

**THRUXTON N.D.P. OBJECTIVES CONSULTATION EXERCISE
RESULTS WITH ALL COMMENTS**

Environment objectives: *the parish is rural by nature and the environment objectives seek to protect, conserve and (where possible) enhance the natural environment and biodiversity that currently exists*

Proposed Objectives	Agree	Disagree	Comment
To conserve the rural agricultural nature of the landscape	129		<p>Yes but not sure what this means, no obvious agricultural elements in Thruxton.</p> <p>Maintain as many views of open fields.</p> <p>To protect green belt land.</p> <p>Strongly agree.</p> <p>We seem to be loosing quite a few trees in the village.</p> <p>Important</p> <p>Crucial</p> <p>[Lots of ticks in 'Agree]</p> <p>V. important.</p>

			<p>Consistent with current usage.</p> <p>While not refusing any worthwhile changes just to conserve it.</p> <p>Strongly agree. This is essential. We can develop but must not become a semi urban area.</p> <p>Stop building new houses.</p> <p>[agree - triple tick]</p>
<p>To protect views and vistas into and across open countryside from the public roads and footpaths.</p>	<p>126</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Does not seem so important.</p> <p>There are many walks - travesty to loose.</p> <p>Public roads and footpaths v. diff. impact. No to roads and yes to footpaths.</p> <p>Farmers should keep hedges under control.</p> <p>[Lots of ticks in 'Agree]</p> <p>Very important to monitor these footpaths so that they remain open and accessible.</p>

			<p>Where practical for landowner.</p> <p>Yes, especially coming down from Weyhill looking towards the village.</p> <p>Who do you see doing this?</p> <p>Village look has changed in the 70s, 80s and 90s so a modest change should be expected.</p> <p>[Agree - triple tick]</p>
<p>Look to identify and designate Local Green Space where designation will preserve the rural character and sense of place of the Parish, be of recreational value or support wildlife and the environment</p>	<p>128</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Our village Green is important.</p> <p>Village Green, Recreation ground, fields surrounding Mullen's Pond, Field between Stanbury Road and Shoddesden Road.</p> <p>Very Important</p> <p>Desirable.</p> <p>Not possible if open countryside is not protected.</p> <p>Can you be specific about any sites you have in mind.</p>

			<p>Strongly agree. Protect the land that makes the village/parish what it is.</p> <p>The airfield <u>used</u> to fit this description.</p> <p>We cannot preserve the village in aspic but need to be sympathetic.</p>
To protect and enhance local green space (in all its forms) which is not suitable for designation but which is important to the community, including allotments (if not designated).	128	1	<p>Strongly agree</p> <p>Very Important</p> <p>Crucial</p> <p>Not possible if open countryside is not protected.</p> <p>To protect children and dog walkers.</p> <p>Allotments seem to be gradually taken over.</p> <p>Protect green spaces where possible. Not sure what designation means.</p>
To promote high energy efficiency standards in all future development	125	3	<p>Sustainability should be promoted in new construction.</p> <p>Over and above B. Regs min. requirements.</p>

			<p>OK</p> <p>All new houses should have solar as standard.</p> <p>More information.</p> <p>Important</p> <p>Not important.</p> <p>Cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Cost must be considered.</p> <p>Very laudable but these sorts of measures make build costs higher which would undermine affordability so it's a balance.</p> <p>Does this mean 'eco housing'?</p> <p>This requires TVBC to support energy efficiency by applying ?? ...and conservation area regulations. Currently these are used to trump essential progress e.g. not permitting double glazing in listed buildings</p>
--	--	--	--

To protect natural water sources that occur, underground and over land.	130		<p>OK</p> <p>Important.</p> <p>Especially the stream through the village, which seems to get less.</p> <p>Water is naturally soothing to listen to.</p>
To mitigate pollution (in all forms) within the Parish	127	1	<p>Triple (agree) tick – of course</p> <p>Farm spray Harvest (?)</p> <p>Obviously.</p> <p>Important</p> <p>Not understood.</p> <p>Pollution from A303 a priority.</p> <p>Pollution should be reduced, not just mitigated.</p> <p>Pollution from A303 concerning to those who live near it – lots in the news about health risks of particulates and noise.</p> <p>Including air quality from A303 and noise.</p>

		<p>Some pollution is an unfortunate part of modern life, but encouraging 'green' practices should be a priority.</p>
<p>To create, protect and enhance flora, wildlife habitats and bio diversity across all land within the Parish, especially the ancient 'Open Chalk Landscape'</p>	<p>131</p>	<p>Where is the ancient chalk landscape?</p> <p>Where are the areas of ancient chalk landscape?</p> <p>Interested in projects to protect/increase habitat and would like to participate in this.</p> <p>Important.</p> <p>Also Mullens Pond where there are springs.</p> <p>Not possible if open countryside is not protected.</p> <p>Most important.</p> <p>Strongly agree - where's our wildlife group?</p> <p>Active measures to create are required. This won't occur by just not doing harm.</p> <p>Very important, especially for birds,</p>

			<p>butterflies and bees etc.</p> <p>Maximise wild/water fowl population at Mullenspond. Provide viewing area/platform cut into hedging on Amesbury Road.</p>
<p>To Promote indigenous tree planting where appropriate, and encourage good tree husbandry of existing trees within the Parish boundaries</p>	<p>125</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Should be 'of value'. Yes but where trees are interesting/valuable species. Not just any old ugly bush or tree.</p> <p>Too many trees being cut down and not replaced.</p> <p>As long as Preservation Order isn't slapped on trees which could endanger village and villagers.</p> <p>Only where appropriate</p> <p>To continue the practice of involving young villagers in planting trees.</p> <p>We must plan for future generations.</p> <p>And remove all leylandii please!</p> <p>Strongly agree.</p> <p>Trees in private gardens need better</p>

