

THRUXTON PARISH COUNCIL

Chairman: CWM Milner Williams TD FCIS

12/11/19

Dear Ms O'Rourke

Ref -Thruxton Neighbourhood Plan Examination Ref: 01/MOR/TNP

Thank you for your letter of 1st November 2019. Please see below the answers, in red, to the questions asked of Thruxton Parish Council.

Questions to Thruxton Parish Council:

1. Please confirm that the Consultation Statement dated January 2019, but marked as V2.6, includes the amendments that were required to be made by the Borough Council, as explained at the top of page 3 of the Borough Council's response dated September 2019 (reference pages 11-8 of the TNP). **V2.6 of the Consultation Statement included all amendments required by the Borough Council. There is an e mail trail of the dialogue between the Thruxton Parish Council NDP Steering Group (SG) and TVBC demonstrating the progression through earlier versions of the Consultation Statement to v2.6 which satisfies TVBC requirements.**
2. Please confirm whether the QB carried out a local housing needs survey and, if so, please provide the survey results. **A housing needs survey has not been carried out in the period January 2014 to date i.e. the period of development of the NDP.**
3. As Thruxton lies well to the west of the western boundary of the South Downs National Park, please clarify for me the relationship of the National Park Authority (whose logo is on the front of the Basic Conditions Statement and the Consultation Statement) to the Parish Council and, as I am not familiar with the role of the South Downs National Park Consultancy Services. **SDNPA have acted in their capacity as consultants not as a National Park Authority. Their website <https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning/community-planning/neighbourhood-development-plans/neighbourhood-planning-consultancy-service/> gives details of the services they offer and refers to the Thruxton Plan as one example of their work.**
4. Other than the 3 page document entitled Views Policy Research September 2018 (listed in the TNP Evidence Base and in the Consultation Statement at Appendix B), is there any other evidence as to what is important about the 15 views listed in policy EN3? **There is a continuing theme evident in the whole of the information gathered to create our NDP that supports these views as being important. A good part the LGS Consultation Weekend was spent explaining why views could not be designated in the way that LGS are despite the views over the LGSs being equally important. From the initial 2016 Survey the setting, rural feel, settlement separation, enjoyment of our footpaths, community feel and tranquillity of the communities in the Parish have**

been strongly expressed. It is the visual appreciation of the Parish that largely gives rise to these feelings as expressed in the “What makes the settlement special” returns. The research carried out by Surrey University referenced in that report states “Professor Bertram Opitz, Professor in Neuroimaging and Cognitive Neuroscience at the University of Surrey, said: “Visualizing special places, be it a garden or an area of outstanding beauty, can trigger an emotional response in individuals, helping to improve their overall physical wellbeing and alleviate anxiety and depression.” It is the visual impact of the areas covered by the views, on homecoming, leaving a place or moving about the Parish, that makes the listed views important to Parishioners and their emotional wellbeing. 97.6% of Parishioners supported Policy EN 3 relating to Protecting Views. ‘Other Agency’ comments did give rise to the Policy being amended and the Evidence base strengthened. A spreadsheet detailing the Regulation 14 Consultation responses and the SG determination against every comment will be provided to support the above.

5. The Local Green Space Assessment Report January to July 2017 refers at paragraph 4.1 to the Neighbourhood Planning Group Potential Local Green Space Allocation May 2017 Report and its identification of 12 sites, whittled down from an initial 18 sites (paragraph 5.30 of the TNP). However, the latter document only puts forward 5 sites within the Thruxton Conservation Area as potential LGSs. Where do I find the evidence of the initial 18 sites considered as possible suitable Local Green Spaces and the selection of the 12 sites taken forward? In the Evidence Base on the Parish Council website Document “07 Local Green Space Assessment Report, SDNPA consultancy services 2017” details how 12 proposed areas were reduced to 8. The ownership of the Recreational Field was in the process of changing hands and designation of that field under the Sports Fields in Trust scheme was being sought. This has proved successful and hence the Recreational Field has been deleted from the LGS list. Earlier, during the Land Appraisal phase, other areas were considered but rejected prior to submission for SDNPA advice. These were, The George Inn Yard, strip behind the George Car Park, the ‘Daisy Field’ immediately to the east of the eastern footpath and adjoining Dauntsey Lane, the field to the north west of the Village Street opposite Lovell Close, the fields to the north and east of Stanbury Close and Lambourne Close and land opposite Stanbury Close. Additional information is included in In the Further Evidence Base on the Parish Council website in the various Land Appraisals.
6. Please provide the area in hectares of each the 7 Local Green Spaces designated in policy EN8. LGS1 The Village Green, 0.488Ha; LGS2 Manorial Earthworks, 1.460Ha; LGS3 Snowdrop Field, 1.041Ha; LGS4 Churchyard, 0.367Ha; LGS5 Allotments 0.396Ha; LGS6 Mullen’s Pond and surrounding fields, 5.885Ha; LGS 7 Land between Coach Park and eastern footpath, 3.311HA.
7. Please provide an amended Map 5 correctly annotated to show Flood Zones 2 and 3, as referred to in paragraph 5.39 of the NP, to include an Environment Agency copyright, and entitled Flood Zones, not Flooding. **Attached.**
8. The TNP at paragraph 5.17 describes the River Test as a complex chalk river of international importance. Please give details of any relevant national/international nature designations. One branch of the Pillhill Brook, designated as a major river, has its source in the Parish the other branch rises in the adjacent Fyfield Parish and runs into Thruxton Parish. The Pillhill Brook is a tributary of the River Anton which is in turn a tributary of the River Test. Other than the Mullen’s Pond SINC the SG are

