

Minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group (NDPSG) held on the 16th October 2017, 19:30 Machin Room, TWMH.

1. Apologies – Kate Philipson (KP), Sarah Fanthorpe-Green (SFG).
2. Present – Louisa Chamberlain (LC - CHAIR), Steve Counsell (SC), John Davis(JD), Mike Windsor (MW), Bill Brewer (BB), Liz Watson (LW), Simon Watson (SW) and Alan Leslie (AL).
3. Minutes from NDPSG Meeting on 6.6.17 were agreed. LC will send to JD and Clerk to Parish Council for presentation and agreement at next PC Meeting. JD will then ensure their upload on to Village website.
4. Minutes from NDPSG Policy Meeting on 5th August 2017 were agreed. LC will send to JD and Clerk to Parish Council for presentation and agreement at next PC Meeting. JD will then ensure their upload on to Village website.
5. Local Green Space (LGS) Landowner Meetings update:
 - a. Rome – LGS5 and 6. The NDPSG had read the attendance note made by KP following the meeting with Mr and Mrs Rome. Mr and Mrs Rome were happy that LGS 5 be put forward for consideration of LGS designation. They wished to confirm that LGS designation did not confer right of access to the land by the General Public. This was confirmed by KP and LC to them. LGS 6 will not be put forward for LGS designation following the South Downs Consultancy (SD) report.
 - b. Pelham - The NDPSG had read the Meeting Minutes from the meeting with Mr Pelham, BB and LC. The NDPSG agreed it was reasonable to change the boundary of LGS 4 – to bring the boundary line south to follow the line of the Conservation Area and NOT to include the track and small building. There was no justification to include this in the LGS designation as it was outside the Conservation Area. LC would discuss this with SD consultancy and feed back to the NDPSG. Designation of LGS 8 was discussed in light of the meeting with Mr Pelham and also a comment made by Mr Lees (planning consultant for Mr Jukes (below) and Orchard Homes).Mr Lees queried the ease of building a Pavilion on LGS 8 if it was designated LGS. LC noted that it had been a long held Parish ambition to build a Pavilion on the Recreation field and if LGS designation of it would/could create difficulties with obtaining planning consent for a Pavilion and if funds could be raised for one (by whatever means), then it might be reasonable and justifiable for supporting an alternative method of protection, other than LGS designation. LC will also ask SD Consultancy about layering of protections and whether there may be other ways of protecting the recreation field. MW thought that other local authorities had built Sports Pavilions on land that had LGS designation. JD stressed the importance of some form of appropriate protection of the

Recreation Field being applied, especially to protect the area as a recreation field when Mr Pelham was no longer its owner.

c. Jukes – the SG had read the Meeting Minutes pertaining to the meeting between Mr Jukes, Mr Lees, LC and JD regarding LGS designation proposals of Mr Jukes' land. Mr Jukes and Mr Lees were happy that LGS15 was not seen as suitable for LGS designation but had considerable concern over SD Consultancy's wording over public footpath protection that they felt was constraining and protectionist. LC will discuss this with SD Consultancy. LW and SW advised caution and review of wording in case this was challenged. The importance of Thruxton Parish's existing public footpaths to Parishioners was once more confirmed by the NDPSG, in light of consultation exercises. SW said that redirection of footpaths could always be applied for by developers. Mr Lees' comment of "less is more" protection in the context of LGS AND its current SINC designation of Mullen's Pond was discussed. A formal response from Mr Lees had been received and was available on the DropBox for review. The NDPSG's view was that it would wish to continue to designate ALL of LGS12. Mr Jukes' current difficulties with access to his part of LGS 12 were discussed. SW felt that as a landowner he had a right of access to his land through any reasonable route. LC informed the NDPSG that Mr Lees had asked for copies of the comments by Parishioners during consultation exercises. It was felt that Mr Lees could make such representation through The Parish Clerk, Heather Bourner, if so wished.

6. LGS – Landowner – Telephone call with Teds family – The NDPSG had read the notes KP had made of the telephone call she had had with Sam Dorman, daughter of the landowner, Mr Teds. It is felt unlikely that the NDPSG will have further response.
7. LGS – Church/Vernon Estate response. The landowners in question had requested copies of the South Downs LGS Report and this had been sent to them. No further response had been had from both parties since.
8. Consolidated response to South Downs following LGS Landowner discussion will be done by LC. In the light of the discussions had with Landowners to date over LGS designation it was still the unanimous view of the NDPSG NOT to identify sites.
9. Updating Minutes on website – LC stressed the importance of updating the Minutes of the NDPSG Meetings on the Village Website. JD discussed some of the problems he was experiencing with uploading large documents on to the website and SC pointed out that the website was not a Parish Council website. However, LC was concerned that the general public was not able to see recent meeting Minutes and they should be able to. To prevent the SG falling foul of rules to disseminate information, JD agreed to upload the recent Minutes, once agreed by the PC on to the Village website as this was our only tool for information dissemination on progress of the NDP.

10. Amendment to Thruxton Times report regarding potential house numbers deemed suitable for development in Thruxton Parish – KP was misquoted. KP had sent an email to John McKenzie, editor of Thruxton Times seeking clarification and correction of her reported comments at the Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Council in August 2017 – “Can I just please make it clear that whilst the info from the survey and the comments from the other consultation could be interpreted as suggesting what was reported, my concern at the meeting was whether we had sufficient evidence to draw any detailed conclusions about the level of new housing the Parish was supporting, and that I thought that we needed to take advice from South Downs (the consultants) on the evidence that we have, whether we needed more and what their interpretation of the data would be.”
11. Finances – BB gave an update. As yet we have not had a further bill from South Downs consultancy for their work done recently. LC will chase.
12. AOB - BB asked for any bills that came from SD consultancy to be sent to him asap so that he could make payment.
 - SW asked if the draft Policies had been sent to SD consultancy – SC confirmed they had.
 - LC made the Steering Group aware of an email sent by the Chairman of the Parish Council wishing to inform the NDPSG that he had received reliable information that the 15 or so acres owned by Mr Jukes behind Lambourne and Stanbury Closes was currently being advertised on a traveller’s website. No further information was available.
13. Date of next Meeting – will be arranged when further work from South Downs Consultancy is obtained. LC will notify all accordingly.
14. Meeting closed at 20:40.