

# Overall Analysis

Overall Analysis	Response Analysis									
	Responses Received	Abstain	Agree	Disagree	Abstain % of Respondents	Agree % of Respondents	Disagree % of Respondents	Abstain % of Parish Residents	Agree % of Parish Residents	Disagree % of Parish Residents
General:										
Does the overall presentation of the Plan meet with your approval?	127		124	3	0.0%	97.6%	2.4%	0.0%	24.0%	0.6%
Policies:										
Landscape and Environment:										
EN1: Landscape and Character of Thruxton Parish	127		126	1	0.0%	99.2%	0.8%	0.0%	24.4%	0.2%
EN2: Settlement character and separation	127		125	2	0.0%	98.4%	1.6%	0.0%	24.2%	0.4%
EN3: Protecting views	127		123	4	0.0%	96.9%	3.1%	0.0%	23.8%	0.8%
EN4: Biodiversity	127		127		0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24.6%	0.0%
EN5: Pillhill Brook	127	1	124	2	0.8%	97.6%	1.6%	0.2%	24.0%	0.4%
EN6: Trees and hedgerows	127		127		0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24.6%	0.0%
EN7: Green Infrastructure	127		123	4	0.0%	96.9%	3.1%	0.0%	23.8%	0.8%
EN8: Local Green Space	127		121	6	0.0%	95.3%	4.7%	0.0%	23.4%	1.2%
EN9: Pollution	127		125	2	0.0%	98.4%	1.6%	0.0%	24.2%	0.4%
EN10: Flood Risk	127		125	2	0.0%	98.4%	1.6%	0.0%	24.2%	0.4%
Heritage:										
H1: Conservation Area	127		123	4	0.0%	96.9%	3.1%	0.0%	23.8%	0.8%
H2: Archaeology	127		124	3	0.0%	97.6%	2.4%	0.0%	24.0%	0.6%
H3: Parish Heritage Assets	127		126	1	0.0%	99.2%	0.8%	0.0%	24.4%	0.2%
Housing and Design:										
HD1: New Residential Development	127		111	16	0.0%	87.4%	12.6%	0.0%	21.5%	3.1%
HD2: Replacement dwellings, extensions and annexes	127		124	3	0.0%	97.6%	2.4%	0.0%	24.0%	0.6%
HD3: Sub-division of Residential Gardens	127	2	119	6	1.6%	93.7%	4.7%	0.4%	23.0%	1.2%
HD4: Design	127		125.5	1.5	0.0%	98.8%	1.2%	0.0%	24.3%	0.3%
HD5: Outdoor Space	127		126	1	0.0%	99.2%	0.8%	0.0%	24.4%	0.2%
HD6: Off-Street Parking	127		126	1	0.0%	99.2%	0.8%	0.0%	24.4%	0.2%
HD7: Supporting independent living and sheltered housing	127		124	3	0.0%	97.6%	2.4%	0.0%	24.0%	0.6%
HD8: Rural Exception Housing for Local People	127		121	6	0.0%	95.3%	4.7%	0.0%	23.4%	1.2%
Community Infrastructure & Wellbeing:										
CI1: Protection of existing community facilities	127		126	1	0.0%	99.2%	0.8%	0.0%	24.4%	0.2%
CI2: Provision of new community facilities	127		124	3	0.0%	97.6%	2.4%	0.0%	24.0%	0.6%
CI3: Developer Contribution to Infrastructure Improvements	127		120	7	0.0%	94.5%	5.5%	0.0%	23.2%	1.4%
CI4: Improved Pedestrian and Travel to School Safety	127		123	4	0.0%	96.9%	3.1%	0.0%	23.8%	0.8%
CI5: Increased Access Points and Traffic	127	1	118	8	0.8%	92.9%	6.3%	0.2%	22.8%	1.5%
CI6: Connected Countryside	127	1	122	4	0.8%	96.1%	3.1%	0.2%	23.6%	0.8%
Economy and Thruxton Airfield:										
EC1: Thruxton Airfield	127		121	6	0.0%	95.3%	4.7%	0.0%	23.4%	1.2%
Overall Plan plus number of Policies										
Percentage of Respondents	28	5	3449.5	101.5						
Percentage of Parish Residents (see note 1)	24.6%	0.0%	23.8%	0.7%						
Total of Parish Residents (see note 1)	517									
Entered Responses Total	127									

## Notes:

1. The number of Parishioners eligible to vote on the NDP is the number used here. The number quoted at Section 2.20 of the NDP is the expected total population at 2021 (i.e. 634, this includes those under voting age).

2. Some outside agencies have been contacted with a copy of the NDP. Where appropriate their comments have been included in the "Record Other Agency's Comments" worksheet but they have not been counted as having a vote in the analysis above as they are not Parishioners.

Policy	Responder's Comment	Determination Rationale	SONPA response	Action Determination		
				Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
<b>General:</b>						
Does the overall presentation of the Plan meet with your approval?	A lot of thought and hard work has gone into this impressive document. It should help to protect our village and local environment for years to come. Well done.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Excellent, very professional and great flow to the whole project.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	First rate - clearly set out, well presented and user friendly. (Tho' it would have been helpful to put on the "Needs You" sheet the page numbers for sections 5 - 10 to enable quick referencing back). Thank you for all the enormous amount of time and effort you are giving to carrying out this work on behalf of the whole community.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Excellent work, Congratulations to everyone involved. (this comment was "dittoed" for every other Policy except EC1 see below)	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	This is a very comprehensive report, well presented, easy to understand with a good photographic input. Well done to all who produced it! Let's hope it gets the results needed.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	I have found this to be an extremely comprehensive and interesting compilation of the future plans for the village. I would like to convey my thanks to all who have worked so hard and given so much of their time to this project. I thoroughly enjoyed reading the booklet through from cover to cover. A very interesting and enjoyable read.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Well thought out and comprehensive.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Just wondering why there is a photo of my house on page 52? What point is being made here?	The photo was included to show sympathetic new and old build. Parishioner informed.		NO	N/A	YES, complete
	This is an excellent document which reflects an outstanding team effort. Somewhere in the NDP, which has clear policy aspirations for Thruxton, reference should be made to the villages of Kimpton and Fyfield. I am aware that they have been approached and have not shown a great deal of interest. Never the less, attempts at a strengthend liaison should continue and that intent should be stated. If for example there was a stated attempt for development within one of the two village boundaries there could well be an effect on Thruxton NDP. The NDP in its current format finishes at "Section 9 Economy and Thruxton Airfield". I would suggest that there then could be a section headed "Conclusions " or "Executive Summary". That would reflect how Policies, Vision and Objectives had been met. That would complete the NDP. Section 10 "Community Projects and Aspirations" would then be a separate document with cross reference to the NDP. Is it the intention to review the document on a periodic basis? That should be stated in the Conclusions.	Kimpton and Fyfield Parishes have been consulted throughout. The format has been developed from best practice.	Para 3.2 updated - you may wish to add further on this if it is something you have strong views on.	NO	N/A	Preamble amended.
	I cannot find any fault. The booklet is fantastic, very comprehensive and fascinating reading. Congratulations to you all. I have little to add. The photographs are first class.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	If a less expensive production of the Booklet were to be made, please put me down for a copy. I do not mind paying.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Excellently presented. Very Informative. A comprehensive document for the future of our lovely village.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Very good, very enlightening. Well presented	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Excellent balance of informed text, maps and photographs. Many congratulations, well done.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Page 12, No mention of the Church as a local facility.	Church to be included.	Para 2.32	NO	N/A	2.32 amended
	"Local Facilities" P12. There is no mention of the Church. Why not? The Church is open all day every day by a dedicated team of volunteers. Access is available to everyone for whatever reason or purpose and the churchyard.	Church to be included.	Para 2.32	NO	N/A	2.32 amended
	Many congratulations on a superb piece of work demonstrating many hours of labour.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Good	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Very informative. Found the Community Stats revealing. Previous indications from discussions/ proposed development meetings suggested a village community of at least 80% over 65!! A very professional document which captures a true input from villagers. Thank you for all your hard work on our behalf.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	The Thruxton NDP is, in my view, a very thorough and well thought out document that is clear and easily understood and has been compiled by residents who have a comprehensive knowledge of the Parish and its needs. <u>N.B.</u> in the interests of brevity I have not added further comment but agree with those made by my wife Christine Paviour in her questionnaire.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	It looks great and was surprisingly easy to read online.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Good. I have lived here in Thruxton for 41 years and enjoy many walks. I would like to raise with you one of the Local Green Spaces you have shown on Map 4. If in future there should be building on areas I have marked as A (records comment: the field to the southeast of the footpath from Stanbury Close to Fyfield Church) and B (records comment: the field behind the coach park and to the east of the footpath from Fyfield Church to the Amesbury Road) a visual barrier would be needed to reduce the visual impact of buildings as I have marked out on the plan (attached), with a woodland this would give continuity to the whole valley to Fyfield Church. (Records comment: woodland strips just outside of the boundaries of LGS7)	In the event of development approval in these areas the PC would be able to campaign for tree/hedge row screening of any development. Refer to general planning rules.	Suggest no change to policy. The intention of the policy is to protect these areas from development. To add text about screening in the event of development would conflict. Trees would not always be an appropriate screening particularly in areas of open downland.	NO	N/A	No
	Very informative, excellent amount of detail and lays out a solid plan for the future. Thank you for the time and effort that has gone into this.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Very long but very informative and easy to understand.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Generally a well balanced document but would have liked more protection for land used in agriculture	The area to the west of the Airfield is designated as Open Countryside, and its use is governed by national legislation. Post meeting note: at the PC meeting of 3 OCT 18 reference was made to new legislation protecting open grassland. Reference that here?	Many agricultural uses do not require planning permission, see https://www.gov.uk/planning-permissions-for-farms. Land outside the settlement boundary is well protected. Do we know what is the respondent trying to protect?	NO	N/A	No
	Generally agree. I would like more protection for land used for rural activities and agriculture					
	Clear and well presented	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Generally good	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Well presented, good photos if abit old as Granny's now! Clear not much about Thruxton Down?	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Very clear, easy to read, well set out	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Very well presented. Thanks to all the team who have given so much of their precious time in doing this for the Village.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	No mention of the Cholderton and District Water Company. Which draws water from Thruxton Hill and supplies Thruxton farm, Cholderton and parts of Shipton and possibly Gateley.	Steve to write to company re consultation. Possible text change as a result? Following an exchange of e mails the following or an extract from their website to be used at an appropriate point in 2. Economy? "The company may not supply many properties actually in Thruxton but it does supply the whole of Shipton Bellinger and Cholderton, serving around 2000 people. The main infrastructure of the company is in Thruxton. For the future, the companies concerns will be centred on maintaining and improving ground water quality. Steps need to be taken to introduce more sustainable farming practises in the area, to reduce nitrate pollution. Measures also need to be introduced to prevent water pollution from activities occurring at Thruxton Race track. Details of the history of the company can be gleaned from our website " Cholderton water.co.uk ".	Really useful info - Reference to the Cholderton & District Water company which overlaps with the western end of the Parish to be included in plan in section starting 2.5 and supporting text to EN9: Pollution at 5.30	NO	N/A	2.5 and 5.31 amended