not aware of any relevant national or international designations for the Pillhill Brook. The following links may provide useful information in response to this query relating to the River Test:

<https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx?startTopic=Designations&activeLayer=sssiIndex&query=HYPERLINK%3D%272000170%27>

<http://hampshirebiodiversity.org.uk/pdf/PublishedPlans/ChalkStreamsHAPjiDTP2.pdf>

<https://www.testvalley.gov.uk/planning-and-building/treesandlandscape/landscape-character-assessment-documents> in particular LCA 5H Pillhill Brook Valley Floor a subset of LCT5 River Valley Floor.

9. Where do I find evidence to support the parking standards proposed in policy HD6? The evidence is largely anecdotal (parking issues are regularly raised at Parish Council Meetings, as recently as 6 NOV 2019) other than the returns from the 2016 Survey and Regulation 14 Consultation (copy to be provided see our response to Question 9 above). Responses to the 2016 Survey showed over 80% of respondents were concerned that the lack of parking in Thruxton Village would mean further development would be unsustainable. The CA Land Appraisal 2018, see Evidence Base, reports this problem further and includes photographs of some problem areas. Originally this standard was set at 1.5 per household (copied from the then existing TVBC guidance?) but a Parishioner comment asking that it be clear that “rounding” would be up not down led to this being rounded up in our NDP. On street parking is an issue in Thruxton Village and Parishioner views are that it should not be exacerbated under any circumstances. It is felt that one-bedroom properties are as likely to house two people as one and hence two parking spaces would be essential as there is little public transport infrastructure to support Thruxton residents.
10. Appendix 1 of the TNP lists parish heritage assets. The ‘barn/garage at Hamble House’ is not listed in policy H3. Should this property be deleted from Appendix 1? This error will be amended at the next opportunity to include the ‘barn/garage at Hamble House’ in the Policy H3 list.

For information and request for document

On the Thruxton Parish Council website, Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base, I was unable to open the following documents – Nos 7, 11, 13, 14 and 16, and on the Further Evidence Base, the Comparison of Village Appraisals 1981, 1997, 2009. However, other than No 16, I was able to access these documents via Appendix B of the Consultation Statement. Can I be provided with either a link to this document, or the document itself? The SG regret but cannot explain why you are unable to open these links. The author has just successfully opened all of them from the Evidence Base as have other SG members. The link to the Conservation Areas document is:

<http://www.thruxtonvillage.com/shared/attachments.asp?f=256568e3%2D60ec%2D48fc%2D9eb4%2Dcb3c3af43e00%2Epdf&o=16%2DFyfiled%2C%2DKimpton%2C%2DThruxton%2DConservation%2DPolicy%2C%2DTVBC%2D1985%2Epdf>

The spreadsheet referred to in our response to your question 9 above will be added to the PC website ‘Further Evidence Base’ as will another spreadsheet detailing the SG position on the Regulation 16 responses. Once the PC have agreed to this we will notify you and anticipate this will be achieved before Friday 22 NOV 2019.

Yours Sincerely

Heather Bourner

Heather Bourner
Clerk to the Parish Council

Please reply or contact the Clerk to Thruxton Parish Council:

Mrs Heather Bourner, Tanglewood, Stanbury Road, THRUXTON, Hampshire SP11 8NR.
Tel 01264 773976.

E-Mail: Heather.Bourner@googlemail.com