

## Mid Suffolk District Council



## Thorndon Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Submission Consultation Responses

In June 2020, Thorndon Parish Council (the 'qualifying body') submitted their Neighbourhood Development Plan to Mid Suffolk District Council for formal consultation under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended). The consultation period ran from Monday 22 June until Friday 14 August 2020.

In total, nine organisations submitted representations. They are listed below and copies of their representations are attached.

Ref No.	Consultee
(1)	Suffolk County Council
(2)	Eye Town Council
(3)	Natural England
(4)	Historic England
(5)	Environment Agency
(6)	Anglian Water
(7)	Highways England
(8)	National Grid
(9)	Ipswich & East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group

*[ PLEASE NOTE: THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK ]*

# (1) SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL

Date: 13<sup>th</sup> August 2020  
Enquiries to: Georgia Teague  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]



Mid Suffolk District Council  
Endeavour House,  
8 Russell Road,  
Ipswich  
IP1 2BX

Dear Robert Hobbs,

## **Submission version of the Thorndon Neighbourhood Plan**

Thank you for consulting Suffolk County Council (SCC) on the Submission version of the Thorndon Neighbourhood Plan.

SCC welcome the changes made to the plan in response to comments made at the Reg. 14 pre-submission consultation stage.

As this is the submission draft of the Plan the County Council response will focus on matters related to the Basic Conditions the plan needs to meet to proceed to referendum. These are set out in paragraph 8(2) Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act. The basic conditions are:

- a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan
- b) the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.
- c) the making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area)
- d) the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.

Where amendments to the plan are suggested added text will be in *italics* and deleted text will be in ~~strikethrough~~.

### Flooding

The neighbourhood plan has used some of additional wording provided, in Policy THN18 – Design Considerations for SuDS, however to fully meet the Basic Conditions part A, national policies and guidance, it is recommended that the following wording is included for part i:

“not result in water run-off that would add-to or create surface water flooding; and incorporate, ~~where necessary,~~ *unless inappropriate,* the use of above ground open Sustainable Drainage Systems (*SuDS*);”

This amendment would make Policy TH18 more in line with paragraph 165 of the NPPF, which states; “Major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate.”

### Health and Wellbeing

The Thorndon Neighbourhood Plan states that Thorndon has an “ageing population with many being over 60 years old” however, does little to meet the needs of these residents. Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan does include support for the building of bungalows in Policy THN9, it is recommended that there should be specific mention of support of adaptable homes built to the M4(2) Standard. As stated in the Housing Mix section, many of the residents feel the need for more smaller one- and two-bedroom houses, therefore it is recommended that they should be built to be a home that will service the needs for a lifetime.

Following guidance from footnote 46 in the NPPF “Planning policies for housing should make use of the Government’s optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing, where this would address an identified need for such properties.”

Whilst SCC acknowledges that the Ministerial Statement 2015 referenced in the Consultation Statement states that neighbourhood plans should not set additional technical standards; SCC was not proposing that the plan should impose a requirement for M4(2). SCC recommended that the plan set out a positive position towards proposals which contain homes built to those standards, in the same way that the neighbourhood plan supports bungalows in Policy THN9, and internal space in Policy THN10. This will help the plan meet the needs of a wider range of groups including older and vulnerable people, reflecting paragraph 61 of the NPPF.

The following text is recommended to be included in either Policy THN 10 – Measures for New Housing Development, or Policy THN 9 - Housing Mix:

*“Support will be given for smaller 2 and 3 bedroomed homes that are adaptable (meaning built to optional M4(2) standards), in order to meet the needs of the aging population, without excluding the needs of the younger buyers and families.”*

### Transport

Within the Consultation Statement, the neighbourhood planning group disagree with the County Council’s suggestion that development should provide a level of on street parking, stating: “A major concern in the village is the narrowness of the public highways, as noted in the Plan. As such, it is not considered that any additional allowance for on-street parking should be made on the existing highways.”

It is believed that the parish council have misunderstood the intent of SCC’s recommendation to include on street parking. It was not intended that this parking would be on the existing highway, but within the development itself. The phrase “on plot” was interpreted by SCC as meaning on the plots of the dwellings, rather than on the site as a whole. Any new on street parking should of course be provided on the site of a development, rather than the existing highway. Having well designed and integrated on street parking can help to reduce inconsiderate parking, which can restrict access for emergency services and refuse collections, and parking on pavements that hinder pedestrian access and safety. Please see pages 25-28 of Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019 <sup>1</sup>for further guidance.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/assets/planning-waste-and-environment/planning-and-development-advice/Suffolk-Guidance-for-Parking-2019-Adopted-by-SCC.pdf>

The mentions of walking and cycling and permeability is welcomed, however it is recommended that Policy THN18 could be further enhanced by including that movements of pedestrians and cyclists should be prioritised where feasible within developments and should connect to existing footways.