Policy	Responder's Comment	Determination Rationale	SDNPA response	Action Determination		
				Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	<p><i>Recorder's note: A two page attachment has been included and the same response is given for responder numbers 99 and 100.</i> The maps and plans are drawn from various Crown sources and are quite attractive visually. Some are very detailed, but they do not allow us to pan in and out of the online versions. It would be useful if a few of the maps online could be brought up to Google standard, with panning and other modes incorporated, including satellite and plan views. If the Thruxton specific borders, names and highlights could be superimposed on them that would be a major bonus. This would allow us to scrutinize all the far reaches of the Thruxton parish. With the level of detail available from such hi-tech maps, they could also serve future planning and conveyancing purposes. I do not know whether the Crown has invested in such hi-tech innovation nor whether it is yet available. If the plans could be updated to show all current names and features, that would be an added bonus. For instance, Village Street should replace Stanbury Road in mid-village. Likewise Scholars House instead of Hillside View; The Forge instead of School Houses, etc. The course of the Pillhill Brook through the Village centre, with its old and new channels could be clarified. Introduction and Planning Documents Para 1.16 - We suggest that all the relevant documents should be assembled and collated in one place, preferably in a dedicated Appendix to replace or enhance or supplement the Evidence Base on Page 74. They should all then be cross-referenced for ease of comprehension wherever they are mentioned in the text. The key planning documents could then be highlighted here in the Introduction Para 1.16. Community and Stats Para 2.20 - 2.27 The amount of detail outlines in Para 2.20 makes it difficult to comprehend in narrative form. We would suggest that the figure work should be shown in tabular form, augmented by pie graphs as approximate. Then only the salient points, anomalies and conclusions need be commented upon in the text. The same applies to Paras 2.23 and 2.24. There is a fair amount of redundancy in the NDP. While some is inevitable as Policies are drawn out from the text, other repetition could be eliminated by radical pruning and simplification. Para 2.2 - It is noteworthy that the old A303 or Amesbury Road through Thruxton Down is now mainly used for stacking traffic into Thruxton Circuit Events. Para 2.35 and Para 7.3 - The Rosebourne Garden Centre is mentioned under two different guises in these two paragraphs. It may be useful to make only one mention and specify clearly what it is and where it lies, Ampert or Weyhill. It should be acknowledged as an asset to the village, including employment. Para 3.8 - What is Survey Monkey for the common man? Para 5.6 - This exceedingly long sentence beginning "Key elements" could be split and simplified for ease of understanding. Para 5.8 - What is the meaning of a "nucleated settlement" to the common man? Para 5.12 and 7.5 - Dauntsey Lane is mentioned twice as a small part of the Weyhill West settlement. The reason and implication of this could perhaps be elaborated. Para 5.18 - What is Eutrophication to the common man? Para 5.27 - the sole pedestrian access across the A303 is highly dangerous. Are there any moves to close it or any ideas how to replace it with a bridge? Para 6.2 - The first sentence is a little ungrammatical. We suggest it be split for clarity. Para 6.6 - We think the second sentence should be split for enhanced clarity.</p>	<p>Of the 14 areas addressed: 6 are misunderstandings on the part of the responder, 2 query technical terms which could and will need to be included in the Glossary, 2 relate to grammar which can be clarified, 1 is seeking greater clarity in the Parish statistics asking for pie graphs etc. This will be referred to SD for possible inclusion, 1 asserts that the content is unduly repetitive, which is not the opinion of the majority, 1 is an opinion outside the scope of the NDP and 1 is a question for the PC regarding a footbridge over the A303.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insert "Nucleated Settlement" (5.8) and "Eutrophication" (5.18) in the Glossary with their meanings</li> <li>2. Para 6.2 delete "which"</li> <li>3. Para 6.6 Split and reword the second sentence to aid clarity</li> <li>4. Consider including graphical presentation of the statistics in paras 2.20, 2.21, 2.23 and 2.24.. Refer to SD?</li> <li>5. Refer the question regarding a footbridge over the A303 to the PC.</li> </ol>	<p>Designations in the NDP should be transferred onto the policies map produced by Test Valley BC. This should then also be used by land search for the purposes of conveyancing. This is not an issue for the Parish Council. The docs referred to in 1.16 are on the Test Valley Website generally. Consistency of reference to Rosebourne Garden Centre, no change re survey monkey. Para 5.6 amended. Text changes as per Thruxton suggestion -</p>	No	N/A	Appropriate additions and amendments made. Footbridge referred to PC
	<p>Page 18: Threats, item 3 "a negative impact on the landscape , ecology, and quality of life of residents"</p> <p>Page 63, Water supply to allotments. Water rates would need to be applied and consequently rents would be likely to increase. Have tenants been made aware? Would they wish to pursue?</p> <p>Page 67 first paragraph. 20 households seems low. Presumably evidence doesn't support a higher number, or is this a misprint?</p> <p>Page 70 Para 10.5 Propose amend "to improve safety for drivers and pedestrians....." to read "to improve safety for road users...". This would ensure cyclists and horse riders/carriage drivers received consideration too.</p>	<p>Page 18 additional text highlighted in red to be included</p> <p>Page 63 PC to consider</p> <p>Page 67 "at least" already included covers this</p> <p>Page 70 amendment to be read "to improve safety for all road users, including pedestrians."</p>	Agreed	No	N/A	Appropriate additions and amendments made. Water in allotments referred to PC.
	Hugely impressive document. What would be great in addition would be a 2 page key summary sheet that residents could review. Make mention of Village Association.	General praise, no response necessary.		NO	N/A	No
	Some of the language is a bit flowery(e.g. Nestled/Nestles in 2.5/2.8) but then very formal "Dwellings - homes? 2.21, 2.27 and 2.31 all very subjective. 2.28 Strongly disagree. Most people we have talked to have never ventured over to the circuit, often after many years of living here. We really enjoy its proximity and visiting events but to say the village embraces it is a stretch.	A misunderstanding of 2.28 which is about the whole of the airfield AND Industrial Estate.		NO	N/A	No
	Really good.			NO	N/A	No
<b>Policies:</b>						
<b>Landscape and Environment:</b>						
EN1: Landscape and Character of Thruxton Parish	Street lighting def to be kept to a minimum. However, might it be a good idea to encourage householders to install a photo-sensitive Imp by their gate/front door? - for everyone's safety.		Not a planning matter	No	N/A	No
	Reduction in lighting would be possible within the Village but areas without pathways should have more lighting			No	N/A	No
	"Ribbon Development" between settlements should be avoided, as clarified in original Village Design Statement	Noted	None is proposed, countryside policy helps protect against	No	No	No
	Good idea to avoid extra lighting			No	N/A	No
	Strongly agree to limit light pollution in all forms. We must be allowed to continue to enjoy our night skies.			No	N/A	No
	The Parish Council should keep aware of any other development which might fill in the space between Thruxton and surrounding villages. And try to influence any such planning permission.	The NDP is not able to control any occurrence in adjacent Parishes.	Correct - Parish Council can only comment on the basis of landscape character etc, no changes to plan.	No	No	No
	I agree the preservation of the village rural character must be conserved.			No	N/A	No
	What about Thruxton Down is there a Plan to develop here?	This is a question that is covered off in the NP	Mentioned 4 times in the plan.	No	N/A	No
	Thruxton Down does not seem to warrant a mention! Any future plans?	As above		No	N/A	No
	Is Thruxton Down earmarked for any future development as there is now a repair garage here?			No	N/A	No
	Lighting may be required for health and safety requirements in some areas. Especially in areas where there are no footpaths.	In EN1 c , delete avoided and insert minimised.	I would suggest you stick to 'avoided' - a specific safety reason would still be permissible. Minimised suggests a presumption that you start with lighting and then try to reduce it.	No	N/A	No
	I agree with the sentiments of EN1. However I do not agree with 1 c) Lighting. In this century lighting must be a balance between safety and pollution. We have erred towards the latter.	As above	Does the crime data for Thruxton suggest there are crime issues in dark areas? Most low level lighting e.g. by front doors / solar garden lights etc do not require planning permission and can still happen so unless crime is a particular issue then the policy is sufficient.	No	N/A	No
	"Lighting is avoided"? -agree with desire to prevent light pollution but there is a safety/crime prevention aspect too. Low level lighting can be cleverly designed and unobtrusive.	As above	As above	No	N/A	No
	This is a rural parish. Development must be in keeping with that and not make it "urban" or "quasi-urban". What might work in Andover would not be appropriate here. We chose to live in this setting; don't change it by inappropriate development.			No	N/A	No
EN2: Settlement character and separation	Separation of settlements is essential.			No	N/A	No
	Re 1a) even HD8 housing should be totally within the settlement boundary, only transgressing it if it is proved to be totally unavoidable.	Misunderstanding - not relevant		No	No	No
	1 d) "do not have a detrimental impact on..."? Typo	Typo - change	Agree	Y	Y	
	Keep developments within the settlement boundaries. Where there are no settlement boundaries ensure the countryside remains that way - open and without development			No	N/A	No
	I agree no detrimental impact of the undeveloped landscape of the Parish. What makes Thruxton so special is that it still looks like a village surrounded by rural beauty.			No	N/A	No

Policy	Responder's Comment	Determination Rationale	SDNPA response	Action Determination		
				Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	Everything seems clumped together as not much mention of individual area plans.	Comment seems to overlook the structure of the plan	In response to this comment and that about Thrxuton Down not being mentioned, there could be a specific sentence clearly stating there are no allocations for the smaller hamlets in the Parish - amended para 7.8	No	N/A	No
	Whilst I agree with EN2, the wording precludes almost any further development. I am not sure this is acceptable to Government.		To be tested by examination and in accordance with Test Valley Local Plan	No	N/A	No
	Some small scale building of small housing for young people to remain in village is needed and the only place for this is to go outside the settlement boundary. These policies (EN2 and EN3) will not allow any building outside settlement boundaries or change any view currently in the village. This effectively cuts out any possibility of developemnt even on a small scale which does not support the views of the Parish who want small developments of affordable housing for youngsters or the elderly. Young families should be encouraged on a small scale to live in the village - which will support all village organisations.	Rural exception sites fulfil this. HD8 refers. as above	This was the balance to be struck between development or very limited development and a rural exceptions policy. There is no right or wrong answer.	No	N/A	No
	Must keep the settlements separate and not add to boundaries so reducing the current gaps.			No	N/A	No
	Have no objection to infill for example between Mullenspond and Dauntsey Lane.			No	N/A	No
	b) Is there no way to address separation from neighbouring parishes esp. Fyfield and Kimpton c) Not sure what this means... D) Should be "...impact on" perhaps?	Comment ref c and d, typos needs to be changed to 'identities' and d. impact on	Agree	Y	Y	
	No ribbon development down Amesbury Rd from Weyhill. Infill south of Rosebourne between the A303 and Amesbury Road is not acceptable.			No	N/A	No
EN3: Protecting views	Views are crucial. And what about the views along Village Street, from Hall going East? - Should that not be included too? Re View 1, Mullenspond, i.e. from the bridge at the bottom of Amesbury Road, it would be great to have it restored (landowners cooperation needed, I know, but surely possible).	The view along Village Street from the Hall going East is protected as it falls within the Conservation Area and many of the buildings lining this street are either Listed or have been put forward as part of the NDP as Parish Assets. The SG have considered many "views" and have highlighted those especially valued by Parishioners.	Agree with response from group. Could the restoration of View 1 be put on the community aspirations list - or linked with a project at Mullenspond.	No	N/A	No
	All the views must be mentioned.			No	N/A	No
	I agree our views and vista, green spaes should be preserved and protected.			No	N/A	No
	Wish in particular to preserve view of Manor House Field from Church Lane (no 12).			No	N/A	No
	Essential to preserve all these views. The Manor House Field in particular to conserve wildlife, birds and insects.			No	N/A	No
	Garage next door is in our View! Retrospective planning permission!			No	N/A	No
	We have a view of a garden and ???? Cars that have been there for months!			No	N/A	No
	Old photos of Thrxuton Down - much more overgrown now. View from Downlands over Quarley Hill Fort marred by next door garage!			No	N/A	No
	It is important to keep the character of the village.			No	N/A	No
	As far as possible but not to the detriment of changes or EN2.			No	N/A	No
	These policies (EN2 and EN3) will not allow any building outside settlement boundaries or change any view currently in the village. This effectively cuts out any possibility of developemnt even on a small scale which does not support the views of the Parish who want small developments of affordable housing for youngsters or the elderly. Young families should be encouraged on a small scale to live in the village - which will support all village organisations.	See earlier response in Line 66, 67. The purpose of a rural exception site is to provide affordable small housing for local people outside of the settlement boundary.		No	N/A	No
	More signs required to divert traffic onto A303 near Mullens Pond instead of encouraging traffic to pass through village to next accesspoint (west of village)			No	N/A	No
	As with EN2 views must be protected since this is what adds to the rural feel			No	N/A	No
	Agree totally. We don't want another Picket Piece!			No	N/A	No
	View at 3 seems unimportant			No	N/A	No
	I find it hard to envisage how development would/could enhance a view!			No	N/A	No
	These photos lack clarity and cannot be blown up online. We wonder whether they are available in a computer friendly format to enhance the NDP. There is an excellent photo of the view along Church Lane from the Old Rectory, showing all the thatched cottages from Forge Cottage & Robin's Roost over to Manor Cottages. This was taken on 25 January for the visit of George Clark's Amazing Spaces to Thrxuton. It was posted on the Thrxuton, Fyfield and Kimpton Facebook closed site. This could class as an important view for your Policy EN3.		Is this an area within the Conservation Area? And therefore comment as above?	No	N/A	No
EN4: Biodiversity	Essential for the whole of creation, not just Thrxuton.			No	No	NO
	You say there are 4 SINCS but Map 3 only appears to show 3?	SD to clarify - if 4, then need to add this to Map and ? Change Para 14.	There are only 3, a 4th borders the parish boundary. Text amended.	Y	Y	
	No mention of Bats in tree line next to 40 Stanbury Road	Noted		No	N/A	No
	why should any development that was an adverse effect on SINC be allowed?	The wording expresses what the responder asks for?		No	N/A	No
	I agree we need to conserve our natural wildlife habitats and biodiversity. Tis is all part of the charm of the village, having nature so close to where we live.			No	N/A	No
	Difficult although I see Mullenspond will be protected.			No	N/A	No
	This is essential as so many areas are loosing the natural environment due to development.			No	N/A	No
	Research has shown that arable farmland, plant diversity and bird life remains low (lack of winter stubble etc.). Any opportunity to incorporate conservation knowledge into farming practice should be supported.	Unable to influence through NDP	Agree	No	N/A	No
	It is particularly important that the chalk stream/watercourses in the Parish e.g. Pillhill Brook are not adversely impacted by development. They have world heritage status and MUST NOT BE PUT AT RISK.	Normal planning consideration.		No	N/A	No
EN5: Pillhill Brook	These <u>two</u> must be protected for their own sakes as well as for the benefit, multi-faceted, of this whole settlement.	Noted and matter has been referred for further protection status.		No	N/A	No
	Does this cover preventing developments from reducing runoff into the Brook? i.e. we need to ensure that drainage of natural water into the Brook continues.	Noted, no action.	Linked to SuDs requirement in policy	No	N/A	No
	If SuDS are inappropriate for a development any development proposal <u>must</u> contain adequate tried and tested means to prevent pollution entering the watercourse.	Covered in Policy EN5 2	Agree	No	N/A	No
	Make sure that Pillhill Brook continues to flow and no water is taken out.	Covered by legislation regarding extraction of water.	Correct	No	N/A	No
	Very important to support wild life and maintain appearance of the village.			No	N/A	No
	Village drainage (storm) is very much in need of new infrastructure	Not within remit of NDP		No	N/A	No
	Need to ensure that water quality is improved and not reduced.	Not within remit of NDP	Run-off from development is one mechanism, you have included it in the policy	No	N/A	No
	Work on the circuit would appear to be in conflict with EN5.1c)	This work has been approved by the Environmental Agency and other statutory bodies.	Correct	No	N/A	No
	We are on chalk, often have a high water table and so SuDS may not work. Alternatives must therefore be in place if development occurs. If neither SuDS or a suitable alternative for the Parish context are unavailable, development MUST not occur as the environmental risk would be unacceptably high.	If SuDS or alternative not appropriate we would hope that planning consent would not granted.	Correct - SuDS can be difficult on chalk, may need storage tanks that hold water and slowly release it in times of heavy rainfall.	No	N/A	No
EN6: Trees and hedgerows	Great need for trees but they should be kept at the right height etc by owners		Parish Council advice on maintaining good tree health? Advice from Woodland trust or RHS? SD amended text in line with Test valley response which was similar.	No	N/A	No
	Thoroughly agree with all 4 points. For No 3, from whom might up-front payment come? Re 4c) it would be good for some assistance (re Treen application costs) to be available so that where, for whatever reason, the trees have not been managed for some years, current property owners are not hindered from action.		See https://www.gov.uk/how-to-resolve-neighbour-disputes/high-hedges-trees-and-boundaries	No	N/A	No
	Care needs to be taken to ensure that hedgerows are not allowed to encroach on road boundaries.		Parish project correct?	No	N/A	No
	Was there ever a hedgerow along Church Lane bordering the Manorial earthworks (Manor House Field)? Should it be re-instated?			No	N/A	No

