

THURSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2018 - 2036

Reg 14 Pre-Submission Draft – Residents

Colour used	Meaning
	Agree/straightforward change
	To be passed onto Stakeholders
	No further action to be taken

Page / Policy Number	Comment	Comments by NP	Action to be taken
Housing & Design	Whilst the objective to ensure Thurston retains a village feel is welcomed, this is not reflected in the scale of development approved within the village, its design and related infrastructure. I fear the village is at risk of falling between a village and a town with the benefits of neither, despite the aspirations and policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.	The situation has been overtaken by events and the state of play is that which was approved by the LPA on 1 st November 2017	
Policy 1	Unclear from reviewing the wording of Policy 1, the Policy Maps and paragraph 4.5 how the settlement boundary on the eastern side of Ixworth Road will operate.	Settlement boundary to be redrawn to take into account the planning permission granted. It is noted in the new joint Local Plan, this is the settlement boundary being recommended.	

Policy 1	The policy objectives are rather contradictory and are open to interpretation. The objectives of the proposed policy have not been followed with existing development proposals particularly with regard to soft boundary treatments as outlined in Policy 4.	With regards to the existing development proposals, both the NP and Parish Council have argued that they should take regard of the work being done by the NP but until the NP is approved there is no requirement for developers to follow it.	
Spatial Strategy	The statement of agricultural land protection is not a correct interpretation of the National Policy and therefore lacks the weight of this policy.	The NP believes that this will be addressed through amendments to the settlement boundary.	
Spatial Strategy	<p>No mention of soils use and protection which is a separate policy to that of Agricultural Land.</p> <p>The plan policies do not reflect the advice given in the detailed assessment report of Agricultural Land and Soils in and around Thurston to assist in the preparation of the Plan.</p>	<p>The NPPF states that “Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland.”</p> <p>The report does not – and cannot – justify some form of greater level of protection than that provided by the NPPF.</p> <p>The report will be listed as a supporting document and is referred to in the Environment Paper which is also a supporting</p>	

		<p>document.</p> <p>Policy 1Da will be amended to read: “They represent appropriate uses in the countryside, such as agriculture (taking account of the economic benefits of best and most versatile agricultural land), forestry...”</p>	
<p>Policy 5</p>	<p>Community Facilities – must be rigorously applied to all new developments. It should be noted that at least one of the proposed developments contributes no community facilities whatsoever. Like a number of Policies within the plan there is no defined criteria about how impacts will be assessed, should be interpreted or implemented.</p> <p>For example, Policy 5 B a, b and c raise questions such as: What constitutes significant harm? What are harmful impacts? How are surrounding residents defined?</p> <p>Recent planning proposals have dismissed residents’ views by stating residents have no right to a view therefore there can be no loss of amenity.</p>	<p>With regards to the existing development proposals, both the NP and Parish Council have argued that all new development should take regard of the work being done by the NP but until the NP is approved there is no requirement for developers to follow it.</p> <p>Term significant harm is used in the NPPF.</p> <p>Term harmful impacts is used in the NPPF</p> <p>Agree that all are subject to interpretation but are terms commonly used in National Planning Documents and by Local Planning Authorities.</p> <p>With regards to the existing development proposals, both the NP and Parish Council have</p>	

		argued that they should take regard of the work being done by the NP but until the NP is approved there is no requirement for developers to follow it.	
Road infrastructure	Current road structure is inadequate, and every effort must be made to improve the following junctions: Thedwastre Bridge, Pokeriage Corner and Fishwick Corner.	Already acknowledged within the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Community Infrastructure	Why no mention of an exercise area for dogs? Provision of a Dog Park would give benefit to the large number of residents with dogs and would reduce the opportunity for owners to exercise their animals in inappropriate places.	<p>Whilst there are no specific site allocations within the plan on reviewing the questionnaires it is agreed that a Dog Area scored highly as being important to be included in new areas coming forth for community facilities.</p> <p>Agreed that an insertion is required based on the comments received and the need as mentioned. This should be considered by the Parish Council as part of future infrastructure.</p>	To be passed to the Parish Council for consideration against CIL funding allocation
Road Infrastructure	Increase traffic in Church Road – and in particular the junction with Hollow Lane – request for better signage and mirrors and for requests to be made for residents to keep hedgerows trimmed.	CIL funding could be used to improve signage at certain points in the village.	To be passed to the Parish Council for consideration against CIL funding allocation.

			Request for hedgerow and verge maintenance to be improved to be passed to the Parish Council.
	Further development will bring further traffic and road improvements will be required in and around the village.	This has already been acknowledged within the Neighbourhood Plan.	
Community Infrastructure	Keen to see: Retention of green space Further outside resources for kids and improvements to play parks Additional cycle paths Roads made safer A fitness trail	Included within NP policies Included within NP policies & part of PC remit Included within NP policies Included within NP policies Already earmarked for New Green Area and Hopkins Homes development	
Community Infrastructure	More public car/parking areas/space – could the New Green car parks be made pay and display and open at all times?	For onward submission to PC & New Green Trustees as stakeholders	For onward submission to PC & New Green Trustees as stakeholders
Transport	Bus Service – rumours of the Genesta Drive loop being removed from current service Rumours of trains not stopping at Thurston	Commercial operation - outside or remit of NP. To be passed to PC for comment/review. Whilst NP and PC are talking to Network Rail regarding the Barrow Crossing there are no rumours to close the station at Thurston. It should be noted that the NP, PC, SCC and MSDC are actively	