		<p>maintenance, as do hedges along public paths.</p> <p>Extremely important</p> <p>With judicious application of common sense.</p> <p>Agreed in principle.</p> <p>“Where appropriate” needs to be interpreted taking into account the negative impact of large trees close to dwellings.</p> <p>[Agree}BUT we have too many oversized trees in the wrong places so there must be sensible husbandry and TVBC must permit this and not always apply TPOs.</p> <p>Husbandry yes – planting no because of open countryside.</p> <p>Just maintain the existing trees. We certainly don’t need more.</p> <p>We need to remove non – indigenous species such as Sycamore and Leylandii</p>
--	--	--

Heritage Objectives: *seek to conserve and enhance the rich local heritage assets of the Parish*

Proposed Objectives	Agree	Disagree	Comments
To conserve and enhance the local Thruxton Parish character, identity and cultural heritage	124	1	<p>While embracing cultural diversity.</p> <p>Whose interpretation of character?</p> <p>Don't care.</p> <p>Crucial.</p> <p>Agree but not sure what is the definition of cultural heritage.</p> <p>This is not S.M.A.R.T. As phrased, this means nothing.</p> <p>This is one of the reasons we chose to move to the village.</p> <p>Unsure how to 'enhance' the character.</p>
To identify and, where possible, protect ancient and heritage sites/assets	127		<p>Burial ground available to all residents</p> <p>Very important</p> <p>OK but not everything old is heritage.</p> <p>But assume that listing does that too?</p>

			<p>And prevent damage to areas not yet identified but which could reasonably be of historical/heritage value.</p> <p>These need to be identified in the plan.</p> <p>But is the Village Hall an asset or a liability?</p>
<p>To conserve the built and historic environment and to maintain a Conservation Area within Thrupton Village that reflects local priorities.</p>	<p>123</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Double (agree) tick – can more info be provided on what this is/what it means. E.g. map of area, what is protected? Lots of village isn't worth conserving e.g. modern housing.</p> <p>The Church is a vital asset available to all residents</p> <p>Include Mullen's pond.</p> <p>Not sure what this means but we must recognize that change is inevitable.</p> <p>Imperative.</p> <p>Strongly support.</p> <p>Very important.</p>

			<p>What priorities.</p> <p>(Agree) BUT local? = The key. TVBC are NOT local, nor are HCC.</p>
<p>Seek to preserve the 'Open Chalk Landscape' to the west of the parish, recognising the importance of the setting and views to the community</p>	119	5	<p>Unclear if this would conflict with building development in the west of the parish.</p> <p>Isn't this covered by the objective under environment?</p> <p>Based on wildlife rather than views.</p> <p>Heritage or environment?</p> <p>Not sure what this means.</p> <p>Believe this cannot be protected – also mostly farmland.</p> <p>?</p> <p>This is essential, not a 'nice to have'.</p> <p>Not bothered.</p>
<p>Preserve the separation between the four settlement areas within the Parish, and seek to ensure that future development does not link Thruxton Parish to neighbouring parishes, so as not to reduce further the individual nature of each settlement.</p>	116	9	<p>I do not have a problem with linking either the four settlement areas or the neighbouring parishes, say by linear development. I obviously do not want</p>

		<p>these areas joined by several hundred homes but do not feel we have to remain so insular. People need somewhere to live!!.</p> <p>Particularly the east end of Lambourne Close</p> <p>Definitely (highlights linking of Thruxton Parish to neighbouring parishes).</p> <p>What does this mean?</p> <p>Strongly agree.</p> <p>Isn't this two separate objectives? Strongly agree that the villages should not be linked - they should have green space between them. This objective needs to be rewritten to development boundaries - not about linking parishes.</p> <p>Where are these designated? Where are their boundaries? Who decides on these boundaries?</p> <p>Very important</p> <p>Strongly support in order to preserve</p>
--	--	--

		<p>the unique qualities in each village. Keep the gaps.</p> <p>NO building to take place on Rosebourne land down to the village or Mullens Pond.</p> <p>Top priority. Once this fails, all is lost.</p> <p>?</p> <p>Strongly agree.</p> <p>Ensure green space between Thruxton village and Fyfield.</p> <p>Essential. Must not be subject to ribbon development and urban sprawl. We are a rural and distinct community and Parish. That is why many are here. If I wanted to live in a town I would, but I don't. So don't let townsfolk tell me how to live.</p> <p>We want our own identity as Thruxton.</p> <p>Snopdrop ? Already at risk from the development at the top of Stanbury Road.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>No building of any sort on greenfield sites.</p> <p>Not necessary.</p> <p>Not bothered.</p> <p>Often the developments that lead to this do not involve/include the necessary infrastructure/amenities so whilst we encourage sustainable development, the associated upgrades to infrastructure are just as important.</p> <p>To a point, but it would be really good to have stronger links to the local parishes, including a bus stop at Thruxton Down for the aging population here who will become increasingly isolated otherwise! Sadly, there is not much sense of community at Thruxton Down and it would be nice to have more links into Thruxton for events and activities that the elderly can access. Also a link from Thruxton Down to Rosebourne Garden Centre</p>
--	--	--

Infrastructure objectives: *seek to improve accessibility to and around the parish and promote improved service provision*