This is stated in paragraph 110 of the NPPF: “.... applications for development should: a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; ....”

As such, for clarity it is recommended that part g of Policy THN18 is amended to state:

“g. produce designs, in accordance with standards, that maintain or enhance the safety of the highway network ensuring that ~~all~~ *appropriate* vehicle parking is provided ~~within the plot on site, where a proportion of parking is provided on street within a new development, but is well designed, located and integrated into the scheme to avoid obstruction to all highway users or impede visibility, and seek always to ensure permeability through new housing areas, connecting any new development into the heart of the existing settlement, *whilst prioritising the movement of pedestrians and cyclists,*”~~

-----

I hope that these comments are helpful. SCC is always willing to discuss issues or queries you may have. Some of these issues may be addressed by the SCC’s Neighbourhood Planning Guidance, which contains information relating to County Council service areas and links to other potentially helpful resources.

The guidance can be accessed here: [Suffolk County Council Neighbourhood Planning Guidance](#).

If there is anything I have raised that you would like to discuss, please use my contact information at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Georgia Teague  
Planning Officer  
Growth, Highways, and Infrastructure

## (2) EYE TOWN COUNCIL

### Section One: Respondents Details

All respondents should complete Part A. If you are an Agent please complete Part's A & B

<b>Part A: Respondent</b>	
Title / Name:	Wendy Alcock
Job Title (if applicable):	Town Clerk
Organisation / Company (if applicable):	Eye Town Council
Address:	The Common Room Tacon Close Eye
Postcode:	IP23 7AF
Tel No:	07713 196251
E-mail:	townclerk@eyesuffolk.org

<b>Part B: Agents – Please complete details of the client / company you represent</b>	
Client / Company Name:	
Address:	
Postcode:	
Tel No:	
E-mail:	

## Section Two: Your representation(s)

To which part of the document does your representation relate? (You may wish to complete a separate form for each separate representation)

Paragraph No.		Policy No.	
---------------	--	------------	--

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)

Support  Support with modifications  Oppose  Have Comments

**Please give details of your reasons for support / opposition, or make other comments here:**

*We have no comments in relation to the content of the plan. We acknowledge that the plan is well presented highlighting a number of similar matters as the Eye Neighbourhood Plan which are of importance locally.*

*(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)*

**What improvements or modifications would you suggest?**

*Please be as brief and concise as possible ..*

*(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)*

If you are including additional pages these should be clearly labelled and referenced.

Normally the Examiner will aim to consider the responses through written representations.

Occasionally an Examiner may consider it necessary to hold a hearing to discuss particular issues. If you consider a hearing should be held please explain why this is necessary.

Please note that a decision on whether to hold a hearing is entirely at the discretion of the Examiner.

**I consider that a hearing should be held because ...**

*Please be as brief and concise as possible ..*

*(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)*

Please indicate (tick) whether you wish to be notified of:

The publication of the recommendations of the Examiner	
The final 'making' (adoption) of the Thorndon NDP by Mid Suffolk District Council	

<b>Signed:</b> 	<b>Dated: 14<sup>th</sup> July 2020</b>
--	---

## (3) NATURAL ENGLAND

Date: 03 August 2020  
Our ref: 320122  
Your ref: Thorndon Neighbourhood Plan



Paul Bryant  
Neighbourhood Planning Officer  
Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils

Hornbeam House  
Crewe Business Park  
Electra Way  
Crewe  
Cheshire  
CW1 6GJ

**BY EMAIL ONLY**

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Mr Bryant,

### **Thorndon Neighbourhood Development Plan – Regulation 16 consultation**

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 19 June 2019

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.

**Natural England does not have any specific comments on this neighbourhood plan.**

For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: [consultations@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk).

Yours sincerely,

Ben Jones

Consultations Team



## (4) HISTORIC ENGLAND



Historic England

Mr Paul Bryant  
Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils  
Endeavor House  
8 Russell Road  
Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP7 6SJ

Direct Dial: [REDACTED]

Our ref: PL00686043

14 August 2020

Dear Mr Bryant

### Ref: Thorndon Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation

Thank you for inviting Historic England to comment on the Regulation 16 Submission version of this Neighbourhood Plan.