Policy	Responder's Comment	Determination Rationale	SDNPA response	Action Determination		
				Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	4 c) This is too vague "should" to many would mean they don't have to do anything. Can this be stronger or deleted? There is a risk that it is ineffective.		I think in this case 'should' is probably about as far as it can go	No	N/A	No
	The hedgerow along the Jubilee Walkway is already subject to a Hedgerow Retention Order.		<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/countryside-hedgerows-regulation-and-management#check-if-a-hedgerow-is-protected-for-more-info">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/countryside-hedgerows-regulation-and-management#check-if-a-hedgerow-is-protected-for-more-info</a>	No	N/A	No
	4 a) gives a let out for developers. Who decides if reasons are overriding?	Change wording to "...chose an alternative species."	Local Planning Authority as decision maker decides - e.g. is planting ash a good idea at the moment given Ash Die-back? Not sure where this suggested change in words goes.	No	N/A	No
	Very definitely agree with the right tree being planted in the right place. Ash grow extremely large and should not be planted on a boundary. Para 5.24.			No	N/A	No
	Para 5.22" Woodlands priority habitat in NW of Conservation Area" - where?. Any chance of funding new tree planting along the A303 to double noise barrier?	SG refer to PC.		No	N/A	Referred to PC
	Glad to see importance of "right tree right place" particularly highlighting due consideration should be given of sufficient space for growth and to enable long term management before they can become intrusive, as replacements or for newer developments.			No	N/A	No
	All hedgerows and tree be protected where possible			No	N/A	No
	Trees need looking after but so does our safety and wellbeing (light restrictins)			No	N/A	No
	Too many sycamore trees!			No	N/A	No
	Agree with overall statement but point 1 is a bit woolly saying "where possible" also who what defines "of value"?	Discussed and no change.		No	No	No
	Point 3 is key; tree and hedgerow management is necessary. It must be sustainable and thus financially viable. The costs must be borne by the developer, paid in advance to the Parish Council who must agree the sum and ringfence the money in advance of planning permission/consent being granted.			No	N/A	No
EN7: Green Infrastructure	This is surely critical for the whole ecology as well as for immediate local benefit.			No	N/A	No
	Walking network is excellent - difficult to find - cycling access offroad is very poor		Parish project - improved signage?	No	N/A	No
	Positive response to ensure any new developments given planning permission should encourage green infrastructure (trees/hedging).			No	N/A	No
	All green infrastructure to be protected			No	N/A	No
	Village drainage (storm) is very much in need of new infrastructure		Second mention of village storm drain / should it be on community projects list?	No	N/A	It is the Pillhill Brook. The PC are supposed to have formed a "Flood Group" for the Village but are delinquent.
	7.2 Too sweeping. There are plenty of circular routes, both within and passing through the Parish. Seeking to develop more seems to be over-egging the cake.			No	N/A	No
	It would be worthwhile producing something about existing routes (maybe not one for this exercise!)		Good point - Parish project?	No	N/A	No
	Link to C16. Essential. Thruxton village is already very isolated given the proximity of the A303 and surrounding roads/villages. Any new development must not further restrict green infrastructure and access, and must actively improve it.			No	N/A	No
EN8: Local Green Space	Is the airfield not considered as a Local Green Space? (Entered against EN7 in error agreed that it is for EN8)	The Airfield does not fulfill the criteria for Local Green Space designation - please see Evidence Base Document "Local Green Space Assessment Report".	Agree - extensive area of open space	No	N/A	No
	Very important in order to maintain some semblance of Village atmosphere.	General praise, no response necessary.		No	N/A	No
	The Recreation Ground has been identified greenspace. As the owner is currently going through the process of "Fields in Trust" this is not necessary as the field will be protected as a Recreational Facility for all time.	The Recreation Field is becoming a Field in Trust and to prevent unnecessary layering of protections the Steering Group feel that the Recreation Field will no longer required to be LGS designated to confer protection of its current use in perpetuity once the Field in Trust status is confirmed. Until confirmation is received, LGS 5 will remain in the NDP. NOTE TO SD AT WHAT POINT IS THE LAST OPPORTUNITY TO PULL THIS FROM THE PLAN?	Before the plan is considered by the Parish Council for submission to TVBC at Reg 16. you will need to update / add an amendment to the LGS evidence base to explain your reasoning. You may even be able to request a change to the plan through the Examiner once it is at that stage if this amendment cant happen in time.	Y	Y	Watch to confirm "Field in Trust" status is achieved
	Very important aspect of the area.	General praise, no response necessary.		No	N/A	No
	There are some relatively small but none the less important green spaces that need protecting: e.g. at the west end of the Village St ( by the road to the Industrial Estate); the land behind the pillar box in Lambourne Way; the land beside /beneath the A303 at east end, opposite Mullenspond.	The Steering Group acknowledge the importance of the areas highlighted in this response. These areas have been looked at with regard to LGS designation and protection, and the outcome of these considerations is found at the Evidence Base Document "Local Green Space Assessment". Unfortunately they are not deemed suitable for LGS designation. Within the Evidence Base Documents these areas are discussed and their importance highlighted.	Just checking - have all the suggestions put forward here and below been examined? You can always consider some more, even if to reject them by doing an amendment to the study.	No	N/A	No
	I think that it is important that development proposals are not supported on Local Green Space.	Development proposals are generally not supported when an area is LGS designated. For further information, see the Evidence Base "Local Green Space Assessment" document.		No	N/A	No
	Strongly support - ensure the openness that makes Thruxton Village what it is continues to be enjoyed by future generations.	General praise, no response necessary.		No	N/A	No
	LGS5 will be afforded protection under an imminent Fields in Trust arrangement. Sight lines from road over Mullenspond should be improved.	The Recreation Field is now a Field in Trust and to prevent unnecessary layering of protections the Steering Group feel that the Recreation Field is no longer required to be LGS designated to confer protection of its current use in perpetuity. Fields in Trust status may also help with the building of a sports pavillion. Sight lines over Mullenspond is a Community Projects and Aspirations. See above.	Agree with SG	No	N/A	No
	Please note Recreation Field for all of the community not just children	SG acknowledge use of Recreation Field is for all.		No	N/A	No
	The triangular area between the A303, its slip road and the Village Street at its junction with the Amesbury road should be a designated LGS. Why isn't it?	The Steering Group acknowledge the importance of the area highlighted in this response. This area was looked at with regard to LGS designation and protection, and the outcome of these considerations is found at the Evidence Base Document "Local Green Space Assessment". Unfortunately the area was not deemed suitable for LGS designation. Within the Evidence Base Documents this area is discussed and its importance highlighted.	As above	No	N/A	No
	Now that LGS5 has been gifted to the Parish for use as a recreation field and is a "Field in Trust" - does this now need designating as LGS? Is the gift with safeguards not enough? Otherwise agree all.	See above.	As above	No	N/A	No
	Agree, but would like to see other fields within the Mullens Pond area included.	The Steering Group acknowledge the importance of the areas highlighted in this response. These areas have been looked at with regard to LGS designation and protection, and the outcome of these considerations is found at the Evidence Base Document "Local Green Space Assessment". Unfortunately they are not deemed suitable for LGS designation. Within the Evidence Base Documents these areas are discussed and their importance highlighted.	As above	No	N/A	No

Policy	Responder's Comment	Determination Rationale	SDNPA response	Action Determination		
				Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	We would like more local green spaces	The Steering Group acknowledge the importance of local green space highlighted in this response. Many areas have been looked at with regard to LGS designation and protection, and the outcome of these considerations is found at the Evidence Base Document "Local Green Space Assessment". Unfortunately many areas are not deemed suitable for LGS designation. Within the Evidence Base Documents important areas of local green space are discussed and their importance highlighted.	Need to define them!	No	N/A	No
	Manorial earthworks should have no building/recreational approval (LGS2)	If approved the Manorial earthworks with be classified as Local Green Space and it will be difficult to build on an area with LGS designation. The area is also a Scheduled Monument that protects this space further from development.	Correct	No	N/A	No
	No building/recreational approval on Manor House Field or Manorial earthworks	If approved the Manorial earthworks with be classified as Local Green Space and it will be difficult to build on an area with LGS designation. The area is also a Scheduled Monument that protects this space further from development.	Correct	No	N/A	No
	Eastern footpath needs better signage as it is hard to find.	Pass this information to Mr King, who has special responsibility for footpaths within the Parish.		No	N/A	Referred tp PC
	Village drainage (storm) is very much in need of new infrastructure	Need to pass comment on to Parish Council		No	N/A	
	b) Some or all of the green space North of the village (as far as Fyfield) should be considered for inclusion as "Local Green Space to try to maintain separation.	LGS designation and protection, and the outcome of these considerations is found at the Evidence Base Document "Local Green Space Assessment". Unfortunately they are not deemed suitable for LGS designation. Within the Evidence Base Documents these areas are discussed and their importance highlighted.	Extensive tract of open land	No	N/A	No
		LGS designation and protection, and the outcome of these considerations is found at the Evidence Base Document "Local Green Space Assessment". Unfortunately they are not deemed suitable for LGS designation. Within the Evidence Base Documents these areas are discussed and their importance highlighted.		No	N/A	No
	b) Requires better caveats. A definition of "benefit to the Community" is required or this could become a hostage to fortune. It requires also what can't be agreed e.g. BBQ site on the Green would be wrong... Should the Rec be removed from the list now that it is gifted to the Parish? Suggest not.	Comment noted. See above.		No	N/A	No
EN9: Pollution	Pollution from the A303 should always be monitored.		Monitoring is an issue identified - can the Parish investigate some monitoring equipment? Noise monitoring? Air quality monitoring tubes?	No	N/A	No
	Yes, Yes, current pollution levels (of water, air, noise, light) must be urgently and effectively addressed, so that they are minimised and then continue to be monitored. This matter is of paramount importance for quality of all life (not just human) in this special environment.	NDP can only address development issues.		No	N/A	No
	To continue to monitor			No	N/A	No
	Para 5.31 reference to "EN05" is inconsistent "EN5". The new wiers on the circuit land are to be welcomed. Reduction of flood risk and filtering of pollution.	Correct typo	Agree	Y	Y	
	Slight concern over drainage systems. May need upgrading			No	N/A	No
	The definition of "SuDS" is in here but should be in EN5 as it occurs earlier. In the abbreviation should it be a lower or upper case "u/U"? How can a "demonstrably negative and damaging effect" be demonstrated before the development takes place? As the "dualling" of the A303 passing Stonehenge and completely to the M5 at Taunton is due to be completed during the timeframe of the plan and traffic, according to Government figures will increase by a <u>minimum of 17%</u> , where pollution is already a problem, no new development should be allowed within 1/4 mile of the A303 to avoid subjecting new residents to unhealthy living conditions.	Should be in first mention in document. Delete "has a demonstrably" and insert "will have a". SD to comment on pollution	Agree	Y	Y	
	Please ensure that any development proposals use Suds, or if not appropriate, demonstrate an adequate tried and tested system that prevents further water problems with ground water and foul waste infiltration.	If proposals are not adequate then they should not get approval.		No	N/A	No
	I think this refers to the sewage problems opposite the slip road to the A303 westbound. Tankers are constantly removing sewage from the tank, even though no new houses have been built recently.	This is a misunderstanding of what happens. Tankers remove grey water.		No	N/A	No
	9.1 Noise pollution from the airfield and or race circuit is inevitable. If no noise is required the community should seek to close this facility down but that of course would damage the local community far more than tolerance of this local asset. As stated elsewhere it is nationally recognised.	Noted	Can't find reference to urban environment	No	N/A	No
	9.2 Does Thruxton fit the definition of an "urban" environment?			No	N/A	No
	This Policy needs a reference to EN5.2 and vice versa and EN10.	No need.	Agree, cross references should be avoided as plan should be read as a whole	No	N/A	No
EN10: Flood Risk	The flooding of roads through the village has greatly increased over the years.			No	N/A	No
	Implications for Home Insurance: - Can companies be convinced that flooding, such as in 2002/03 is a rare occurrence? Some companies, if not all, will seize upon this section (5.37 - 5.41) as an excuse to refuse to insure/impose an outrageously high premium unjustly. A date on the photograph on page 41 would be helpful! Would not any development in the areas in/adjacent to the flood zones increase the risk of flooding, thus making water management an even greater (- and costlier) challenge?	Not for NDP to influence insurance companies.	Agreed	No	N/A	No
	Very important. Flooding is a worry			No	N/A	No
	Most important to the Lambournes. Also along the Village Street.			No	N/A	No
	Water retention would be good to manage as well as run off.		Hence SuDS	No	N/A	No
	Wholly supported. Para 5.40 is to be welcomed. HCC <u>must</u> ensure that their grey (subsurface) water capacity is sufficient to cope with sudden springs. Halcyon Drive.	Noted		No	N/A	No
	Again where Suds are not appropriate, development proposals must indicate use of another tried and tested system that will prevent flooding. Water tables are high, surface water flooding is already an issue and must not be exacerbated.	See 156.		No	N/A	No
	Assured by inclusion that any new development proposal should be required to provide/indicate management of surface water run off - in light of excessive run off experienced in Village at certain times of year, depending on weather conditions	Noted.		No	N/A	No
	I thought best practice was <u>not</u> to build on areas prone to flooding rather than risk it. Given the limited opportunities to do so, this could be beefed up.	Noted.	I wonder if policy should relate to surface water flooding as all other sources of flooding are covered in Test Valley plan. See proposed amendment to EN10	No	N/A	No
	You need to be more consistent when describing SUDS and alternative appropriate methods. You only use the term SUDS here but it is not the only solution. Broad Policy concept is however correct.	Alternatives to SUDS are detailed in other Policies.		No	N/A	No
<b>Heritage:</b>						
H1: Conservation Area	Most definitely. Also vital to ensure that Planning Applications for existing buildings, in the Conservation Area <u>and</u> adjacent to it, adhere to this policy.	General praise. Planning Applications in areas adjacent to the Conservation Area will still have to comply with those Policies detailed in the final NDP. By the nature of the buildings being outside the Conservation Area, any planning applications will not, by definition, have to adhere to the stricter planning rules pertaining to buildings inside a Conservation Area. It is not within the remit of an NDP to petition for change of these Planning Rules.	Agree and Test Valley Local plan will have a policy.	No	N/A	No