Proposed Objectives	Agree	Disagree	Comments
To pursue improvements to public /pedestrian safety in the village	121	4	<p>Neutral/Not priority</p> <p>Need footpath to meet pavement on bus stop side between Lambourne Way entrance. Can't walk on other side because of parked cars; very dangerous when walking dog</p> <p>Speed calming would be welcome.</p> <p>Unclear how this could be achieved in High street.</p> <p>Encourage a speed limit in Amesbury Road, particularly near the T-junction with Village Street. There is more traffic since the Rosebourne development (garden centre) opened. It appears that the Mullen's pond part of Thruxton does not count and that Thruxton and East Cholderton residents are the</p>

		<p>ones that speed in this area.</p> <p>How will this be ???</p> <p>Add better lighting to roads without pavements</p> <p>Maintaining safety standards</p> <p>What about the rest of the parish?</p> <p>Agree that the current status should not be made worse - cannot see how it could be improved.</p> <p>Weight restriction through village (lorries).</p> <p>Review and improve road signs. Enforce speed limit and seek a reduction in the speed limit through the village. The village speed limit should be extended to cover the residential properties off the A303 to the west of the village, to cover Lovell Close and the other properties.</p> <p>Massive problem of speeding.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Particularly Pedestrian</p> <p>Please not too many road signs!</p> <p>Agree to traffic speed limits but not more pavements.</p> <p>Important, but please not pavements everywhere.</p> <p>Better street lighting and paths. Many potholes in roads. When wet I often get splashed by cars when I am walking.</p> <p>So far as is practicable.</p> <p>Paramount. These are areas where safety is seriously lacking.</p> <p>Strongly agree with this. We do not enjoy the village enough because we are scares of the road as a pedestrian. Thinking ahead to when the girls start school, I would want to walk but currently find that frightening as morning 'rush hour traffic is particularly scary.</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Where practicable and manageable.</p> <p>Footpaths/lighting are very poor.</p> <p>How?</p> <p>But do not change character.</p> <p>(Agree – double tick) Strongly agree. The lack of paths/narrow road is a real ??</p> <p>Need pavements as appropriate. Road markings, signs, lights and traffic calming.</p> <p>Street lighting in village street please.</p> <p>Very important. It can be very dangerous walking through the village.</p> <p>[Agree] but does not affect us.</p> <p>20 mph speed limit.</p> <p>20mph speed limit.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Very important.</p> <p>A zebra crossing at Thruxton Down and two streetlights on either side perhaps? Speeding is a problem at Thruxton Down - maybe a 30/40 mph speed limit here.</p> <p>Also footpath beside Thruxton Circuit is just awful with fly tipping, junk and rubbish everywhere. It doesn't feel safe to walk there. Thruxton Down footpaths need clearance, tree cutting back and verge cutting.</p>
To promote improvement in all forms of electronic/data communication	119	5	<p>Neutral/Not priority</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>Presumably broadband – yes please!!!</p> <p>Strongly agree.</p> <p>Particularly mobile phone coverage.</p> <p>Since high-speed broadband came in, local demand means that it is</p>

		<p>starting to slow down.</p> <p>As long as it does not encroach on one particular area.</p> <p>Although improvements to Broadband already good.</p> <p>In hand surely.</p> <p>Not of great importance.</p> <p>Neither agree or disagree</p> <p>Not relevant to all</p> <p>This can be achieved individually.</p> <p>Improve internet speeds.</p> <p>(Triple tick)Could have started with an electronic form for this!</p> <p>Mobile signal dreadful – have to move to particular place in house to use mobile or send text.</p> <p>Broadband and mobile yes. What else? I don't want masts, lots of</p>
--	--	--

			<p>digging or lots of ?? from e.g. junction boxes.</p> <p>Urgent.</p> <p>Very important to us.</p>
To look to increase and improve footpaths giving improved access to the local countryside (including safe access points across the A303)	120	6	<p>Already adequate (x2)</p> <p>Extremely expensive and even more unlikely – but a bridge over the A303 would be a great asset.</p> <p>Concern re potholes in roads . Referred o pothole in Halcyon Drive (now filled).</p> <p>Don't believe we should walk across the A303</p> <p>Double (agree) tick – agree v. important.</p> <p>More than one access/crossing point across A303</p> <p>How?</p> <p>Safe access point to A303 v. important</p>

			<p>Disagree with access across A303 (otherwise agree).</p> <p>Crossing the A303 would be very difficult without a bridge or underpass which are not rural friendly.</p> <p>Important.</p> <p>A303 probably impossible</p> <p>A more proactive role is being pursued by the PC.</p> <p>Don't care.</p> <p>Not a good idea.</p> <p>Important for health and enjoyment of the community to have a variety of walks.</p> <p>The only safe crossing of the A303 would be by public footbridge but this is too expensive.</p> <p>Footbridge only safe access over</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>A303.</p> <p>The A303 is a very dangerous road to cross.</p> <p>How can this be achieved without a footbridge over the A303.</p> <p>No more footpaths.</p> <p>Ensure current footpaths remain useable and are not ploughed over.</p> <p>There were footpaths across the aerodrome and safe crossing needed at the top of croft.</p> <p>The reality of safe access across the A303 is open to challenge.</p> <p>How? A footbridge?</p> <p>Thruxton Down footpath needs cleaning as it is overgrown and slippery.</p>
To encourage improvement to public transport to and from the parish.	116	6	<p>Neutral</p> <p>This will only happen if we work with other areas and aren't so</p>