We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan. We would refer you to any previous comments submitted at Regulation 14 stage, and for any further information to our detailed advice on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into your neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/>

We are pleased to note the inclusion of Section 8, and welcome the protections it includes for Thorndon's heritage under policy THN 16- Heritage Assets. We would highlight that paragraph Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 18a-040-20190723 of the Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that non-designated heritage assets, in this case known as 'buildings of local significance', can be identified as part of the neighbourhood planning process, and do not therefore need to be registered with the local planning authority again, as suggested in paragraph 8.2.

I would be grateful if you would notify me if and when the Neighbourhood Plan is made by the district council. To avoid any doubt, this letter does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed NP, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.

Please do contact me, either via email or the number above, if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely,

Edward James  
Historic Places Advisor, East of England

CC:



24 BROOKLANDS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 8BU

Telephone 01223 582749  
HistoricEngland.org.uk





Environment  
Agency

Paul Bryant  
Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Council  
Spatial Planning Policy Team  
8 Russell Road  
Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP1 2BX

**Our ref:** AE/2020/125260/01-L01  
**Your ref:** Reg 16  
**Date:** 28 July 2020

Dear Mr Bryant

**CONSULTATION UNDER REGULATION 16 OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING (GENERAL) REGULATIONS 2012 (AS AMENDED) – THORNDON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**THORNDON PARISH COUNCIL HERON CHASE HESTLEY GREEN THORNDON EYE IP23 7LR.**

Thank you for your consultation dated 19 June 2020. We have reviewed the submission draft of the Thorndon Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 16) and have the following comments to make regarding the development plan.

We are pleased to see that many of the suggestions from the regulation 14 consultation have been included in the revised draft. We are pleased to see that the river Dove is now extensively referred to within the document and reference to the 10 metre buffer beside the river has been included. We are also pleased to observe the further references to biodiversity net gain, as suggested, have been included in the plan policies within the document.

Please note that the view expressed in this letter is a response to the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan only and does not represent our final view in relation to any future planning or permit applications that may come forward. We reserve the right to change our position in relation to any such application.

I hope that this information is beneficial to you. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further queries regarding this matter.

Yours sincerely

**Mr Mark Macdonald**  
**Planning Advisor**

Direct dial 0 [REDACTED]

Direct e-mail [REDACTED]

Environment Agency  
Cobham Road, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP3 9JD.  
Customer services line: 03708 506 506  
[www.gov.uk/environment-agency](http://www.gov.uk/environment-agency)

End

## (6) ANGLIAN WATER

For Office use only:

### Section One: Respondents Details

All respondents should complete Part A. If you are an Agent please complete Part's A & B

Part A: Respondent	
Title / Name:	Mr Stewart Patience
Job Title (if applicable):	Spatial Planning Manager
Organisation / Company (if applicable):	Anglian Water Services Ltd
Address:	Thorpe Wood House, Thorpe Wood Peterborough
Postcode:	PE3 6WT
Tel No:	██████████
E-mail:	████████████████████

Part B: Agents – Please complete details of the client / company you represent	
Client / Company Name:	
Address:	
Postcode:	
Tel No:	
E-mail:	

## Section Two: Your representation(s)

To which part of the document does your representation relate? (You may wish to complete a separate form for each separate representation)

Paragraph No.		Policy No.	THN1
---------------	--	------------	------

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)

Support  Support with modifications  **Oppose**  Have Comments

**Please give details of your reasons for support / opposition, or make other comments here:**

In our previous comments we had raised concerns that Policy THN1 as drafted did not refer to water and wastewater infrastructure as being acceptable in principle in the designated countryside.

We note that in response to Anglian Water's previous comments it is stated that such works would normally fall within permitted development rights and therefore no changes to Policy THN1 are proposed.

However not all works undertaken by Anglian Water would have the benefit of permitted development rights as suggested. For example any planning applications for water supply infrastructure (both potable and raw water) above or below ground would be determined by Mid Suffolk District Council.

Further details of Anglian Water's permitted development rights for both water supply and wastewater infrastructure are outlined in the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 (Part 13 of the Order).

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2015/596/contents/made>

Policy THN1 does not allow for development which requires planning permission being brought forward by Anglian Water within the designated countryside. As such this could limit our ability to make provision for water and water recycling infrastructure to serve our customers.

In addition the policy as drafted includes a requirement for all development including that proposed by Anglian Water to demonstrate a 'local need' for any development as well as demonstrating that alternative sites have been considered as part of a site selection process.