Policy	Responder's Comment	Determination Rationale	SDNPA response	Action Determination		
				Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	Generally yes, but would support environmentally concious new development e.g. grass roof, solar panels.	Amend wording to allow for the consideration of contemporary design and materials provided that the design is appropriate in its context.	New wording added	Y	Y	
	Support. TVBC Conservation Officers must become more sympathetic to modern environmental measures such as double glazing which is indistinguishable.	Noted. SG to discuss. Conservation Officers must remain open minded and sympathetic to modern environmental energy conserving measures. SD to advise on wording change, see 172	New wording added	Y	Y	
	The first eight properties at the entrance to Lambourne Way should not have been included in the Conservation area. A TVBC official has admitted that they were included in error. When will the Conservation Area be reviewed? Their inclusion is inconsistent with the remainder of the area.	TVBC (Graham Smith) was asked specifically about a plan for Conservation Areas review, There is currently no plan nor date for the review of Test Valley Conservation Areas.		No	N/A	No
	Conservation has its place but the Council don't have a lease on freehold property and it exercises a landlord approach instead of giving advice. It's too subjective and denies owners their rights.	Noted. SG to discuss. Likely outside of remit of NDP to comment.	Outside remit	No	N/A	No
	there should be no insistence on (e.g. cob) traditional materials, as long as the overall effect fits the environment.	See 172.	The policy does say 'such as' therefore does not require	No	N/A	No
	Para 7.3 Ther's the Weyhill Farm shop too. Also has someone actually price checked Rosebourne - bit of a sweeping statement otherwise	Delete sentence "The shop has...than a supermarket".	Agree	Y	Y	
H2: Archaeology	This is such an ancient settlement, so rich in heritage, that there <u>must</u> be protection of archaeological deposits and this policy used to ensure that there's NO unauthorised exploration. Is education about this integral feature needed for the <u>whole</u> population?	Unable to use the word MUST due to planning wording preferences. See new wording recommended by Historic England that will cover these concerns.	Amended text in accordance with English Heritage rep	Y	Y	
	A flint arrowhead was found on LG56. It is now in Andover Museum I believe.	Noted. See Evidence Base "Desktop Archaeology Reports of Thruxton Parish" document for details		No	N/A	No
	Agree, any possible future development areas should be supported by a thorough archaeological assessment.	general agreement.		No	N/A	No
	This could be accomodated, where appropriate.	general agreement.		No	N/A	No
	We should not be over cautious regarding "potential" historic sites.	noted		No	N/A	No
	Was an archseology survey conducted prio to the major earthworks at the circuit?	Yes -please see TVBC planning application website ref 16/02571/FULLN to see arcaheological discussions and also Historic England's response to this agreed planning application.		No	N/A	No
H3: Parish Heritage Assets	Old Wesleyan Chapel (War memorial Hall) and Victorian School House extension should be a Heritage Asset in my opinion.	It is a Listed Building, so not suitable for designation of a Heritage Asset. General confusion over this Policy and the supporting Text, requiring wording change of 6.11 to e.g "A number of buildings and features have been designated as Parish Heritage Assets. In addition to those buildings or features already protected as Listed Buildings (? need map references here), there are currently several buildings and features within the Parish that have local significance for their historic, archaeological or architectural interest....It is these buildings that the NDP would look to make Parish Heritage Assets".	Agreed, good suggestion, para 6.11 amended	No	N/A	6.11 amended
	Excellent! (but please see note on extra sheet): - Re Parish Heritage Assets (pp47 and 72, plus Map 9c) We are puzzled! South Barn and Faraway Cottage are adjacent to Thruxton Manor, on what was the Manor Farm. We don't know the Barns on Thruxton Farm, CholdertonRd. but surely they don't have these names?	The Barns names are now Jackdaws and Homewood Cottage - text needs amending on Page 72 - remove South Barn and Faraway Cottage and replace with Jackdaws and Homewood Cottage.	Agree	Y	Y	Map amended
	Nice to know I'm a "Parish Heritage Asset"	general approval.		No	N/A	No
	Surely Bridge Cottage should be added to the list?	It is a Listed Building, so not suitable for designation of a Heritage Asset. General confusion over this Policy and the supporting Text, requiring wording change of 6.11 as discussed above.	Agree	No	N/A	6.11 amended
	It would be nice to see older properties included	It is a Listed Building, so not suitable for designation of a Heritage Asset. General confusion over this Policy and the supporting Text, requiring wording change of 6.11 as discussed above.	Agree	No	N/A	6.11 amended
	Would be helpful to point out these exist.	general approval.		No	N/A	No
	Why is the Church not a Parish Heritage Asset?. Unless it is already considered a designated heritage asset. In which case I agree with the policy. 6.11 to be clearer.	It is a Listed Building, so not suitable for designation of a Heritage Asset. General confusion over this Policy and the supporting Text, requiring wording change of 6.11 as discussed above.	Agree	No	N/A	6.11 amended
	Why is the Church not includedthere?	It is a Listed Building, so not suitable for designation of a Heritage Asset. General confusion over this Policy and the supporting Text, requiring wording change of 6.11 as discussed above.	Agree	No	N/A	6.11 amended
	Should the Hall be regarded as a Heritage Asset as it is listed Grade 2, in the Conservation Area and the only public building open to every parishioner?	It is a Listed Building, so not suitable for designation of a Heritage Asset. General confusion over this Policy and the supporting Text, requiring wording change of 6.11 as discussed above.	Agree	No	N/A	6.11 amended
	Not sure	So what?		No	N/A	No
	Manorial Earthworks should also be listed as a Parish Asset	This area is a Scheduled Monument and is protected because of this.	Agree	No	N/A	No
	Include Manorial Earthworks as a Parish Heritage site.	This area is a Scheduled Monument and is protected because of this.	Agree	No	N/A	No
	Village Hall as a listed building should also be added	It is a Listed Building, so not suitable for designation of a Heritage Asset. General confusion over this Policy and the supporting Text, requiring wording change of 6.11 as discussed above.	Agree	No	N/A	6.11 amended
	Add george Cottage and other buildings of local interest	George Cottage is a Listed Building so cannot be added to list. No details of others that they would like added.	Agree	No	N/A	No
	Definition needs amplification. It needs a phrase to the effect of:"... in addition to those buildings that are covered by Listing or other definitions, the Parish has designated several buildings and features as heritage assets..." Currently the first two sentences of 6.11 Para are muddled and not plain English. To avoid confusion or exploitation by a developer, this needs to be addressed.	General confusion over this Policy and the supporting Text, requiring wording change of 6.1	Agree	No	N/A	6.11 amended
	Response from 99 and 100. There is some overlap between the "Parish Heritage Assets" in the NDP and "Buildings of Local Interest" on the TVBC Thruxton Conservation Area Plan. We suggest that this TVBC plan - or the enlarged central part - should replace your Map 6, as it names all the listed and unlisted assets and provides a lot more admirable detail. A decision could then be made about the unlisted assets of local interest and whether they could be amalgamated with your Parish Heritage Asssets. We would also suggest that virtually all the unlisted assets within the conservation area have their distinctive character which enhances the village identity and atmosphere and this should be acknowledged. Add George Cottage and other buildings of local interest. (Para 6.11. & Appendix 1 and Map 6)	The purpose of the NDP is provide advice on planning proposals and not to be a resource for local information.		No	N/A	No
Housing and Design:						

Policy	Responder's Comment	Determination Rationale	SDNPA response	Action Determination		
				Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
HD1: New Residential Development	See attached note: I am concerned that a determined housing developer, with good legal support, will be able to successfully challenge our NDP regarding the objection to any construction of housing outside the stated settlement boundaries. This matter is even more worrying given the huge pressures that all councils are now under to build a large number of houses. Policy HD1 states that residential development of 10, or fewer, dwellings will be supported within the settlement boundaries. Indeed, the case for a number of smaller sized dwellings is highlighted in several parts of the NDP. However, I foresee that we are in danger of opening ourselves up to the accusation of only paying lip-service to this need for new homes, since there is absolutely no land available within the currently identified settlement boundaries where 10, or fewer houses could be built, apart from the odd home extension. All that said, some suitable land does exist in both the Thruxton Down and Parkhouse Cross settlements, that could be made available for residential development and would not adversely impinge on the desire to protect countryside views. Yet neither of these locations are designated in the NDP as having settlement boundaries which is somewhat inexplicable, since they are both very long standing settlement areas within our Parish Boundary. Further more, both of these locations have good independent road access that would not exacerbate the ongoing traffic dilemma that exists within the main part of our village. I urge that this aspect of the NDP is re-considered.	The respondent recognises that the NDP relates to the Parish rather than the village alone. The Parish Survey provides the basis for the figure given. The figure given is a maximum and the building of individual houses may be possible in some areas where a small 'development' of 2 or more is not.	Parish needs to be happy that it is not allocating a site in order to deliver more housing. This was a key part of the consideration during the preparation of the plan	No	N/A	No
	Criterion of local need for local people is vital and fair, and to be affordable.	The criteria for RES would mean that any homes built would be affordable and prioritise local people	What is RES?	No	N/A	No
	The abortive attempt by TVBC to establish a Showman's Site in Thruxton Down must not be separated. Arguably the inadequacy of the roads through the village mitigates against further development.	Normal planning rules would apply. Ask SD whether we need to have anything to address travellers/show people etc?	Generally left to local plans to allocate sites due to the complexity involved	No	N/A	No
	Support should be given for Affordable Housing, enabling young people /families the ability to remain in the locality to ensure "Lifeblood to the Village.	RES provision. PC rejected alternative policy to support provision for local people.	Yes - may need a note in the consultation statement setting out how this issue was considered and the options gone through	No	N/A	No
	New development means more pressure on the drainage system that can barely cope now (with queues of tankers taking excess away through the year now).	Policy re drainage etc in accordance with Southern Water responses and earlier correspondence.		No	N/A	No
	I understand the desire to avoid development outside of settlement boundaries but the lack of space within Settlement Boundaries means that any development will be very limited and is unlikely to provide the smaller housing required for the young( though the Exception Sites may help there) and the monied elderly.	Previous proposal rejected by PC - reasons minuted.	As above	No	N/A	No
	Should be closely monitored.			No	N/A	No
	There is no space within settlement boundaries for further development	There is space within settlement boundaries within the Parish.	I am not sure there is much - there is only one main settlement boundary plus the little bit to the east of the Parish - need to ensure everyone understands this	No	N/A	No
	Para 7.4 line 5 add Stanbury Road (the Long House). Need to continue Map 8 westward to show Settlement Boundaries of Thruxton Down. The southern side could be utilised for additional housing defined at HD1	TD and PHC do not have a settlement boundary. The SG have looked at alternative wording for those areas.		No	N/A	No
	Good idea to have affordable housing for local people	Would be just RES/affordable housing. The provision is dependant upon a suitable site becoming available.		No	N/A	No
	As Parkhouse Cross and Thruxton Down do not have settlement boundaries currently, provision must be made to define their boundaries.	Noted and defined in glossary. SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES DEFINED IN GLOSSARY, MISUNDERSTANDING. NO ACTION.	No, their boundaries cant be defined in a glossary, they don't have boundaries, they are treated as countryside for the purpose of planning. Rural exception and agricultural / countryside related development only.	No	N/A	No
	Agree, as stated if there was a residential development in the future no more than 10 dwellings. We have little facilities, limited travel facilities and access and sewage problems! If a new development happens, schools, doctors etc would be needed!			No	N/A	No
	Para 6.3 Second green bullet - typo - remove "the" Thruxton.	Amend text	Agreed			Text amended
	No large development to take place on the field behind Lambourne Close. This is a Village and must remain so, only infill where appropriate.	There is no proposal for development in that area.		No	N/A	No
	Any planning application should be judged on its individual merits and not be automatically discounted because of the amount of proposed bedrooms.	The survey clearly supports smaller housing. Normal planning rules would apply but would follow the NDP unless there are reasons not to do so.		No	N/A	No
	The plan is a comprehensive document really well written and laid out. We haven't commented on individual policies as they were clear and concise. We are happy to agree to all.	General comment of support and agreement		No	N/A	No
	No further development west of Stanbury Road - this will result in more traffic through the village on a dangerous road and will detract from the Conservation Area.	The NDP is not identifying sites. The area west of Stanbury Road is outside of the settlement boundary.		No	N/A	No
	There should be no further development west of Stanbury Road north of The Moorings. This will detract from the Conservation area.	As above. The only development that would be considered outside of the settlement boundary would be Rural Exception Housing		No	N/A	No
	I would not be supportive of anymore than 10. Also what is the timescale for these 10 houses?	The NDP is not proposing that a development of 10 houses is built. It is saying that any development should not be of more than 10. Most applications are likely to be for fewer houses due to the nature of and size of sites.		No	N/A	No
	Including Thruxton Down? What Plans if any? Also applies to HD2 and HD3	Thruxton Down is part of the Parish. All policies would apply to TD as to anywhere else. Normal planning rules would also be taken into account as would the lack of facilities/public transport etc.		No	N/A	No
	Anything to do with Thruxton Down? Applies to HD2 and HD3 as well.	As above.		No	N/A	No
	Is this just within Thruxton Village itself or including Thruxton Down? Also applies to HD2 and HD3.	As above.		No	N/A	No
	Page 52 7.3 refers to garden centre not the major facility of Rosebourne.	Noted.		No	N/A	No
	I think 10 houses is too many	The number came from a parish wide survey and represents the majority view.		No	N/A	No
	Traffic problems will be increased. Suggest we support residential additional properties closer to Andover, or nearer to where the Conservation Officer lives.			No	N/A	No
	Why restrict to 3 bed or less? Families would be looking for 4 bed.	The parish has a significant proportion of 4 bed houses. The survey reflected a need for smaller houses that are also likely to be within the price range (to buy or to rent) of local people.		No	N/A	No
	Does this mean within the area bounded by the thick black line on Map 8? If so, does that mean anywhere in the Thruxton neighbourhood? What is the significance of the pink shaded areas? Conflicts with Local Green Space etc?	This reflects a misunderstanding of the map, which simply identifies the settlement boundary.		No	N/A	No
	It would be useful to reference in this section the Time period for developing 10 new houses.	The plan is not advocating the development of 10 homes. The comment reflects a misunderstanding of the plan.		No	N/A	No
	H1c) Traditional thatch is becoming prohibitively expensive and reduces the market value of houses.	Heritage Issue		No	N/A	No
	Policy would benefit from clarifying if it means 10 or fewer on one site or across the Parish/Village. 10 x 10 dwelling sites is different to a maximum of 10 dwellings.	The number came from a parish wide survey and represents the majority view of the maximum number of dwellings acceptable in any one site. It was not intended to address multiple sites as each would be subject to all the policies.		No	N/A	No
				No	N/A	No
HD2: Replacement dwellings, extensions and annexes	Essential to preserve small homes via strict planning controls - to meet local needs as well as being affordable. This is just and eminently reasonable.	Respondent supports the plan.		No	N/A	No
	Footprint generally is not of relevance			No	N/A	No
	This states for older residents. We also have disabled younger people who will benefit from developments. These should be included.	Agree - clarify that HD7 includes all needing help with independent living.	Delete word 'older', also amended para 7.18	No	N/A	Text amended