		<p>insular.</p> <p>Very necessary.</p> <p>Buses too frequent and usually nobody on them.</p> <p>Will this be used?</p> <p>This must be important - it occurs three times in this NDP!</p> <p>The only way to achieve this is through mass development.</p> <p>Smaller buses needed.</p> <p>Not used beyond current provision.</p> <p>Will go with majority.</p> <p>OK.</p> <p>I have no knowledge of the demand for public transport.</p> <p>There needs to be high demand for this to happen.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Buses are infrequent.</p> <p>Public transport TO Thruxton also v. important – not just for us to use.</p> <p>Out of our hands except for engagement with quangos.</p> <p>A basic requirement, largely ignored.</p> <p>Not important to me but important to others.</p> <p>Not practical.</p> <p>No support from village for Saturday bus to Salisbury when offered but could try again I suppose.</p> <p>But the villagers have to make it viable.</p> <p>In honesty, not relevant as we don't use public transport but would support this for local people who do.</p> <p>More bus services would help residents who don't drive.</p>
--	--	---

			<p>This is sorely needed.</p> <p>[Agree - triple tick] - Buses stopping at Thruxton Down please.</p>
<p>To ensure any proposed new development includes an analysis of its effects and impact on the current infrastructure and provides acceptable and appropriate solutions.</p>	<p>120</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Double (agree) tick - Strongly agree</p> <p>Particularly with reference to the current proposal to build on the field in Lambourne Close.</p> <p>Where appropriate - the increased traffic.</p> <p>The area is not geared for any development</p> <p>Only very small developments should be allowed , in a village style.</p> <p>Imperative.</p> <p>Especially access and drainage.</p> <p>No houses to be built until the sewers have been renewed, so that the tankers are no longer needed.</p> <p>Appropriate solutions determined</p>

			<p>by the Parish Council I suspect.</p> <p>very important.....and provides new infrastructure as appropriate .</p> <p>This is essential is we are to retain our identity as a community.</p> <p>The industrial estate is underused at present. Many units under occupied.</p> <p>Not S.M.A.R.T. so means nothing.</p> <p>This is nice in a 'wish list' but where realistically do you see such development? It is a very sensitive subject.</p> <p>This is surely what the planning oversight of the Parish Council is for (and TVBC).</p> <p>v. important.</p>
To reduce the impact of road traffic, noise, pollution and parking	124	4	<p>Definitely need more done on this.</p> <p>Triple (agree) tick</p> <p>Strongly agree.</p>

		<p>Parking important</p> <p>Plus speeds of traffic.</p> <p>People coming to village to use Hall.</p> <p>There isn't much need to reduce it in my opinion.</p> <p>Important to reduce road noise.</p> <p>Ban LGV vehicles (Max 7.5 tons). They have no regard for the kerb on Church Lane X Stanbury Rd.</p> <p>Especially the road surface eon the A303 which has only been half done) ** N. B Resurfacing now due to commence end March 2017 – KP</p> <p>Including alternative route, not just to divert traffic from main road through the village.</p> <p>In principle, yes, but there are few alternatives.</p> <p>HCC is little help here.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Is there a parking problem ? If you don't like the A303, move.</p> <p>Big problem.</p> <p>Better, higher fencing and noise blocking for those backing onto the A303 (as erected post Andover).</p> <p>Better to reduce the volume of traffic.</p> <p>Noise and pollution in particular.</p> <p>Require traffic calming and signs to stop lorries in village centre.</p> <p>Put a weight limit on vehicles through the village.</p> <p>Yes, Yes, Yes!</p> <p>There seems to be more very large lorries coming through the village.</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>Road traffic, noise and parking a problem.</p>
--	--	---

			[Agree – triple tick] – How ? No parking signs at Thruxton Down and also a speed limit.
To work with national agencies to reduce the risk of flooding and to improve flood defences where relevant	121	3	<p>To ensure no development on water meadows.</p> <p>Do we have a flooding problem?</p> <p>Important.</p> <p>Definitely.</p> <p>Massive work to eliminate flooding already in hand at circuit.</p> <p>Not vital in our case.</p> <p>What flooding?</p> <p>Don't care.</p> <p>E.A. must fix stream edge in village centre.</p> <p>Good work so far.</p>
To seek timely and effective maintenance of existing infrastructure			Potholes.

		<p>Important.</p> <p>Especially the sewerage problem</p> <p>PC assuming greater role.</p> <p>Potholes....potholes.</p> <p>Pot holes.</p> <p>Define timely.</p>
--	--	--

Housing / design objectives: *seek to reflect the wishes of the Parish in terms of development scale and design*

Proposed Objectives	Agree	Disagree	Comments
<p>To accept small scale development, or the building of individual dwellings, that meet Parish need and can be situated within the current settlement boundaries</p>	<p>115</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Within current boundaries only, and without using meadows/greenspace/nature areas etc.</p> <p>Development should be supported /encouraged but should enhance the appearance of the village....should be attractive, well designed and sustainable.</p> <p>As long as existing services with any additional properties built.</p> <p>With reservations.</p> <p>Agreed on condition that development is on a one dwelling basis (i.e. individual design and not multi builds on one plot.</p> <p>To stop development /redevelopment of bungalows into houses. There will be no bungalows left for the elderly or disabled.</p> <p>Must be within [current] settlement boundaries.</p> <p>What is classed as small scale? Do we have</p>

		<p>a parish need?</p> <p>I understand the need for new builds but these must not be detrimental to other dwellings within the Parish.</p> <p>Do not need any more development.</p> <p>Meet Parish need?</p> <p>Highlights small scale and individual dwellings.</p> <p>Totally agree.</p> <p>A small row of starter homes would fit in Stanbury Road between the Moorings and the road to the school. The George should be retained as a single dwelling if not viable as a pub.</p> <p>How small is 'small'.</p> <p>[Agree] but being cognizant of the estates and infilling which has taken place over recent decades.</p> <p>We seem to have acknowledged the need for further housing. This should not be</p>
--	--	---