Development proposed by Anglian Water would relate to the provision of essential water and water recycling services for our customers. Therefore it is unclear why it is necessary to demonstrate a local need for development proposals proposed by Anglian Water which are located in the designated countryside. It is also unclear on what basis Anglian Water would be required to demonstrate the consideration of alternative sites particularly as there is existing infrastructure located outside of the settlement boundary.

We therefore remain of the view that the Neighbourhood Plan should be amended to acknowledge development which requires planning permission which is proposed by Anglian Water as an infrastructure provider within the designated countryside provided for our customers.

*(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)*

## What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

It is therefore recommended that Policy THN1 is amended as follows:

'Proposals for development located outside the Settlement Boundary will only be permitted for those that are essential for the operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other exceptional uses, ~~where: i) it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that there is an identified local need for the proposal; and ii) it cannot be satisfactorily located within the Settlement Boundaries.~~'

It is also recommended that the following supporting text be added to the Neighbourhood Plan:

'For the purposes of policy THN1 the term 'exceptional uses' would include development required by a utility company to fulfil their statutory obligations to their customers.'

*(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)*

## Section Two: Your representation(s)

To which part of the document does your representation relate? (You may wish to complete a separate form for each separate representation)

Paragraph No.		Policy No.	THN18
---------------	--	------------	-------

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)

Support  Support with modifications  Oppose  Have Comments

Please give details of your reasons for support / opposition, or make other comments here:

### Policy THH18 - Design considerations

In our previous comments we had asked that Policy THN18 makes clear that the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems is the preferred method of surface water drainage.

We note that in response it is stated that this issue is addressed in Policy THN19. However Policy THN19 as drafted refers to water re-use measures but not sustainable drainage systems more generally.

It is suggested that Policy THN18 be amended to make it clear that the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems is the preferred method of surface water drainage.

*(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)*

### What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

It is therefore recommended that Policy THN18 be amended as follows:

'i. not result in water run-off that would add-to or create surface water flooding; and incorporate, wherever possible necessary, the use of above ground open Sustainable Drainage Systems;

*(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)*

## Section Two: Your representation(s)

To which part of the document does your representation relate? (You may wish to complete a separate form for each separate representation)

Paragraph No.		Policy No.	THN19
---------------	--	------------	-------

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)

Support  Support with modifications  Oppose  Have Comments

**Please give details of your reasons for support / opposition, or make other comments here:**

We note that Policy THN19 has been amended to refer to grey water recycling and storm water harvesting as previously recommended by Anglian Water.

Anglian Water fully support the requirement to include water re-use measures as outlined in Policy THN19.

*(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)*

**What improvements or modifications would you suggest?**

*Please be as brief and concise as possible ..*

*(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)*

If you are including additional pages these should be clearly labelled and referenced.

Normally the Examiner will aim to consider the responses through written representations.

Occasionally an Examiner may consider it necessary to hold a hearing to discuss particular issues. If you consider a hearing should be held please explain why this is necessary.

Please note that a decision on whether to hold a hearing is entirely at the discretion of the Examiner.

**I consider that a hearing should be held because ...**

*Please be as brief and concise as possible ..*

*(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)*

Please indicate (tick) whether you wish to be notified of:

The publication of the recommendations of the Examiner	√
The final 'making' (adoption) of the Thorndon NDP by Mid Suffolk District Council	√

**Signed: Stewart Patience**

**Dated: 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2020**

**(7) HIGHWAYS ENGLAND**

**Email from: Planning EE <PlanningEE@highwaysengland.co.uk>**

**Received: 26 June 2020**

**Subject: RE: CONSULTATION: Reg 16 Thorndon N'hood Plan (Mid Suffolk)**

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for your consultation dated 19 June 2020. The following Neighbourhood plan is remote from the strategic road network. We therefore offer no comment in this case.

Yours faithfully

Connor Adkins

**Connor Adkins**

Highways England | Woodlands | Manton Lane | Bedford | MK41 7LW

**Tel:** [REDACTED]

**Web:** <http://www.highways.co.uk>

[ Ends ]



Our Ref: MV/15B901605

T: +44 (0)191 261 2361  
F: +44 (0)191 269 0076

29 July 2020

**avisonyoung.co.uk**

Babergh Mid Suffolk Council  
[communityplanning@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:communityplanning@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)  
**Via email only**

Dear Sir / Madam

**Thorndon Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation  
June – August 2020  
Representations on behalf of National Grid**

National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to local planning authority Development Plan Document consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.