Policy	Responder's Comment	Determination Rationale	SDNPA response	Action Determination		
				Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	A) Some increase in "footprint" should be allowable, so long as it remains in scale to overall plot size.	Purpose of policy is to retain smaller houses rather than allowing them to be demolished and replaced with larger properties. This is consistent with the overall aim to support the development of/retention of smaller houses that would be attractive to local people.		No	N/A	No
	Happy with the concept but too narrow in restrictions and so it ends up weak. In essence you are saying "keep it broadly the same". But why can't there be change if that is appropriate? So restricting to the same footprint is actually unhelpful. If the current is poor then we substitute for poor. i.e. if footprint is 10m2 N/S orientated, why can't build property 10m2 E/W?	Anything outside the existing footprint would be an "extension" and treated accordingly	I have suggested clarification of policy HD2, to say extension may be permissible on replacement dwellings	No	N/A	No
HD3: Sub-division of Residential Gardens	How many potential plots are there? We are concerned that land behind George House and bordering Beech Close, currently privately owned by a former parishioner, remains protected so that there's no building on it.	The survey supported infill where appropriate.		No	N/A	No
	Hope conditions proposed will be adhered to.			No	N/A	No
	Not sure.			No	N/A	No
	It is hard to see how subdivision could be achieved due to lack of access.	Infill would only be possible where suitable access was in place. It is possible that neighbouring properties would work together to make access possible.		No	N/A	No
	Point e) - add noise too. If homes are built in gardens, they will probably be quite close physically to existing properties	Noise is caused by people rather than buildings. Normal planning conditions would also apply		No	N/A	No
	a. makes no sense. If adding, how can you "conserve the density"? B. Define sufficient.	Delete "and density". SD - advise on reword if necessary? B. Unable to define sufficient. Are the words too woolly or is this still suitable for our purposes?	I have amended policy to say 'reflect the character of the surrounding area in terms of form, height and layout of development' remove density and conserve.	Y	Y	
HD4: Design	Excellent requirements.	Supports draft		No	N/A	No
	Spelling error d) "discreet"	Amend typo	Agree	Y	Y	
	Ensure rural theme is retained through housing	The policy seeks to ensure that any development is in keeping with what is already here. Not sure what reference to 'rural' actually means. Other provisions in the plan look to ensure that density etc is also in keeping to a rural community - do we need to strengthen that?.		No	N/A	No
	This sounds too prescriptive					
	1 f) Delete "0" from "EN 01" to be consistent	Look at consistent numbering pattern throughout.	Agree	Y	Y	
	By preferring development to exhibit features as in para a) will surely increase cost and make properties less affordable for younger families.			No	N/A	No
	c) Completed finish is more important than the use of "traditional" materials, especially as some skills have been lost.	Delete HD4 c "Chalk should be used to repair existing cob wall;" as this Policy refers to new development proposals and not about repair of current walls. SG agrees with point. Policy should ensure this objective is taken in to account. SD to NOTE.	Agree, policy amended	Y	Y	
	c) Whilst these are desirable the use of thatch and cob repairs are becoming unaffordable - see vacant houses in Village Street.	see above		Y	Y	
	Interesting the emphasis on affordability. The suggested design features are pretty costly - nice but expensive! I'd like to see more emphasis on innovation rather than being ultra - traditional.	Noted. See above. TVBC also looked to support contemporary design where suitable/appropriate to situation. Good design should be able to use traditional materials in a contemporary context for one off houses.	tect amended	Y	Y	
	Must have reference to drainage and flood risk mitigation.e.g. no patios/drives that increase run off. Should reference Policies 5,9,10.	Addressed in other Policies.		No	N/A	No
HD5: Outdoor Space	Absolutely!			No	N/A	No
	Agree (seeing some new developments in the area there are like rabbit hutches) which could not be suitable in Thuxton.	Supports plan and recognises thinking behind policy.		No	N/A	No
	Sound policy statement with regard to parking to be included on new extended developments which will not impact on existing narrow roads and thoroughfares.	Supports plan and recognises thinking behind policy.		No	N/A	No
	Enough.			No	N/A	No
	More specific guidance on garden size in relationship to property size would be useful.	Discussed with TVBC who are against prescriptive sizes as create difficulty with application. Wording to reflect that garden sizes should be in keeping with surrounding properties.	Agree	No	N/A	No
		Discussed with TVBC who are against prescriptive sizes as create difficulty with application. Wording to reflect that garden sizes should be in keeping with surrounding properties.		No	N/A	No
				No	N/A	No
HD6: Off-Street Parking	This would seem to be an area of real concern in all areas of the Village. Most importantly around the Village Hall is often quite dangerous.	The respondent makes an observation only.		No	N/A	No
	Very important. There must be allowance for emergency vehicles to pass any off street parking. Great concern over emergency vehicles being able to pass through Village Street and over bridge into the Lambournes.	The Policy relates to parking provision on the site of new development. The policy stresses the requirement of off street parking to avoid the exacerbation of the issues raised.	Correctly put	No	N/A	No
	This is good. The only thing to be said in favour of on-road parking along the whole of the Village St at present is that it slows down other vehicles on what has become an increasingly risky area to walk.	The respondent makes an observation only.		No	N/A	No
	Parking should not be allowed on the bridge at the entrance to Lambourne Way. Ballet class mothers park anywhere!	Not relevant to policy		No	N/A	No
	More public transport would be helpful. Parking must be monitored to allow for emergency vehicles to get through the village.	Not relevant to policy		No	N/A	No
	this is very important	Agrees with policy		No	N/A	No
	Off -street parking is essential. The already significant risk of injury or death particularly on the Village Street must not be compounded.	Agrees with policy		No	N/A	No
	See comment in EN9			No	N/A	No
	"Rounding" must be up e.g. 1.5 becomes 2	include amended wording i.e. rounded up. Also note that the figures are a minimum	Not sure what changes can be made, it does already say rounded-up.	Y	Y	
	Agree - also any developments in Thuxton would have an effect on our roads in and out of the village! Personal experience - parking - base a space to park per person.	Levels proposed would be unreasonable and not accord with the Local Plan	Agree and would have design issues, leading to urbanisation	No	N/A	No
	Had 5 living in my house 5 cars!			No	N/A	No
	Related to previous comment it is very clear what is expected for each property.	General comment. Supportive.		No	N/A	No
	6.1 Electric vehicle charging facilities are still variable and inconsistent; too early to make assumptions about this.	Propose to include emergency vehicles at HD6 2a when looking free flow of traffic - a recurring comment. Re electric charging points - leave as drafted. Electric cars are being accommodated in service stations etc and proper infrastructure in new builds will 'future proof' them to some degree. If electric cars do not take off as expected then the policy can be amended at the review stage.	Agree, not necessary but if it reduces comments that is fine	Y	Y	
	6.2 Including use by emergency vehicles too, surely?					

Policy	Responder's Comment	Determination Rationale	SDNPA response	Action Determination		
				Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	Not sure where this comment belongs, but any access roads to new developments should be carefully considered in terms of siting , traffic flow, disruption to existing dwellings, noise, safety etc. etc. Also there should be adequate services and facilities to support any proposed development - impacts on Community Infrastructure section.....	Part of normal planning deliberations.		No	N/A	No
		General comment setting out respondents concerns. TheNP and planning law cover these issues.		No	N/A	No
	Para1. Replace "...so as not to impact on parking issues..." with "...so as not to exacerbate existing parking and access issues..."	Amend as "exacerbate"	Agree	Y	Y	
HD7: Supporting independent living and sheltered housing	Definitely - and well said!	Supportive comment.		No	N/A	No
	Not appropriate.	No reasons given. The survey supported provision to allow people to stay in their own homes, as does national policy. Remaining in the local community reduces loneliness and promotes wellbeing. The use of M4(2) to be extended to all building as appropriate for the elderly, disabled, young etc.		No	N/A	No
	Does this apply to Thruxton Down?	All the Parish		No	N/A	No
	I do not agree with the caveat in para 2 "On a very limited scale". I suggest this is deleted as "limited scale" is almost meaningless and indicates we are not in favour.	Delete "very" in HD7 2	Agree	Y	Y	
	Traffic problems will be increased. Suggest we support residential additional properties closer to Andover, or nearer to where the Conservation Officer lives.	We would maybe support the sentiment but it is not relevant to this NDP.		No	N/A	No
	As for HD 2 above for elderly and disabled.	Reword Policy and supporting text to reflect this. HD7 re move "older" in line 2. Amend 7.18 to include all people needing support for independent or sheltered living.	Agree	Y	Y	Text amended
	Dislike the term "the elderly" - they're people i.e. older/elderly people. Also no mention of lifetime homes i.e. future proofing	See 287	Agree	Y	Y	
	2. Unenforceable. May work for 1st occupant but not thereafter.	Depends on how the restriction is couched.		No	N/A	No
HD8: Rural Exception Housing for Local People	Group of 4 is plenty.	Wording in 7.19 and policy need to be framed in the same way. Consistency.	Agree. Stick to policy wording			Text amended
	Are only 5 houses sufficient?	SD to advise	Hard to pick a figure - Review Test Valley Comments. Does say generally and therefore larger or smaller sites might be achievable.	Y	Y	
	Only small development for local people. No housing estate.	Would only be up to 4 so not a housing estate		No	N/A	No
	Does this apply to Thruxton Down? Considering older population here.	Applies to whole Parish.		No	N/A	No
	Extent to which this goes such as boundary and Thruxton Down?	Do not understand the question.		No	N/A	No
	Does this include Thruxton Down and where is boundary? Map is a bit small.	As above.		No	N/A	No
	This policy is good but it will not supply small affordable housing for young people who would like to live in the village.	The purpose of this Policy is to provide accommodation for young people but is dependant on suitable sites coming forward, but is not necessarily in the Village but in the wider Parish.		No	N/A	No
	If allowed this could be the thin end of the wedge and lead to other properties being built to fund properties for local use.	No evidence to support concern and survey suggested support for affordable housing for local people.		No	N/A	No
	Insert the words ...comprising of... before 100% in first line.	Amend wording - add "comprising" before 100%	Agree	Y	Y	
<b>Community Infrastructure &amp; Wellbeing:</b>						
C1: Protection of existing community facilities	This is spot-on! And the issues listed in 8.4 are critical			NO	N/A	No
	The existing mains electricity supply is unreliable and will need to be improved to cater for any further development.	There is no evidence for this whatsoever - we are very lucky to have two or three independent sources into the village and, compared with the situation when the Lambournes, Beech and Lovell Close and Halcyon Drive were first developed, power cuts are very infrequent and power is restored relatively rapidly.		NO	N/A	No
	Inconsistent numbering. Either C1 or C11. 8.4 Add at Bullet 6 Adequacy of electricity supply to support more housing.	Numbering is not inconsistent. See comment above re electricity supply.	Agree	NO	N/A	No
	Policy C1 1 includes the Village Green as a key Community Facility, but it is not included with the others at the end of Para 8.2	Include the Village green in 8.2		NO	N/A	Text amended
	Yes.			NO	N/A	No
	What facilities at Thruxton Down?	Agreed we haven't listed any Community Facilities at Thruxton Down. Are there any?		NO	N/A	No
	No facilities at Thruxton Down.			NO	N/A	No
	With the loss of the "George" as a public house the "White Horse" should be included as a community facility	Can't include the White Horse as it is in Amport Parish and doesn't qualify even if it is near by.		NO	N/A	No
	The Village now owns the Recreation Field (or soon will do). Perhaps we should have a formal plan to develop the site. Housing Developers could be encouraged to make donation of equipment / materials etc			NO	N/A	No
	Shame this didn't include the George especially as people identify the lack of a pub as a loss to local amenities.			NO	N/A	No
	1.C) Add the White Horse Pub. The village must have at least one pub. The school is actually called: Kimpton, Thruxton and Fyfield CoE Primary School and is not just "Kimpton Primary School".	The White Horse is outside the Parish. The full title of the school should be used in all occurrences - "Kimpton, Thruxton and Fyfield CoE Primary School", refer to SD for correction.	Agree	Y	Y	
C12: Provision of new community facilities	Definitely.			NO	N/A	No
	Allotments are important to village. Road marking and safety must be visible on Village Street			NO	N/A	No
	No buses etc			NO	N/A	No
	A bus of transport to/from Thruxton Down is very much needed!!!	A bus to Thruxton Down is unrealistic. I doubt there would be any justification for this. When we canvassed villagers to have an occasional direct bus to Salisbury there were a total of 3 responses!		NO	N/A	No
	I have suggested to Village Association that we set up a care in Community type fund. We could use it to help support residents if they are in financial trouble or need support on a venture.	Organised by? Funded by?. We already have other avenues available through our Village Agent, the Community Club and many HCC agencies.		NO	N/A	No
C13: Developer Contribution to Infrastructure Improvements	Also: - and existing infrastructure would need (esp. in certain places) to be reviewed, replaced etc..			NO	N/A	No
	I personally could not see any developer spending enough capital out to make a difference on the drainage system and make a substantial profit.			NO	N/A	No
	Preferably pristine non-car infrastructure			NO	N/A	No

Policy	Responder's Comment	Determination Rationale	SDNPA response	Action Determination		
				Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	Is the car park really our top priority? I would prefer to see improvement to the children's play area and a pavillion first.	Priority between the Play Area, Pavillion and Car Park has always been a difficult decision for the PC. In the past it has depended on the source of possible funding . The Play Area will have additional equipment installed when the ground is suitable for concrete foundations. Now that the PC has ownership of the Sports Field there will be other sources of funding . However the Car Park remains a priority for road safety reasons, but without a reasonable surface we cannot expect parents to utilise it to the full.		NO	N/A	No
	I think sports facilities i.e. sports pavillion more important than the car park.			NO	N/A	No
	Can financial contributions mitigate impacts? This sentence should end after ".....off-site works."	SD - is the wording appropriate and accurate, particularly "mitigate"?	Text amended in accordance with Test valley Comment	Y	Y	
	Needs reference to drainage specifically.					
C14: Improved Pedestrian and Travel to School Safety	This has now become a major issue not least because of the increasing number of HGVs which ignore the signs and drive through the Village. (Entered against C5 in error?)	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	Very important. Hall users must be informed of other parking sites to avoid the above HD6.	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	Definitely, since the problems for pedestrians in the village have increased HUGELY in the last 10 years or so.	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	4a) The wording needs to be clear that the pedestrian safety improvement is supported but that it does not necessarily provide a free pass for the entire development.	All NDP requirements must be met, not just this one		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	The road up the hill from the Green to the School is dangerous in its current state to navigate by foot especially for children. Any improvement in the road/pavement infrastructure for this area should be supported and applauded.	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	As a young person I would strongly support improved non-car transportation.	noted		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	Para8.8 Resurfacing the car park, expanding it and enforcing extended yellow lines should be done.	noted and PC to be informed.		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	Maybe try speed restrictions in Village Street	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	I agree with this but do not want to see paveemnts everywhere, it is a Village.	noted		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	Proposals should include the need to enforce speed limits to reduce the speed of traffic through the Village, including introduction of 20mph limit.	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	Stanbury Road needs serious consideration on safety for pedestrians as this is a main route to Kimpton School.	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	The pre-amble to this objective highlights "lighting" as an issue. This conflicts with EN1.	remove "and inadequate or"	Agree	NO	N/A	Text amended
	1. Restrict speeds down Topliss Hill. The turning into Thruxton Farm is blind and unsigned (10 dwellings). 2. More footpaths along old A303 and B3084	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	Current footpath too narrow and hedges overgrown. Use field if path made in there.	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	Note school name is incorrect. Improved pedestrian safety is not just about travel to school or after activities. Any measure enhancing safety on our roads must be supported provided it doesn't contravene other Policies - i.e. - increasing lighting beyond that which is necessary...	Change school title to Kimpton, Thruxton and Fyfield CoFe Primary School	Agree	NO	N/A	Text amended
C15: Increased Access Points and Traffic	Very important.					
				NO	N/A	No
	Add "Re Access point and traffic, the junction of Stanbury Road and Village Road by the Village Green"	Already included.		NO	N/A	No
	The inadequate and misleading road signage on the approaches to the village leads to confusion, speeding and excessive loads through the village.	Noted - PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	We really must provide car speeding measures in the Village for safety.	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	If again developers strenghtend and widened access and adding to costs before putting a brick down it would become completely uneconomic.	noted		NO	N/A	No
	Most important point to allow access in emergencies	Covered above		NO	N/A	No
	Lower speed limit oand improved public transport would be very useful.	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	No	NO		NO	N/A	No
	Already dangerous and more roads to join this also?	noted		NO	N/A	No
	Stanbury Close - Additionally to Elm Close not just recreation ground corner.	noted		NO	N/A	No
	Traffic is an issue in the village of Thruxton any increase will reduce the quality of life and reduce the rural feel.	noted		NO	N/A	No
	This should be addressed as part of individual planning applications surely?	noted		NO	N/A	No
	There is no space for development in the vicinity of Meorial Hall. It is already "over-packed"	noted		NO	N/A	No
C16: Connected Countryside	These are "no brainers" surely!	noted		NO	N/A	No
	Improve pathway from Thruxton to Weyhill fork to cycle standard to connect to Weyhill track into Andover.	PC to be informed		NO	N/A	PC Informed
				NO	N/A	No
	Similar comment to C4 above			NO	N/A	No
	Strongly support - difficult to access countryside and footpaths to east must be protected.	noted		NO	N/A	No
	This would be superb and as a young person who enjoys walkin, this would be greatly appreciated.	noted		NO	N/A	No
	Thoroughly support this , particularly a footbridge linking footpaths to E. Cholderton over A303.	noted		NO	N/A	No
	More paths to be protected and no building in between.	noted		NO	N/A	No
	Access across A303 is urgently needed as countryside path south of Thruxton is inaccessible.	noted - PC to be informed.		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	noted			NO	N/A	No
	Must reference EN7 and vice versa.	Not necessary		NO	N/A	No
Economy and Thruxton Airfield:						
EC1: Thruxton Airfield	Any Major Commercial development should be avoided.			NO	N/A	No
	a. Hostage to fortune by stating it's part of a long term plan. We wouldn't want to support a bad plan just because it has longevity!			NO	N/A	No
	This is eminently sensible.			NO	N/A	No
	Any airfield development must be Low Rise only. Otherwise we could end up with another mammoth warehouse development like Andover Airfield site. God forbid!			NO	N/A	No
	Is it possible to support those running businesses from home with better mobile signal?	Refer to PC		NO	N/A	PC Informed
	Needs continual monitoring			NO	N/A	No
	Stress that the circuit (9.3) is the premier Formula 3 circuit in Britain.	Is it? What is the source for this comment.		NO	N/A	No