		<p>seen as acceptance of major development: other villages seem to be far less accommodating.</p> <p>Strongly support. A village must grow to survive.</p> <p>Only if the sewage problem has been solved.</p> <p>Agree small and within settlement boundaries. Wouldn't want to see changes to current boundaries.</p> <p>What about schooling/shopping/post office etc.</p> <p>Double tick (agree).</p> <p>[Agree] as long as 'small' developments are 'affordable' for younger families to buy property. We need young people!!</p> <p>Smaller affordable homes for younger people and houses for downsizers – that would leave plenty of 4-5 bed houses for others.</p> <p>Infill better than new sites. Brownfield</p>
--	--	--

			<p>best.</p> <p>To a certain extent.</p> <p>Emphasis on small scale. Suggest any development be limited to 10% of current housing stock.</p> <p>You need to identify acceptable broad parameters for these buildings.</p> <p>Agree with first part but think should extend beyond current boundaries.</p> <p>Those with sympathetic ?? or new development plans could be considered in Thruyton Down.</p>
<p>To ensure that any new development delivers high quality standards of sustainable build and design and is similar in size, scale, bulk, density and separation to existing housing and enhances the character of the Parish.</p>	<p>117</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>Double (agree) tick – yes, very important. Too much 60s/70s/80s development is not that attractive. Pubs need to be redeveloped sensitively.</p> <p>The area is not designed for development on a large scale.</p> <p>Need to make it affordable for a diverse community</p> <p>Agree only on the grounds that this [i.e..</p>

		<p>development] is what will happen.</p> <p>Agree, but not just 4/5 bedrooms that cost a fortune.</p> <p>Avoid more 4/5 bed houses. To include houses for downsizing .</p> <p>[Agree] but being cognizant of the estates and infilling which has taken place over recent decades.</p> <p>Strongly support.</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>Small houses and some flats are required.</p> <p>What about schooling/shopping/post office etc.</p> <p>We need affordable housing.</p> <p>No generic shoe boxes – need to blend with other housing already here.</p> <p>But not like Stanbury Close...awful, futuristic and not rural appropriate/sympathetic buildings. Not</p>
--	--	---

			<p>townhouses.</p> <p>To a certain extent.</p> <p>Emphasis on small scale. Suggest any development be limited to 10% of current housing stock.</p> <p>BUT affordable for young residents currently stuck with their mother!</p>
To ensure that new housing meets the criteria for the 'Lifetime Homes Standard' or equivalent.	114	4	<p>Neither as don't agree with development</p> <p>So long as it fits with the need to promote a diverse community</p> <p>Don't understand lifetime home.</p> <p>Do not know what this is.</p> <p>No idea/Information on this standard</p> <p>No idea ...sorry.</p> <p>[Agree] but being cognizant of the estates and infilling which has taken place over recent decades.</p> <p>Stipulate that must achieve high standards in conditions.</p>

			<p>Haven't seen this, so neither agree or disagree.</p> <p>What about schooling/shopping/post office etc.</p> <p>Don't now.</p> <p>This will contradict [the proposed objective] re mix of housing types.</p> <p>Agree in principle but [previous comments] cost - v- affordability.</p> <p>What is lifetime standard?</p> <p>What is this?</p> <p>As far as possible</p>
<p>To ensure that any new development includes appropriate services and infrastructure to ensure that the current infrastructure and services are not overloaded any further</p>	<p>117</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Neither as don't agree with development</p> <p>Particularly with reference to the current proposal to build on the field in Lambourne Close</p> <p>As long as existing services with any additional properties built.</p>

		<p>Very important.</p> <p>Lambourne Bridge was not a feat of engineering, but as I recall, two large pipes sunk slightly into the stream bed. The area flooded regularly. What are the height and weight restrictions on the bridge? Lambourne Bridge is pivotal to any proposed eastern development. What would happen if the bridge collapsed under the strain? Is there a plan B, and, if so, where and how?</p> <p>Particularly important aspects of this are waste water management and safe traffic access.</p> <p>There will have to be a massive increase in infrastructure for any development.</p> <p>N.B. Internet</p> <p>If any development was 'small scale' his wouldn't be necessary.</p> <p><u>All</u> additional development will put a strain on services.</p> <p>Very important.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Infrastructure, schools, transport and medical to be taken into account.</p> <p>A basic requirement.</p> <p>Problem.</p> <p>What about schooling/shopping/post office etc.</p> <p>Must include at least: drainage, water, electricity, broadband, sewage, parking, lighting, roadmaking, and NOT too much light and traffic.</p> <p>School would be a concern for us, especially if large development with more families/children.</p> <p>This is essential.</p> <p>Essential that infrastructure is able to cope.</p> <p>V. important as development elsewhere highlights the hazards if this is not addressed.</p>
--	--	---

			Buses to Thruxton Down to access Tidworth, Andover and possibly Salisbury. How about a minibus service for the elderly?
To ensure that, where appropriate, any additional development is undertaken on phased basis to reduce integration impact to the existing residents/dwellings.	107	10	<p>Should be no development but if there has to be, would agree.</p> <p>Better to do it at the same time.</p> <p>Agreed on condition that development is on a one dwelling basis (i.e. individual design and not multi builds on one plot. – we live in a small parish and multiple developments would spoil both the design and feel of this location.</p> <p>But need to ensure that phasing does not prolong disruption to the surrounding area.</p> <p>Most definitely .</p> <p>Is this practical for the developer?</p> <p>Poorly worded. Should read ‘To ensure that, where applicable, any additional development is undertaken on a phased basis to reduce the impact of construction to the existing</p>