**About National Grid**

National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators, so it can reach homes and businesses.

National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.

National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States.

**Response**

We have reviewed the above document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.

**Further Advice**

National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks.

Please see attached information outlining further guidance on development close to National Grid assets.

If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us.

To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect their assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect National Grid's assets.

We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database, if they are not already included:

**Matt Verlander, Director**

[nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com](mailto:nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com)

Avison Young  
Central Square South  
Orchard Street  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
NE1 3AZ

**Spencer Jefferies, Town Planner**

[box.landandaquisitions@nationalgrid.com](mailto:box.landandaquisitions@nationalgrid.com)

National Grid  
National Grid House  
Warwick Technology Park  
Gallows Hill  
Warwick, CV34 6DA

If you require any further information in respect of this letter, then please contact us.

Yours faithfully,

**Matt Verlander MRTPI**  
**Director**  
**0191 269 0094**  
**[nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com](mailto:nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com)**  
**For and on behalf of Avison Young**

## Guidance on development near National Grid assets

National Grid is able to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks and encourages high quality and well-planned development in the vicinity of its assets.

### Electricity assets

Developers of sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain existing overhead lines in-situ, though it recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances that would justify the request where, for example, the proposal is of regional or national importance.

National Grid's '*Guidelines for Development near pylons and high voltage overhead power lines*' promote the successful development of sites crossed by existing overhead lines and the creation of well-designed places. The guidelines demonstrate that a creative design approach can minimise the impact of overhead lines whilst promoting a quality environment. The guidelines can be downloaded here: <https://www.nationalgridet.com/document/130626/download>

The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site.

National Grid's statutory safety clearances are detailed in their '*Guidelines when working near National Grid Electricity Transmission assets*', which can be downloaded here: [www.nationalgridet.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets](http://www.nationalgridet.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets)

### Gas assets

High-Pressure Gas Pipelines form an essential part of the national gas transmission system and National Grid's approach is always to seek to leave their existing transmission pipelines in situ. Contact should be made with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in respect of sites affected by High-Pressure Gas Pipelines.

National Grid have land rights for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/ temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Additionally, written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid's 12.2m building proximity distance, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement.

National Grid's '*Guidelines when working near National Grid Gas assets*' can be downloaded here: [www.nationalgridgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets](http://www.nationalgridgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets)

### How to contact National Grid

If you require any further information in relation to the above and/or if you would like to check if National Grid's transmission networks may be affected by a proposed development, please contact:

- National Grid's Plant Protection team: [plantprotection@nationalgrid.com](mailto:plantprotection@nationalgrid.com)

Cadent Plant Protection Team  
Block 1  
Brick Kiln Street  
Hinckley  
LE10 0NA  
0800 688 588

or visit the website: <https://www.beforeyoudig.cadentgas.com/login.aspx>



**Ipswich and East Suffolk  
Clinical Commissioning Group**

Endeavour House  
8 Russell Road  
Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP1 2BX

Email address: [REDACTED]  
Telephone Number – [REDACTED]

06/08/2020

Thorndon Neighborhood Development Plan  
[communityplanning@babergmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:communityplanning@babergmidsuffolk.gov.uk)

Dear Sir/Madam

**Thorndon Neighbourhood Plan**

Thank you for communicating with Ipswich & East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) regarding the Thorndon Parish Council latest stage of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The CCG is encouraged to see mention of healthy lifestyles reducing the impact on local healthcare facilities and welcomes this inclusion in the local plan. The CCG recognises that the parish of Thorndon does not have primary healthcare facilities actually inside the parish but healthcare facilities or within 3-5 miles. To maintain a primary care service for the residents of Thorndon, mitigation might be sought through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in the parish.

The Neighbourhood Plan provides for up to 100 dwellings in the parish. The number of residents proposed in the NP will result in an increase of patients of approximately 230 patients more than likely split between the Eye Health Centre patient list and Mendlesham Surgery, options are currently being looked at to mitigate against the impact of proposed development.

We would welcome the addition of a simple statement, to confirm that Thorndon Parish Council will support Ipswich & East Suffolk CCG and NHS England in ensuring suitable and sustainable provision of Primary Healthcare services for the residents of Thorndon. Ipswich & East Suffolk CCG would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the Parish Council potential solutions to ensure sustainable Primary Care services for the local community going forward.

If you have any queries or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me

Yours faithfully

**Chris Crisell**  
Estates Project Manager  
Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group