Policy	Responder's Comment	Determination Rationale	SDNPA response	Action Determination		
				Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	I am very strongly against the wording "Major commercial development will be supported...." Since I have been on the Parish Council and heading the Planning Advisory Group there have been a number of commercial development proposals at the airfield; additional hangerage, the changes to incorporate the air ambulance, new commercial reception facilities, new hardstanding to name a few. On every occasion we have considered each case individually in conjunction with the airfield owner. Offering a prospective developer the view that major proposals would be supported is, in my opinion, opening the flood gates. Again, in my opinion, to try to delineate whether or not the proposal is larger or smaller than 10,000 m2, or whatever is the suggested criteria, is a complete red herring. Anything that is proposed, whatever size, will be considered by the Parish Council totally on its merits and in line with the NDP. Therefore I would suggest that the word "Major" is removed and the word "supported" be replaced by "considered", the sentence to read - " <i>Commercial development proposals on Thruxton Airfield will be considered where they:</i> "	Propose to delete "major" and ask SD to write and explain what the implications of this wording change would mean.	The definition of "major" is in the supporting text directly above the policy. We were trying to avoid a policy which encompassed absolutely everything from very minor to major which would be difficult to apply. If that is ok, suggest no change.	Y	Y	Para 9.3 text amended
	Para 9.1 ONLY at least 20 householders travelling outside the Parish - how insular that makes us sound - and reflects the ageing population. If we have so few households working outside the Parish it is not surprising that we are allocated such minimal public transport.			NO	N/A	No
	To be kept as an airfield and no housing development.			NO	N/A	No
	There should be no development of housing/buildings west of and adjacent to Stanbury Road. (HD1 Refers)			NO	N/A	No
	Not to support any plans of music concerts or car fests.			NO	N/A	No
	My only reservation, if it was made bigger, would that mean more meets and traffic? 12 P. A. is right I would say.			NO	N/A	No
	Present level of air movement is acceptable.			NO	N/A	No
	Developments which bring work to the area and support the local economy should be supported.			NO	N/A	No
	I do not agree with this policy statement of supporting MAJOR COMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT. Development within scale, type and impact and keeping as existing not major development of any type.	see 376	As above	Y	Y	Para 9.3 text amended
	Should we include a clear highways strategy? So not to increase traffic in the Village	PC to be informed.		NO	N/A	Yes
	The industrial estate road is bordered by wild-life unfriendly rubbish. The owners should keep it clear.			NO	N/A	No
	Not sure would use the word "Major"	See above.		NO	N/A	No
	Not sure would use the word "Major"	See above.		NO	N/A	No

**Policies:**  
Landscape and Environment:

Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	Action Determination			
				SDNPA response	Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
EN1: Landscape and Character of Thruxton Parish	<b>Disagree:</b> As drafted the policy requires development to conserve and enhance the character and landscape of the parish. In applying the tests of the policy it is difficult to see how a development could conserve, ie protect from harm or loss and at the same time enhance ie improve the quality and value of the rural character and chalk landscape of the parish. The tests of the policy are normally associated with development affecting conservation areas rather than as a generic policy to be applied to all development. As drafted it imposes a significant constraint to meeting the current and future housing needs of the parish.	<a href="mailto:Robert.loydsweet@HistoricEngland.org.uk">E-mail: Robert.loydsweet@HistoricEngland.org.uk</a>	Conserve" as in not destroy by unsympathetic development and "enhance" by improving areas that currently detract from the overall feel of an area. This is subjective but beauty is always in th eye of the beholder.	Suggest add 'conserve and where beneficial to do so, enhance.....'	Y	Y	No
EN2: Settlement character and separation	<b>Disagree:</b> The four settlements to which the policy applies are spread across the parish and as currently drafted the policy is effectively a blanket one restricting development. The draft Plan would benefit from a detailed analysis of the areas which are most sensitive in terms of retaining the settlement character and for those areas to be identified.	Orchard Homes and Development Ltd (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	The Evidence Base supports our draft NDP.		No	N/A	No
EN3: Protecting views	<b>Disagree:</b> The policy requires development to protect views into and out of the parish from specified and unspecified locations. If a policy on the impact of development on views is to be included then it should focus on the most important ones. Section 2 of the policy lists 15 views and refers to them on maps. In respect of view 5 on map 2a and the supporting photograph 5 there does not appear to be any supporting text which explains why the view is important or on what criteria the judgement has been made.	Orchard Homes and Development Ltd (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	New Views Policy to be written. Supporting evidence clarified through Consultants.	Agree -this is the evidence base gap I have identified with the group in an earlier e-mail	Y	No	Evidence base improved
EN4: Biodiversity EN5: Pillhill Brook EN6: Trees and hedgerows EN7: Green Infrastructure EN8: Local Green Space	Conservation Areas are designated to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area and should be given 'considerable weight' in all planning decisions affecting them. This should be greater weight than usually consideration and as such is a strong means of protecting views (which are an experience of the 'appearance' of the area, as well as potentially revealing parts of their special historic or architectural interest. It may help to strengthen the protection given to some of these views by specifically identifying those that are important positive experiences of the conservation area and that should therefore receive the statutory protection conferred by that designation either within the policy or in the supporting text.	Historic Places Adviser (South East England) Historic England Guildford Tel. 01483 252028 (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	New Views Policy to be written. Supporting evidence clarified through Consultants.	Identify those that are important to the Conservation Area	Y	No	Evidence base improved
	Agree: The company was consulted on the study commissioned by the steering group. It supported the recommendations of the study in respect of land in which it has an interest ie: the land between Coach Park and the village was not suitable for designation and it did not object to the designation of Mullens Pond (ref LGS7). However, the steering group was asked to review the necessity of such a designation for Mullens Pond given that much of the proposed area included within LGS7 is covered by other policy designations which afforded it protection from development.	Orchard Homes and Development Ltd (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	The Steering Group has reviewed the designation of LGS7. It is currently a SINC. This is a local designation and the Steering Group would like to afford this area a national designation of protection and will continue to put LGS7 forward for LGS designation.	Agree	No	N/A	No
EN9: Pollution EN10: Flood Risk	We recognise that many of the Green Spaces listed contribute to the special historic interest of the conservation area and scheduled monument of the manor earthworks and are pleased to support the designation as local green spaces to protect this special interest of areas LGS1, LGS2, LGS3 and LGS, 4 in particular.	Historic Places Adviser (South East England) Historic England Guildford Tel. 01483 252028 (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	General support		No	N/A	No
<b>Heritage:</b> H1: Conservation Area	<b>Disagree:</b> The policy proposes protection to important open areas and built and natural features which are identified in separate documents; the Conservation Area Land Appraisal (2016) and the Village Design Statement (2009). It is not clear from those documents what land has been assessed as being important. Where development plan policies relate to specific areas those areas should be identified on a proposals map. It is recognised that including relative small individual features may not be practical but by including the larger areas on a map within the Neighbourhood Plan would greatly assist the reader understand the constraints which may apply and enhance the value of the document in the decision making process.	Orchard Homes and Development Ltd (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	The Thruxton Parish NDP is not proposing sites. Therefore, there is no proposals map and no land assessed as being important. To be considered - methods of "embedding" the VDS and Conservation Area Policy into the NDP. The Conservation Area is not going to be reviewed by TVBC in the near future.	All of the important open spaces identified in the Conservation Area appraisal are now covered by LGS designations - amendment to para 6.7 to refer to this and link back to map 4.	No	N/A	6.7 (now 6.5) amended
	We are pleased to see the considerable weight that the community have given to protecting or enhancing the conservation area in the draft policy. Unfortunately the way that national policy is written means that the word 'must' in the first sentence needs to be replaced with 'should' to meet the condition of conforming with the NPPF. This acknowledges that there may, in some circumstances be situations when the benefits of a proposal outweigh the harm caused to a conservation area, and cannot otherwise be avoided or minimised. There may also be cases where it simply isn't possible for a development to enhance the area and, as such an absolute requirement to deliver enhancement would make development impossible.	Historic Places Adviser (South East England) Historic England Guildford Tel. 01483 252028 (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	Change MUST to SHOULD. SD to cross refer to TVBC comments re H1. Cross reference with other housing design policies.	Agree - no further detail added though	Y	Y	No
H2: Archaeology	We heartily support the listing of suitable materials in bullet point c) of this policy and would recommend considering other facets of the area's architectural or spatial character that could similarly be specified, such as maximum scale of buildings (in storeys) or elements of layout.						
	We support the attention given to the area's archaeological potential and see this as an exemplary element of the plan that, sadly, is often neglected in neighbourhood planning. At paragraph 6.10 we recommend that, where it is expected that archaeological remains are presented a desk-based assessment would be superfluous (as the principal of potential impact to remains is what such as assessment is designed to demonstrate) and that in fact a programme of archaeological investigation according to a brief agreed with the District Council's Archaeological advisor would be the most appropriate measure to inform decisions. This allows for an appropriate mix of research, and either invasive fieldwork or remote sensing to be used to test what the nature, extent and condition of any archaeological remains might be. We found the wording of policy H2 to be a bit confusing and would recommend amending this to read: "1. Where development proposals could affect sites of archaeological interest recorded on the historic environment record, or where it is reasonable to expect that previously unidentified remains might be present, proposals should be informed by an appropriate archaeological assessment and, where necessary, the findings of a programme of archaeological investigation completed according to a written scheme of investigation agreed in writing with the District Council's archaeological advisor. This should provide details of the nature, extent and condition of any remains that may be presented and demonstrate how the design of the proposals have sought to avoid or minimise any harm to their archaeological interest. There will be a presumption in favour of the preservation in-situ of all potentially significant archaeological deposits or, where not possible, recorded for deposition within a public archive. 2. Where remains would be affected by development, the enhancement of the understanding and appreciation by the public of significant archaeological sites through the provision of well-designed interpretation materials or landscape features will be supported. Nevertheless, recording of archaeological remains that would be lost as part of development will not be regarded as a public benefit that would be weighed against the harm caused by their loss."	Historic Places Adviser (South East England) Historic England Guildford Tel. 01483 252028 (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	SG would support SD changing Policy to reflect Historic England's notes. If so, 6.10 needs rewording - therefore change "archaeological assessment" with "a programme of archaeological investigation according to a brief agreed with the District Council's Archaeological Advisor."	Agreed - also suggest amending policy to the wording suggested by Heritage England. It says the same but better.	Y	Y	No

Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	Action Determination			
				SDNPA response	Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
H3: Parish Heritage Assets	As with the views listed it would be helpful to identify separately which of the Parish Heritage Assets are located within the Conservation area and whether they contribute positively to the area's special historic or architectural interest or character or appearance that is desirable to preserve or enhance. Where they do they will receive greater protection through the statutory protection provided by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Both the Council existing (but rather dated) Fyfield, Kimpton, Thruxton Conservation Policy Document and Annex 2 of our Historic England Advice Note 1: Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management are likely to be of value in assessing the contribution these buildings or structures make to the conservation area.	Historic Places Adviser (South East England) Historic England Guildford Tel. 01483 252028 (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	Question to SD - All this in the Evidence Base so how much needs o be included in this document? Do we indicate in words which are in the Conservation Area ? Already done on map. Para 6.11 will need to be changed to make it clearer.	Agree, it is unnecessary and perfectly clear on the map. Para 6.11 amended.	No	N/A	6.11 amended
<b>Housing and Design:</b>							
HD1: New Residential Development	<b>Disagree:</b> The policy proposes a threshold for development of ten or fewer dwellings. It also refers to limiting the size of dwelling ie to three bedrooms or less. The purpose of the policy is understood ie to see small scale development and a preference for smaller dwellings. However such a policy needs to be founded on robust evidence to explain why larger scale development would not be acceptable and how seeking a limitation on the number of bedrooms would address the housing issues identified by the draft Plan.	Orchard Homes and Development Ltd (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	The policy appropriately reflects the wishes of the Parish that any development should be small scale and meet the need for smaller homes that will be suitable for older people. downsizing and young people and families. The sense of community is strongly felt and the plan aims to ensure that all new development can be 'absorbed' into the existing community. In addition the Rural Exception Site provision will support the development of a small number of smaller affordable homes for local young people. This is a small community. The Evidence Base also highlights issues regarding infrastructure and services.	The policy also relates to development within the settlement boundary so it is unlikely that developments of over 10 dwellings would be possible. Therefore the limited of 10 is probably unnecessary but it helps to reassure the community about what size and scale might be supported, rather than leave it open to interpretation.	No	N/A	No
HD2: Replacement dwellings, extensions and annexes HD3: Sub-division of Residential Gardens HD4: Design HD5: Outdoor Space HD6: Off-Street Parking HD7: Supporting independent living and sheltered housing HD8: Rural Exception Housing for Local People							
<b>Community Infrastructure &amp; Wellbeing:</b>							
C1: Protection of existing community facilities  C12: Provision of new community facilities C13: Developer Contribution to Infrastructure Improvements C14: Improved Pedestrian and Travel to School Safety C15: Increased Access Points and Traffic C16: Connected Countryside	We welcome early consultation on any new proposals for providing safe access on our network to ensure that any proposed schemes are deliverable.	Highways England, Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey, GU1 4LZ (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	Noted		No	N/A	No
<b>Economy and Thruxton Airfield:</b>							
EC1: Thruxton Airfield	We note from Map 9 that part of the area for this policy overlaps with the Manor Earthworks Scheduled Ancient Monument and we would question whether the Steering group intend for the policies to apply to this area. Whilst it may fall within the land ownership of the airfield it may not necessarily be desirable to allocate for the same land use. Nevertheless, we are pleased to support the policy's focus on sustaining the airfield's historic interest,	Historic Places Adviser (South East England) Historic England Guildford Tel. 01483 252028 (for the full response letter see the data base of documentation)	Map 9 needs red line amending in accordance with Map 6 to reflect the designated Conservation Area boundary of the Scheduled Monument and surrounding area.	Agree - is the boundary right to the east as well?	No	N/A	Map 9 amended
<b>TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018</b>							
Policy/ Paragraph/ Figure	Wording	Comments					
Basic Conditions		Neighbourhood plans must meet the Basic Conditions. All of these can be found in paragraph 65 of national guidance: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#basicconditions-for-neighbourhood-plan-to-referendum">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#basicconditions-for-neighbourhood-plan-to-referendum</a>  One of these states that the "neighbourhood plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan". Up to date strategic policies are set out in the local plan.  It is recommended, as early as possible, to carefully consider how TNP meets the Basic Conditions and why.	SD to confirm we meet these criteria in a Basic Conditions Statement	Include note on basic conditions	No	N/A	Para 1.15 included
		Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that those producing neighbourhood plans should support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, this is set out in Annex A of the TVBRLP.					

Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	SDNPA response	Action Determination		
					Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
		<p>More specifically paragraph 184 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies.</p> <p>When considering whether a policy is in general conformity a qualifying body, independent examiner, or local planning authority, should consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• whether the neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal supports and upholds the general principle that the strategic policy is concerned with</li> <li>• the degree, if any, of</li> </ul>	Noted	Noted	No	N/A	No
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
		<p>conflict between the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal and the strategic policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• whether the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal provides an additional level of detail and/or a distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policy without undermining that policy</li> <li>• the rationale for the approach taken in the draft neighbourhood plan or Order and the evidence to justify that approach.</li> </ul> <p>Strategic policies will be different in each local planning authority area. When reaching a view on whether a policy is a strategic policy the following are useful considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• whether the policy sets out an overarching direction or objective</li> <li>• whether the policy seeks to shape the broad characteristics of development</li> <li>• the scale at which the policy is intended to operate</li> <li>• whether the policy sets a framework for decisions on how competing priorities should be balanced</li> <li>• whether the policy sets a standard or other requirement that is essential to achieving the wider vision and aspirations in the Local Plan</li> <li>• in the case of site allocations, whether bringing the site forward is central to achieving the vision and aspirations of the Local Plan</li> <li>• whether the Local Plan identifies the policy as being strategic</li> </ul> <p>A qualifying body is advised to set out in its basic conditions statement how they have had regard to national policy and considered whether a particular policy is or is not relevant. A qualifying body is encouraged to set out the particular</p>	See SD response.				
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
		<p>national policies that it has considered, and how the policies in a draft neighbourhood plan or the development proposals in an Order take account of national policy and advice.</p> <p>A qualifying body must demonstrate how its plan or Order will contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions or that consideration has been given to how any potential adverse effects arising from the proposals may be prevented, reduced or offset (referred to as mitigation measures).</p>					



Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	Action Determination			
				SDNPA response	Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
		In order to demonstrate that a draft neighbourhood plan or Order contributes to sustainable development, sufficient and proportionate evidence should be presented on how the draft neighbourhood plan or Order guides development to sustainable solutions. There is no legal requirement for a neighbourhood plan to have a sustainability appraisal ( <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainabilityappraisal">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainabilityappraisal</a> ). However, qualifying bodies may find this a useful approach for demonstrating how their draft plan or order meets the basic condition. Material produced as part of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan may be relevant to a neighbourhood plan					
Evidence base		<p>A neighbourhood plan should be supported by a proportionate (in the work required) and robust (to withstand scrutiny) planning evidence base.</p> <p>The three core evidence base documents are the Basic Conditions Statement, Consultation Statement and Environmental Report (SEA or SA report).</p> <p>These should be the primary method of demonstrating how</p>					
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
		<p>TNP meets requirements, to help pass the examination and ensure it can be made part of the development plan.</p> <p>Other evidence base documents may be submitted for examination where they have been prepared and lend support to TNP. The volume of these extra documents should be within reason, so as not to unnecessarily delay examination.</p> <p>The evidence base documents have been filed in categories and are well ordered. It would be helpful however to link the relevant number in the evidence base to the areas of the text to which the document relates for clarity. In particular this would also be helpful within the Evidence Base section at the end of the Plan.</p>					
Health Check		<p>Seeking independent advice from a suitably qualified professional on whether the neighbourhood plan will meet the Basic Conditions is strongly recommended.</p> <p>Two options that could be considered are to seek the views of an examiner or consultant or to carry out a health check on your plan.</p> <p>A health check gives valuable independent insight into whether a neighbourhood plan is expected to meet the Basic Conditions and helps to inform the final submission plan.</p>					
General		The use of community projects and aspirations in a separate section is welcomed and it is clear that these do no form part of the land use policies.					
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
		<p>The My Community Guidance recommends how to set out and reference each policy. In relation to each policy, it may be beneficial to more clearly identify and present the objectives from the outset to provide a defined and highlighted basis for the policy.</p> <p>It would also be helpful to clearly refer to the relevant parts of the evidence base that supports the policy</p>					

Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	Action Determination			
				SDNPA response	Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
		TVBRLP and National policies should be referred to where these are built upon/ relevant.  Whilst much of this is in the supporting text, it is not readily visible and would benefit from re-organisation.					
EN1: Landscape and Character of Thruxton Parish	1. Development proposals must conserve and enhance the rural character and open chalk landscape of the Parish and must demonstrate that:  a) proposals are informed and guided by the landscape character;  b) design, layout and scale of proposals conserve and enhance existing landscape features that contribute to the distinctive character, pattern and evolution of the landscape in the Parish;  c) lighting is avoided and where necessary does not cause light pollution sufficient to reduce the quality of dark night skies or adversely affect habitats or the amenity of other	TVBC support the objectives of the policy, however it appears less detailed the TVBLP E2, with the exception of lighting. It would benefit from further work from the evidence base to support the 'distinctive character, pattern and evolution of the landscape in the Parish' element, such that it was clear what these elements are. If there is more information within the evidence base, this should be highlighted.  Potentially criterion c) could be a separate policy which could go into further detail about reducing light pollution.  Need/ Objectives/ National & TVBC Policy – Although it states it supports the objectives LE01 and 02, it would be beneficial to add this to the policy and potentially to add to the text to provide a more defined and highlighted basis for					

TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018

	occupiers.	the policy.
Policy EN2: Settlement character and separation	1. Development proposals must conserve and enhance the individual identity and separation of settlements, and rural sense of place of the Parish. Development proposals will be supported where they:  a) are located within a settlement boundary, except where they comply with Policy HD8;  b) do not, individually or cumulative with other existing or proposed development, diminish the physical and visual separation of the four settlement areas of Thruxton Parish;  c) respond to the individual identities of each of the four settlement areas; and  d) do not have a detrimental impact of the predominantly undeveloped landscape of the parish.	The policy is generally consistent with the intentions of policies in the TVBRLP.  It would be helpful to refer to the relevant parts of the evidence base that supports the policy in a clearly defined manner – these are set out in paragraph 5.10, but could be clearer. There is also the requirement for a proportionate landscape assessment set out, but this not included in the policy. TVBLP policies should be referred to where these are built upon.  Criterion b) could be worded more positively in line with sustainable development. At present any development on the edge of a settlement would 'physically diminish' the separation by its very nature. Therefore it would be beneficial to re-word this such that the word 'physically' is removed. The four settlement areas could be mentioned by name, particularly if there are specific areas of concern. It may also be beneficial to state how such a policy would be monitored.  The reference to Policy E3 of the TVBLP could be confusing as this is not an area within the designated Local Gaps.
	1. Development proposals must protect and, where possible, positively contribute, to the views and vistas within, to and from the Parish and open countryside, especially where these views are from public rights of way and Local Green Spaces.	The policy is generally consistent with the intentions of policies in the TVBRLP.

Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	Action Determination			
				SDNPA response	Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
Policy EN3: Protecting views	2. Special attention should be made to preserving notable views which are shown on Maps 2(a-c) and include:	It is not clear as to where the evidence for the viewpoints has been obtained. If it is within part of the evidence base of surveys/ questionnaires or appraisals, could this be referenced? Some views such as in and around the Conservation Area for example could carry more weight					

TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018

	<p>1. View from footpath over Mullen's Pond towards Thruxton village;</p> <p>2. Entry to Thruxton village from east;</p> <p>3. View from footpath looking northwest towards Thruxton village;</p> <p>4. View from footpath looking south east towards Amesbury Road;</p> <p>5. View from footpath towards Fyfield Church;</p> <p>6. View south towards Quarley Hillfort from the old A303;</p> <p>7. Looking towards Thruxton village from east from Amesbury Road;</p> <p>8. Looking east from Thruxton Down;</p> <p>9. Entering Thruxton Down from the east;</p> <p>10. Entering Thruxton Down from the west;</p> <p>11. View of Snowdrop Field from Village Street;</p> <p>12. View of Manor House field from Church Lane;</p> <p>13. View across Village Green;</p> <p>14. View down Village Street from west; and</p> <p>15. View down Village Street from east</p>	<p>than others, but without further evidence it would be difficult to substantiate that all views 'must' be protected from development proposals.</p> <p>The plans could be clearer and would benefit from larger numbers (in particular viewpoint 2 for example). Do the different size arrows denote anything different, if so this should be reflected in the key.</p> <p>It may also be beneficial to state how such a policy would be monitored.</p>				
Policy EN4: Biodiversity	<p>1. Development proposals must conserve or enhance wildlife habitats and biodiversity of the Parish, including creating links between habitats to improve connectivity.</p> <p>2. Development proposals that would result in an adverse effect on a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation which cannot either be avoided or adequately mitigated will be refused.</p> <p>3. Where development will impact important habitats it should be demonstrated that the development would have a positive impact on those</p>	<p>The policy which set out opportunities for improving biodiversity is welcomed, but it should be added that:</p> <p>Policy – criterion 1 is too general, not all development proposals in the village may relate to biodiversity. The wording should be reconsidered.</p> <p>The current map shown provides a good overview, but a detailed map would be beneficial. Criterion 2 should link to the map and potentially add the potential SSSI Impact Risk Zones such as Quarley Hill Fort SSSI/ Salisbury Plain SAC &amp;</p>				

TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018

	habitats. A suitable management plan will be required, which clearly sets out the long term management of the habitat, complete with a fully costed budget proposal for the management plan, and to provide the finance in the form of an upfront payment to cover all works so as to ensure that the burden does not fall on the Parish Council. Important habitats include:	SSSI, which fall within the Parish?
--	---	-------------------------------------

Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	Action Determination			
				SDNPA response	Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chalk grassland</li> <li>- Hedgerows</li> <li>- Ponds</li> <li>- Chalk water courses including Pillhill Brook</li> </ul>		Criterion 3 – the wording of the policy with reference to seeking a financial payment should be reworded. It must be clear that this will be sought via appropriate condition or planning obligation to mitigate the effects of the development.				
Policy EN5: Pillhill Brook	<p>1. Development proposals that would adversely affect the following features of Pillhill Brook will not be supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) landscape character, appearance and setting;</li> <li>b) biodiversity; and</li> <li>c) ability for the headwaters and watercourse corridor to function by natural processes throughout seasonal variations.</li> </ul> <p>2. SuDS or other appropriate methods of managing rainwater run off from development towards the Brook must ensure that any pollution is dealt with at source and not allowed to enter the water course. 3. Informal Recreational proposals that would enhance the accessibility, understanding or enjoyment of the biodiversity assets of Pillhill Brook and Mullens Pond will be supported provided its distinctive character and biodiversity is retained.</p>		TVBC support the objectives of the policy, which builds on TVBRLP Policy E5, in particular Criterion 2 and 3. It should be noted however that with regard to criterion 1c, it is not clear where the information for this aspect is to be found and measured?				
Policy EN6: Trees and hedgerows	<p>1. Development proposals should, where possible, conserve and enhance trees and hedgerows. The loss of trees or hedgerows of value will not be</p>		TVBC support the objectives of the policy, which builds on that set out in TVBRLP Policy E2. Criterion 1 sets out that the loss of trees or hedgerows of				
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
	<p>supported.</p> <p>2. Development proposals that affect existing trees and hedgerows, or involve the new planting of trees and hedgerows, must demonstrate that they have been informed and guided by full site survey, including Ecological Impact Assessment.</p> <p>3. Existing trees and hedgerows should be integrated into the proposed landscaping schemes for the development and provide a management plan for their future care and maintenance, which clearly sets out the long term management and yearly maintenance of all trees and hedgerows, complete with a fully costed budget proposal for the management plan term, and to provide the finance in the form of an upfront payment to cover all works so as to ensure that the burden does not fall on the Parish Council</p> <p>4. Where replacement or new trees and hedgerows are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) replacement planting must be with appropriate locally native species unless there are overriding reasons to do otherwise. Species should be particularly suitable to the location, including variety, height, density and soil type;</li> <li>b) tree plantings should be given sufficient space to develop into their natural size and shape; and</li> <li>c) succession planting should be considered where existing plantings are mature or over- mature.</li> </ul>		<p>value will not be supported. It may be beneficial to add of 'amenity or biodiversity value' or similar to clarify. There may also be situations where the proposal will be of benefit to the community and therefore in the interests of sustainable development, it is suggested that such a loss would not be permitted 'unless the benefits of the proposed development outweigh the amenity value'.</p> <p>Criterion 2 uses the word 'site survey' does this refer to an arboricultural survey or a topographic survey? The wording should be considered to clarify.</p> <p>Criterion 3 – the wording of the policy with reference to seeking a financial payment should be reworded. It must be clear that this will be sought via appropriate condition or planning obligation to mitigate the effects of the development.</p>				
Policy EN7: Green Infrastructure	<p>1. Development proposals should seek to maintain, enhance, and take opportunities to provide new</p>		Policy supported, although it provides little additional information over TVBRLP Policy E6.				
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
	<p>green infrastructure assets and links, which are integrated into the design of the development proposals.</p> <p>2. Green infrastructure proposals should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) improve countryside access through enhancements to the public rights of way network, maximising opportunities for walking and cycling, including multi-user route and, where possible facilitate circular routes, and</li> <li>b) strengthen connectivity of habitats.</li> </ul>						
	<p>Development proposals will not be supported on areas designated as Local Green Space identified below, and as shown on Map 4, other than in very special circumstances. These circumstances are:</p>		TVBC support the protection of local green spaces where it conforms with Local Plan policies and the NPPF. The policy as set out clearly references the criteria in the NPPF for designation as local green space.				

Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	Action Determination			
				SDNPA response	Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
Policy EN8: Local Green Space	a) where there is an existing building/structure within the Local Green Space and the works are needed to maintain its viability/use into the future (e.g. Church, sports pavilion, etc.); OR	A detailed Local Green Space Assessment July Report 2017 has been provided in the evidence base, which is important as the NPPF states in paragraph 77 that not all green areas and open spaces will be suitable for this designation. This provides justification as to why each green space has been allocated using the recommended methodology.	Although the report it available in the evidence base, it may be beneficial to have a short summary on the allocated green space to provide a direct and accessible reference to the basis on which they have been selected.				
	b) where the proposed development will be for the benefit of the community and will preserve the particular local significance of the space for which it was designated.						
	The areas designated as Local Green Space are: - LGS1 – The Village Green						
	- LGS2 – Manorial Earthworks - LGS3 – Snowdrop Field - LGS4 – Churchyard - LGS5 – Recreation Ground						
	- LGS6 – Allotments - LGS7 – Mullen's Pond and surrounding fields - LGS8 – Land between Coach Park and the		Whilst map 4 lists the Local Green Spaces, it may also be beneficial to have larger scale individual maps within the document for clarity.				

TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018

	eastern footpath	
Policy EN9: Pollution	1. Development proposals that reduce levels of pollution, particularly light pollution in Thruxton Down, noise and air from the A303 or Thruxton Airfield or water pollution of the Pihill Brook will be supported.	The policy builds on that under TVBRLP Policy E8 in addition to the NPPF and provides specific local detail, which is welcomed.
	2. Development proposals should ensure surface water run-off fully complies with 'Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) regulations and should not exacerbate ground water drainage and foul water drainage through infiltration.	Criterion 2 however, does not fully relate to pollution and would benefit from either being within a separate policy (EN 10 for example) or the policy could be renamed.
	3. Development proposals will not be supported if the level of air, noise, light and water pollution has a demonstrably negative and damaging effect on the people and natural environment of the Parish, now or in the foreseeable future, taking into account cumulative impacts.	
	4. Development proposals should follow best practice methods to reduce levels of dust, other pollutants and damage by construction vehicles from demolition through to completion.	There is also some overlap with the light pollution element of Policy EN1 and potential for re-wording/consolidation.
	5. Development which is sensitive to noise or poor air quality near to the A303 or Thruxton Airfield must include appropriate measures to reduce the impact on users or occupiers to acceptable levels.	
Policy EN10: Flood Risk	Development proposals in areas prone to flooding should provide appropriate flood management measures to reduce the risk of flooding throughout the Parish , especially near Pihill Brook, Mullens Pond, Village Street and Amesbury Road. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be used, to manage surface water run off from new developments, unless they are demonstrated to be inappropriate.	The policy builds on that under TVBRLP Policy E7 in addition to the NPPF and provides specific local detail, which is welcomed.  There is overlap with Criterion 2 – see comments on EN9 above.

TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018

Policy H1: Conservation Area	Development proposals within the Conservation Area, or within its setting, must preserve or enhance its historic character and appearance by:	The policy re-iterates statutory duty, however It would be beneficial to add the key features taken from the appraisal and VDS for clarity to criterion a). This could be added to the supporting text itself and then referred to thereafter.
	a) protecting important open spaces and built and natural features identified in the Neighbourhood Plan Conservation Area Land Appraisal and Village Design Statement;	The wording of the policy should reflect that of paragraphs 132-135 of the NPPF regarding significance, harm and balancing any development with public benefits.
	b) ensuring proposals are designed in context with their surroundings, including existing buildings, street pattern, open spaces, trees and other historic characteristic features; and c) using traditional materials such as chalk (cob), flint, brick or rendered walls with thatch or slate roofs and traditional boundary features such as thatched or tiled topped Hampshire walls.	Criterion c) is worded too prescriptively. The use of materials should be encouraged, but this does not allow for contemporary design, which may also use additional materials not mentioned. You may want to re-word to allow the use of additional materials, but require justification etc.

Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	Action Determination			
				SDNPA response	Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
Policy H2: Archaeology	1. Acknowledgement, assessment, identification and designation of potentially significant archaeological deposits must be addressed by all potential developers to help prevent damage and loss of areas not yet identified, but could yet still be, of historical importance. Lack of current evidence of sub-surface archaeology must not be taken to be proof of absence. There will be a presumption in favour of the preservation in-situ of all potentially significant archaeological deposits or, where not possible, recorded for deposition within a public archive.  2. Where appropriate, the enhancement of the understanding and appreciation by the public of significant archaeological sites through the provision of well-designed interpretation materials or landscape features will be supported.	The Parish contains a number of sites of archaeological interest and therefore support for this is welcomed. However it is not clear from criterion 1 what is required from developers and how this would be applied. This should be reworded.					
Policy H3: Parish Heritage	Development proposals affecting Parish Heritage	Maps 7a to c shows the Heritage Assets, but would benefit					

TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018

Assets	Assets set out below, and as shown on the Maps 7(a- c) must be supported by an assessment of their significance as a heritage asset and how the proposal impacts on this significance. Any harm to significance will be resisted and will need to be robustly justified by evidence, as well as demonstrating that all efforts have been made to minimise harm by appropriate design and materials and optimal viable uses.  The following are designated as Parish Heritage Assets;  - The Thruxton Milestone  - The row of cottages that includes the Former Post Office - May Cottage Barn, Village Street - Veronica Cottage, Village Street - Rose Cottage, Village Street - Site of Thruxton Roman Villa, Land between Coach Park and Dauntsey Lane - Thruxton Airfield Control Tower - World War Two Airfield Hangars - Thruxton Farm Barns, Cholderton Road	from a larger scale mapping base for clarity and specifics as to what type of heritage asset/ grade of listing etc. These are shown on the Conservation Area map and this could be reproduced or more clearly referred to.  The reference to Parish Heritage Assets is unclear as to whether these are designated or non-designated in the policy wording.  The wording relating to harm should reflect that of paragraphs 135 of the NPPF regarding significance, harm and balancing any development with benefits.
Policy HD1: New Residential Development	Residential development of 10 or fewer dwellings will be supported within the settlement boundaries (shown on Map 8) subject to meeting the requirements of other policies in the development plan. Such development must respond to the local need for smaller properties and should consist of 3 bedroom dwellings or less.	The adopted TVBRLP defines Thruxton as a rural village, where windfalls, rural affordable housing sites, community led development and the re-use of buildings and replacement dwellings are supported.  It may be advisable to reword to permit minor infill development with development guidelines rather than a specific number of dwellings.  The mix of dwellings should allow for variation where a robust justification is provided to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that the scheme as a whole would reflect

TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018

		the most up to date housing needs evidence available taking into account viability considerations.
Policy HD2: Replacement dwellings, extensions and annexes	The replacement, or extension, of existing dwellings must respect the character and appearance of the locality and, in addition:  a) replacement dwellings should be on the same 'footprint' as the building they replace; b) extensions should be subsidiary to the main dwelling in scale and height, matching design and materials, unless a compelling design justifies an exception;  c) any extensions to facilitate 'independent living' should accord with policy HD7 of this plan; d) 'Annexes' to be occupied by the children/parents/grandparents/ dependent other relatives of the occupiers of the main dwelling will be viewed favourably. Such annexes should demonstrate the functional and physical dependency on the host dwelling.	Criterion a) should allow for more flexibility. It may be demonstrated that the original siting is less appropriate than an alternative or would offer a benefit.  Criterion d) - Planning permission is granted with the land and rarely should be personal. There are exceptions, however it should be recognised that any granting of permission due to personal circumstances, will endure long after any requirement. Therefore whilst some weight should be given to such circumstances, unless the building is temporary, the overall long term impact of the annexe should be assessed as per any other development.
	Development proposals for new dwellings on sites that form part of an existing residential garden, or a group of gardens, must:	The policy adds to those in the TVBRLP. Consider rewording a) to read 'be in keeping with' rather than 'conserve'.

Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	Action Determination			
				SDNPA response	Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
Policy HD3: Sub-division of Residential Gardens	<p>a) conserve the character of the surrounding area in terms of form, height, layout and density of development;</p> <p>b) provide sufficient garden space, space around buildings and planting, particularly where these spaces and any trees lend to the character of the area;</p> <p>c) existing features such as trees, hedgerows</p>		<p>Criterion c) should be altered to unless sufficiently demonstrated otherwise.</p> <p>The wording of TVBRLP Policy E4 may be relevant for information purposes.</p>				
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
	<p>of value and walls which are characteristic of the streetscape and local area must be retained;</p> <p>d) provide sufficient amenity space, vehicular access and onsite parking, both for the new development and existing dwelling(s) on the site;</p> <p>e) ensure there is no significant adverse impact on the amenities of adjacent properties as a result of overlooking, loss of privacy or overshadowing.</p>						
Policy HD4: Design	<p>1. Development proposals must demonstrate how the development contributes to the character of Thruxton, incorporating design principles that reflect the local vernacular, particularly the Conservation Area and those features and characteristics included in the Thruxton Village Design Statement. Proposals will be expected to demonstrate the following:</p> <p>a) building form and style valued and promoted locally including smaller houses with characteristically low roofs. Low roof lines and details such as flint inserts, arched window details, dormer windows in a low roof, raised eaves and exposed woodwork are all distinctive local features which will generally be supported;</p> <p>b) use of locally distinctive building materials as appropriate to the location (brick, flint, thatch, clay tiles or slate). The use of flint, mellow red and blue brick, rendering painted white or cream, slate or thatch is encouraged. The use of grey and brown roofing materials</p>		<p>The policy is detailed and references local materials, which avoids duplication with TVBRLP Policy E1. However it would be advisable, to consider adding the principles of the VDS to the supporting text rather than a general reference, the findings of this could be summarised for clarity.</p>				
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
	<p>is preferred, or if a red roof is appropriate a mellow mixed red using reused tiles would be acceptable;</p> <p>c) suitable boundary treatments, such as brick, flint, chalk or hedges of beech, hawthorn, ivy, privet or yew. Thatched or tiled topped Hampshire walls should be maintained and are an attractive method of delineating new boundaries. Chalk should be used to repair existing cob walls;</p> <p>d) attention to design detail, with discrete siting and design of service features such as bin stores; cycle stores; meter boxes, flues and ventilation ducts; renewable energy; lighting, satellite dishes and phone lines;</p> <p>e) development should create places that are sustainable, durable, safe and secure, functional, aesthetic, flexible and suitable for their location and use, meeting the relevant policies of the development plan; and</p> <p>f) avoid or minimise the use of external</p> <p>lighting in line with Policy EN01.</p> <p>2. Development proposals where required, should be accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, showing how the proposed design and access arrangements for the proposed development have responded to, and been informed by, the site context.</p>						
Policy HD5: Outdoor Space	<p>1. Development proposals for new and extended housing development should include high quality outdoor amenity space, appropriate to the nature of the development (i.e. either private gardens or a shared amenity area) and must contribute to the</p>		<p>The policy is supported although in criterion 2 it is unclear how it would be assessed whether a garden is</p>				
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
	<p>local character using appropriate materials and landscaping, providing native tree cover and improved biodiversity.</p> <p>2. The amount of land used for garden or amenity space must be commensurate with the size and type of dwelling and the character of the area, and should be of appropriate utility (for play and recreation) and quality having regard to topography, shadowing (from buildings and landscape features), and privacy.</p>						
Policy HD6: Off-Street Parking	<p>1. All new residential developments must provide sufficient resident and visitor car parking spaces so as not to impact on parking issues that already exist in some areas. Development proposals that result in the loss of existing residential off-street car parking to levels less than those set out below, will be strongly resisted unless an equal amount of replacement off-street car parking is provided in a suitable location. Wherever feasible, electric vehicle charging facilities should be provided.</p> <p>2. Provision of parking must:</p> <p>a) be sufficient to avoid additional on-road parking, arising directly or indirectly from the development, which will lead to safety hazards or hinder the passage/free flow of traffic (including use by agricultural vehicles, horses or pedestrians);</p> <p>b) not detract from the rural character of the area;</p> <p>c) take into account that the rural location, and the lack of public transport, will require facilities for visitor parking and reflect the fact that more than the normal level of car ownership is likely, and,</p>		<p>The level of proposed parking must accord with that set out in the TVBRLP Annex G and Policy T2 unless otherwise justified in the evidence base. There is no specific reference to a parking or traffic survey identified in the supporting text.</p>				
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
	<p>House size 1-bed</p> <p>2 and 3-bed 4+bed</p> <p>Total spaces</p>						

Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	Action Determination			
				SDNPA response	Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	1.5 spaces per unit (rounded to the nearest whole number) 2 spaces per unit 3 spaces per unit  d) incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage systems. The following parking standards should be used as guidance:						
Policy HD7: Supporting independent living and sheltered housing	1. The conversion and extension of existing dwellings, and other buildings, to support independent living for older members of the community will be supported provided that the scale and design of development are in keeping with the character of the location, and that the impact on the amenity of surrounding properties is acceptable.  2. Sheltered or purpose built housing for the elderly, on a very limited scale, and with a preference for those with local connections (i.e. currently living in the Parish or with children/closest living relative living in the Parish) will be viewed favourably.  3. Dwellings designed to be suitable for older residents (aged 60 and over) must demonstrate, as a minimum, that they meet Building Regulations requirements M4(2) for accessible and adaptable dwellings. These dwellings will also be suitable for younger residents and are not intended to be restricted in use.	This policy is supported and partly overlaps with the annexe element of HD2.  The wording of 3) is somewhat confusing as it reference those aged over 60 and then discusses younger residents. It would benefit from more clarity.					
Policy HD8: Rural Exception Housing for Local People	Development proposals for rural exception housing of 100% Affordable Housing will be supported in line with Policy COM8 of the Test Valley Local Plan and where such proposals are generally less than 5 dwellings.	No evidence base reference has been produced to support the limited dwelling numbers. The number in the					
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
POLICY C11: Protection of existing community facilities	1. Development that results in the loss of key community buildings or facilities that serve the local community, as listed below will only be supported where:  a) an assessment has been undertaken which shows the facility is surplus to requirements and there is clear evidence that the community has no need for that type of facility;  b) it can be demonstrated that alternative facilities of equal or better quality will be provided in an equally accessible location;  c) the development is for an alternative community facility, the need for which clearly outweighs the loss.  Key Community Facilities include: - Kimpton Primary School  - Thruxton Recreation Ground - Thruxton Memorial Hall - Thruxton Village Green - Church of St Peter and St Paul  2. Proposals to enhance the viability and/or community value of these facilities will be supported, providing that they accord with the other policies of the Development Plan.	The protection of community facilities is supported, and the wording takes future needs into considerations.  There is some duplication with that of protected green spaces on the list, which is already covered.  A plan setting out the location of these facilities would be beneficial.					
Policy C12: Provision of new community facilities	1. The provision of new recreational or community facilities will be supported, provided that their design and scale are in keeping with the local character and that the impact on the residential amenity of surrounding residential properties is acceptable.	The policy overlaps with above and potentially could be reworded and added to C11.					
Policy C13: Developer Contribution to	1. Development proposals must be served by appropriate, necessary and reasonable	This policy would benefit from either referencing appropriate legal agreements or CIL specifically otherwise					
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
Infrastructure Improvements	infrastructure either on-site, through off-site works, and/or financial contributions that mitigate their impact.	Is a duplication of TVBRLP Policy COM15.					
Policy C14: Improved Pedestrian and Travel to School Safety	a) Development proposals that result in improvements to pedestrian safety in the Parish and safety to pupils travelling to Kimpton Primary School on foot, by bicycle, bus or car will be supported. b) Residential development must endeavour to provide good pedestrian connections to safe and suitable pedestrian routes to the schools and other amenities.	The policy builds on TVBRLP T1.  It may also be beneficial to add cycle safety as well as pedestrian?  It is suggested that criterion b) should replace 'must' with 'shall' to reflect that it may not be appropriate for all proposals.					
Policy C15: Increased Access Points and Traffic	- Development proposals in the following locations, which increase the number of access points, or would involve an increase in traffic generation, will need to demonstrate that they do not further increase the risk to pedestrian safety or exacerbate parking stress in these or adjoining areas:  - Village Street along its full length, including the junction with Lambourne Way, and - In the vicinity of the Memorial Hall, and - Stanbury Road (particularly at the corner of the Recreation Ground).	This policy does not reference the evidence base or provide detailed justification for its inclusion.					
Policy C16: Connected Countryside	1. Development proposals that result in improved countryside access and enjoyment of the countryside through enhancements to the public footpath / cycle network and safe access across the A303 will be supported.	This overlaps with Policy EN7 and could be reworded and consolidated.					



Policy	Other Agency's Comment	Name and Address	Determination Rationale	Action Determination			
				SDNPA response	Amend Policy	Policy Amended	Other Action
	2. Development proposals that would reduce or detrimentally impact on public access to the countryside will not be supported.						
Policy EC1: Thruxton Airfield	Major commercial development proposals on	The site specific policy is welcomed, but could be simplified					
TVBC Response to Thruxton NDP Regulation 14 1st June 2018							
	Thruxton Airfield will be supported where they: a) are part of a long term plan for the site and its users; and, b) deliver multiple benefits for the airfield, Parish and local environment; and, c) contribute to the importance of the motor industry and aviation to the Parish at a local and a national level; and, d) contribute to its sense of place and identity as former historic airfield; e) re-use or replace existing buildings where feasible.	by replacing criterion a) to c) by a wording requiring sufficient supporting information to accompany any application which would demonstrate it was in accordance with objectives.					