		<p>residents/dwellings'.</p> <p>Depends on the size of the proposed developments.</p> <p>If any development was 'small scale' his wouldn't be necessary.</p> <p>Don't understand 'integration impact'.</p> <p>Good point.</p> <p>Agree and disagree. If building is to happen would like to see it completed as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Don't care.</p> <p>What about schooling/shopping/post office etc.</p> <p>Living near a constant building site would be a pain. Best to build quickly.</p> <p>Is it better to get it done and then get used to it finished.</p> <p>Essential. Sudden large scale development would be contrary to the existing</p>
--	--	---

			<p>village/parish ethos, atmosphere etc.</p> <p>Does not matter.</p>
Ensure the mix of housing types and supply meet the needs of the Parish	113	8	<p>Should be no development but if there has to be, would agree.</p> <p>Siting of mixed housing project to be carefully considered. It is a village.</p> <p>But realistically cheap starter homes for young people are likely to fail the conservation test, so I think this will be hard to achieve/is in conflict with other objectives.</p> <p>How is that need established?</p> <p>As defined by? Survey?</p> <p>Against low cost housing – Thruxton is a high end village.</p> <p>“Affordable” housing only.</p> <p>Don’t care.</p> <p>Avoid more 4/5 bed houses. To include houses for downsizing.</p>

			<p>If any development was 'small scale' his wouldn't be necessary.</p> <p>[Agree] but being cognizant of the estates and infilling which has taken place over recent decades.</p> <p>This is important esp. to encourage young residents to be able to stay in the village (low cost housing).</p> <p>What about schooling/shopping/post office etc.</p> <p>Defined by whom? Not just the PC or TVBC. Needs public consultation.</p> <p>Local people have first rights etc.</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>People need houses too – not just to think about the Parish needs.</p> <p>How many houses have been built in the village in the last 10 years.</p>
Ensure that within any new housing scheme adequate parking, suitable landscaping (including house gardens) and suitable access are included	124	1.	Should be no development but if there has to be, would agree

<p>as appropriate in their location.</p>			<p>Triple (agree) tick – very important. Parking needs to be sufficient.</p> <p>Don't want any more houses.</p> <p>[Agree but] Don't like the terminology 'scheme'.</p> <p>Including 'future proofing' car parking. Family homes can start with one or two cars but need parking for 3 or 4 as children reach the age of 17.</p> <p>An consideration of visitor parking, and that families with older children may have more than two cars.</p> <p>What about schooling/shopping/post office etc.</p> <p>Access not just to buildings but appropriate to village/parish too. Impact on all must be considered.</p> <p>Housing development usually sees lots of cars parked on paths and roads...roads are too narrow to handle.</p>
--	--	--	---

			Parking is a problem already.
In Thruxton Village, to support the approach and requirements of the Village Design Statement to achieve delivery of development that preserves local characteristics.	104	5	<p>Excellent.</p> <p>Local 'Characteristics'??</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>Design statement specifically does not mention the Parish beyond the village.</p> <p>Nice to keep residents informed.</p>

Economic objectives: *seek to maintain local business and employment opportunities, by supporting SMEs within the settlements, agricultural holdings and the major employment sites on and adjacent to the airfield (within Thruxton Parish)*

Proposed Objectives	Agree	Disagree	Comments
To foster a sustainable community that promotes and supports employment across a range of businesses	122	1	<p>With the closure of the local shop/pub/P.O. little can be promoted. Exception are airfield businesses.</p> <p>Two wage earners in household, neither work in parish, so unaffected.</p> <p>Small scale only.</p> <p>Including single person enterprises working from home and split site working.</p> <p>Employment opportunities are very limited being mostly self employed.</p> <p>Large scale industry is inappropriate in this setting.</p> <p>Include 'develop' in heading as 'maintain' won't keep the village viable.</p> <p>New businesses to be encouraged.</p> <p>The community is ? but no development should take place on greenfield sites.</p> <p>[Agree - Double tick]</p>

<p>To protect all current local employment sites, SMEs, agriculture, and those on the airfield site</p>	<p>123</p>		<p>Had 2 workshops on airfield site for 31 yrs.</p> <p>Double (agree) tick – strongly agree</p> <p>Very important</p> <p>Don't want to loose The George.</p> <p>Neither agree or disagree.</p> <p>Difficult to achieve this if the private owner shuts down sites.</p> <p>How? What role does the PC have and what power?</p> <p>Encourage use of used units on the industrial estate before considering expansion.</p> <p>Don't understand SME</p> <p>[Agree - Double tick]</p> <p>If economically viable.</p>
<p>To continue to foster an engaged and understanding relationship with the Thrupton Airfield site and all associated businesses</p>	<p>127</p>		<p>Very important</p> <p>Thrupton airfield must be monitored for size of planes and aircraft using it. I live under the flight path. On</p>

			<p>occasions the planes come in so low that I fear for my family's safety and that they may hit my chimney.</p> <p>Regular meetings held with airfield and circuit and several villagers work at the businesses there.</p> <p>Very important that the Airfield and Village remain in step with each other.</p> <p>Stop moaning about airfield and circuit. They were there before 99% of us.</p> <p>Most important.</p> <p>Double tick (agree).</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>Does not affect us</p>
<p>To seek to improve public transport that is available at times that suit journeys to and from work from and to the village</p>	<p>123</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Can't see how this could be achieved as public transport links to train/bus station are so poor.</p> <p>Transport for evening activities is unavailable</p> <p>Double tick – essential within ageing community.</p> <p>This assumes that people of the village who work in Andover need public transport.</p>

			<p>But believe this is unrealistic.</p> <p>Smaller buses or minibuses.</p> <p>Not enough demand.</p> <p>Important.</p> <p>Not in our gift.</p> <p>Own transport required. (Big Problem). Best of luck.</p> <p>Not practical.</p> <p>And to access leisure/shopping facilities, not just work i.e. weekends.</p> <p>People here will have to make it viable.</p> <p>Needs looking into.</p> <p>Does not affect us.</p> <p>At least one outwards/return bus service should be provided on Saturdays.</p> <p>Throughout the calendar year – not just in school terms.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Can we be creative as public transport is a waste of time and totally inadequate.</p> <p>At present working life is difficult for non drivers. Perhaps promotion of a lift share scheme??</p> <p>Don't forget about us at Thruxton Down!!</p>
--	--	--	--

Community/Wellbeing Objectives: *seek to retain existing services enjoyed in the Parish and, as appropriate, support new/additional services and facilities that will benefit the community and/or promote health and wellbeing*

Proposed Objectives	Agree	Disagree	Comments
<p>Ensure that any 'Planning Gain' from all developments, (CIL/s106 monies) and any other investment that accrues from future schemes is maximized for the benefit of the Parish</p>	<p>106</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Do not understand the terminology (x2)</p> <p>ALL the parish.</p> <p>Whatever this means!</p> <p>OK</p> <p>Don't like the terminology 'scheme'.</p> <p>I don't understand what this means.</p> <p>The PC maintains a wish list which is regularly updated.</p> <p>Not sure what t his means.</p> <p>Not understood.</p> <p>Where appropriate.</p> <p>?</p>

			<p>Jargon alert!</p> <p>What is this about?</p> <p>Noise /pollution reduction</p> <p>Essential. Must not go into a general TVBC pot.</p>
<p>To seek to support the elderly and those with any disability to be able to continue to live within the Parish.</p>	126	1	<p>1x double tick.</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>Need to include the provision for affordable starter homes too.</p> <p>This should include the youth within the village.</p> <p>Suggest the insertion of the word 'infirm' between 'the' and 'elderly'.</p> <p>Interest declared!</p> <p>Desirable.</p> <p>What about the young? Many old people are very well off and cared for.</p> <p>A big challenge. Consult social services.</p> <p>How?</p>

			<p>Not sure how?</p> <p>Change to 'elderly people'. How?</p> <p>and also the children/youth of the Parish so that they are able to stay here as adults.</p> <p>[Agree - triple tick]Buses or minibuses from Thruxton Down to Andover, Tidworth, Salisbury with regular services please</p>
Improve outdoor facilities for children.	122	4	<p>Already have a park and good access to countryside (x2)</p> <p>Already available, hardly utilised.</p> <p>Play equipment on Green?</p> <p>But that means that we must make it possible for relatively young families to live here.</p> <p>Insert 'recreational' and broaden to all - not just children.</p> <p>Yes please!</p> <p>Subject to local demand, if any and increase facilities at play area.</p>

			<p>Improve all facilities for children and more aged members of the community.</p> <p>Strongly support.</p> <p>Particularly on the Green.</p> <p>Yes please. Strongly agree.</p> <p>How, given today's environment?</p> <p>Are there enough children to justify this?</p> <p>Keep noise levels down.</p> <p>In desperate need of better park/play area for toddlers etc.</p> <p>[Agree - Double tick)</p> <p>Would not want to see a play park on the Green but not against funds being used for child friendly facilities.</p>
To secure the long term future of existing community services and assets	126		<p>Strongly support.</p> <p>In principle.</p>

			<p>What are these? Play areas? The Hall? If it's the Hall disagree, as it cost too much to run and a modern alternative would be preferable.</p> <p>What are they? The Hall, the Green and the Sportsfield??</p>
To maximise opportunities to access the countryside for leisure and exercise	125	2	<p>Covered in previous question.</p> <p>Can we access Mullen's Pond? Walking route - it would be nice if it could be made clearer/better signposted.</p> <p>Unclear as to how this would work in practice.</p> <p>Much of the area is active farmland and is not safe for public access and can destroy crops etc.</p> <p>We do have Thruxton Circuit on the door step. Plenty of opportunities up there!</p> <p>Double tick.</p> <p>Most important.</p> <p>Better (and more) maintained footpaths for joggers/walkers etc.</p>

Proposals that meet the stated wishes of the community but which are not issues that can be addressed under an NDP. The feedback from this section will be fed back to the Parish Council.

Proposed Objectives	Agree	Disagree	Comments
To identify existing assets which could be protected under The Assets of Community Value (England) Regulations 2012	116	3	<p>Very important.</p> <p>Do not understand the terminology.</p> <p>Do not know what this is so cannot specify.</p> <p>If this includes the Hall, could the Trustees be consulted.</p> <p>I don't understand the implications of this question.</p> <p>the Green is registered under the 2006 Act. The George? The allotments?</p> <p>No idea.</p> <p>Don't know.</p> <p>Don't know about.</p>
To seek to create and or work in partnership with organisations for the extension and promotion of existing community facilities and services.	125	1	The village already enjoys a pretty comprehensive range.

			<p>No idea.</p> <p>Are we big enough for that? I am not sure what services we have.</p> <p>not many of them currently.</p>
To consult and work with the community to identify and prioritize spending on any new community facilities	123	3	<p>Consultation being a apriority. No MIMBEs</p> <p>In hand but room for improvement.</p> <p>Some will benefit at cost to others.</p>
Encourage community involvement and action in line with the NP	116	2	<p>Please .</p> <p>This will always rely upon the committed few.</p> <p>As long as it is not an excuse for no action.</p>
To assist in the development and promotion of informal social education facilities for younger residents of the community.	114	4	<p>Double (agree) tick – greater use of Village Hall facilities.</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>Unclear as to what this means.</p> <p>Yes please!</p> <p>The last time we tried this, they showed no interest.</p>

		<p>How?</p> <p>Not sure what that means – is it a youth club?</p> <p>[Agree - Double tick)</p> <p>Not sure what this means – youth club?</p>
<p>To develop a policy and work with service providers (Water, Electricity, Drainage, Communications) to ensure that issues are brought to their attention and dealt with in an effective and timely manner.</p>	<p>125</p>	<p>Double (agree) tick – Good idea</p> <p>Important.</p> <p>The PC does this very well.</p> <p>Clearing road drains of leaves and debris is essential but NOT being done.</p> <p>(Double agree tick)First sensible question .</p> <p>Perhaps a hotline to No. 10 would be more effective (and more achievable!!).</p> <p>Is a policy necessary?</p>

			Also road surfacing.
To ensure that the whole community is consulted at an early date on all matters relating to development proposals.	123	2	<p>Triple (agree) tick – Yes, very important.</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>Strongly agree.</p> <p>Seems a little impractical – how?</p> <p>Planning is discussed at Parish Council meetings which are open to all.</p> <p>Important.</p> <p>This phrasing is too vague, an agreed point should be made.</p> <p>Only small developments when infrastructure has been done.</p> <p>The monthly newsletter (Thruyton Times) is valuable for this.</p> <p>The whole community will never agree, so lets get on with building for the future.</p>

			<p>Vital.</p> <p>and not just once but continually thereafter. One or two PC members adopt a superior attitude – we all have equality in the Parish.</p> <p>Must be open and honest.</p> <p>Very important.</p> <p>Ensure aspiration is not quashed by NIMBYs</p> <p>Important to us e.g. The George.</p> <p>Including Thruxton Down</p>
--	--	--	--

Proposals for the Review of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (will be incorporated into the NDP but listed here for information and are not Objectives)

Proposed Objectives	Agree	Disagree	Comments
The Thruxton Parish Council will monitor the TVBC Local Plan and will revisit the NDP in accordance with statutory requirements to ensure it remains relevant and continues to meet the requirements of the parish and the TVBC plan. If necessary, a full review will be carried out.	125	1	<p>Excellent.</p> <p>Statutory review after 5 years</p>

			<p>[Agree - Double tick) . TVBC – not very user friendly.</p> <p>But membership of the NDP steering group should not be closed to 'selected' members</p>
Reviews will be undertaken by the steering group on behalf of the Parish Council.	118	4	<p>But it doesn't have to be the same people!</p> <p>But not sure who the Steering Group consists of.</p> <p>Frequently.</p> <p>If you want independence, why not involve outsiders.</p> <p>Essential for objectivity.</p> <p>But membership of the NDP steering group should not be closed to 'selected' members.</p> <p>Important to see village represented.</p>
Reviews will include provision for meaningful public consultation	123	1	<p>Good.</p> <p>Might get brassed off.</p>

			Essential for objectivity.
The results of any review will be made known to the Parish and acted upon by the Parish Council.	124	1	<u>But should be advisory</u> Of course. And to residents. Must cover all, not selective elements. If selective then ensure objective and broad consensus achieved....not on the say so of individuals. Very important.

Plus some other comments at the end of the questionnaire:

- Several thanking the Steering Group for their efforts.
- ‘ This is an ambitious wish list. In the body of the plan it is suggested there is a broad list establishing where responsibilities lie in establishing the Objectives. In reality, organizing the current workload is a challenge to villagers who will volunteer. If the NP is overambitious ‘faith’ in its contents will be lost’.
- Aging population at Thrupton Down really need a bus stop and regular services. The Quarley bus (which is irregular) doesn’t stop here and the Tidworth/Salisbury bus doesn’t either. Thrupton Down appears to be a Black hole for public transport and this really does need to be resolved. How about a minibus service for the elderly and disabled at Thrupton and Thrupton Down, twice a week, into Andover to resolve this bus issue? Thrupton has an aging population too. Also stopping at Rosebourne garden Centre, train station, hospital, useful shops etc.

- It's about time that Amesbury Road had a speed limit near the T junction of Amesbury Road and Village Street as there is more traffic since the Rosebourne development was opened. It appears that the Mullens Pond part of Thruxton does not count, and Thruxton residents and Cholderton residents are the ones that speed.

Practice considerations in recording responses

1. **Total number of papers completed and returned/ collected - 132**
2. Double ticks counted as one tick only but are referred to in comments section.
3. Where tick in the middle i.e. between agree and disagree, it is counted as a blank. The 'blanks' are not specifically recorded, but agree+disagree+blank = 132.
4. The papers were gone through twice to count for 'disagrees' and to count those questions left blank. There was a little disparity on some questions and the **higher** recorded figure for 'disagree' is what is recorded the face of this document (i.e. there may have been fewer 'disagrees' but there will not have been more].

Other observations

- There were an abnormally high number of blanks for the question relating to the Village Design Statement. The question was at the top of a page and the last one in its section and it is reasonable to think that it was missed.
- The CIL recorded a high number of blanks but the comments suggest that this is because the terminology was misunderstood.