		pursuing options to make the Barrow Crossing safe for all rail users.	
Roads	Current road infrastructure cannot cope – issue regarding the increased traffic from the 800+ houses and 600+ cars from the withdrawal of SCC buses to the College	The situation has been overtaken by events and the state of play is that which was approved by the LPA on 1 st November 2017 and as per the policy agreed by SCC. Both the NP and PC have made SCC aware of the issues that are likely to be created by these scenarios.	
Housing	Mix of houses, bungalows and small blocks of flats around courtyards with 2 car parking. More housing for elderly	Policies within NP reflect the mix of houses and bungalows with adequate parking. Parking requirements for new developments are those as per the Suffolk CC Parking Guidance. Policy 3 has been written to address this need	
Community Facilities	Doctors Surgery	Meetings with NHS England have stated that there is to be no provision for a new doctor in Thurston. CIL bids will be submitted to increase provision at Mount Road Surgery (Bury St Edmunds); Woolpit Surgery & Ixworth Surgery.	PC & NP exploring options with stakeholders to provide community-based facilities dependent on needs in existing premises and in the newly expanded Pharmacy within the village.
Railway Station	Can a use be found for this building? Accommodation of housing	This is in private ownership, but it has been noted by residents and	PC to be asked to explore possible

Building		the NP/PC.	community actions.
Employment	Not really needed given the business accommodation being offered at Suffolk Business Park in Bury St Edmunds.	This is noted	
JC Green Space	Omission of Green Space off School Road leading to Birch Road and St Peters Way	This has not been raised to date and has not been consulted upon. More evidence would be required prior to inclusion as to why it is demonstrably special to the community. The purpose of the policy is to protect areas that are special / important to the community.	
Allotment	Allotments on Barrells Road; could they be made Statutory Allotment Land?	Currently in private ownership.	To be passed to the PC for consideration, if applicable
Open Space	Pit by the Post Office is now being contained. How can this be made public?	PC to be asked to explore this further as it is outside of the scope of the NP.	To be passed to the PC for consideration/action.
Movement Routes Map	Amendment required to Figure 2.5 to address issues of incompleteness.	Agree - amendment to the path from beside the Parish Church up to Oak Road	
General	Missing Footpath signs Overgrown hedgerows	To be passed to the PC for consideration as it is outside of the scope of the NP.	
Vision	Vision is too long	Disagree as the whole section makes it a meaningful vision that is applicable to Thurston.	

		If just the 1 st paragraph were retained / highlighted it could apply to anywhere.	
2.54	Blackbourne U3A – not mentioned as one of the biggest users	This should be added into the Community Centre at 2.51 and not at Cavendish Hall at 2.54	
Page 63	Scots Pines – not liked.	This is a matter of opinion by the resident.	
7.22	Cycling Proposals – Moreton Hall started with a blank canvas.	Referring to Moreton Hall was demonstrating the principals from which new development would benefit	
8.14	Maltings Garth is an area and not an estate	Agree – remove all reference to the word estate	
Environment	I feel strongly that the order of the 2 objectives should be reversed. The most important objective is E2 'To protect and enhance the village character ...' and this is dealt with first in sections 8.2 to 8.5 and Policy 9. Objective E1 is dealt with subsequently in sections 8.6 to 8.16 and Policy 10.	Disagree with the premise that one objective is more important than the other but agree that the positioning should be changed to follow the sequence of the chapter.	
Environment	A further objective should be added such as ' E3. To enhance green space and wildlife provision and minimise light pollution in new development' to cover sections 8.17 to 8.29 and Policies 11 and 12.	Agree as Policy 11 and 12 covers this objective	
Movement	Prior to 7.5 insert a new heading to deal with Objective M1 such as Road and Rail Infrastructure	Disagree as this is all part of the background section	
Movement	Insert a map showing the main roads in the village and the links to the surrounding road network	Disagree – Figures 1.1 (page 5) and 7.1 (page 45) covers adequately the location of	

		Thurston with regards to surrounding road network	
Movement	The maps shown in Fig. 2.5, 7.3, 7.4, 9.1 and 9.2 give the wrong impression that all roads are equal whereas Mill Lane, Meadow Lane, Pepper Lane and Barrell's Road are single track minor roads or byways.	<p>All of the roads identified within the NP are yellow (apart from no-through roads) which is based on the OS Map designation.</p> <p>The NP agree that the following are minor roads: Mill Lane, Pepper Lane and Barrels Road as they are single track minor roads or byways.</p> <p>Agree for figures: 2.5; 7.3; 7.4 and 8.1 to remove the colour from Meadow Lane as it is a no-through road, this would be consistent with the status of Birds Road.</p>	
Movement	There is conflict with the routes shown on Fig. 9.1, 9.2 which are not shown on Fig. 7.3, 7.4. Why has Meadow Lane footpath been designated a key movement route? Why hasn't Heath Road and Stoney Lane been included.	<p>Disagree as on figures 9.1 and 9.2 they are not identified as Key Movement Routes.</p> <p>Previously the NP has made appropriate modifications to 9.1 & 9.2 to clarify all points raised other than Stoney Lane as it is not regarded as a Key Movement Route.</p>	
Movement	Fig. 9.1, 9.2 Norton Road and Beyton Road extension, Mount Road and New Road have not been included but Barton Road and Pakenham Road extensions have.	<p>Agree with this comment.</p> <p>NP to expand map with additions showing the full extent of Barton</p>	

		Road / New Road to Pokeriage Corner; Mount Road; New Road; Norton Road; Church Road; Beyton Road.	
Priority Schedule	<p>Is it possible that before development commences that a priority schedule can be agreed?</p> <p>For instance, there is a lot of detail about the existing problem of car use and existing over capacity of the two key junctions serving Bury St Edmunds at peak times. The plan has also given significant space in your policy about on street parking and congestion. This needs to be remedied before any new building starts. Can you influence this in any way?</p>	This is outside of the remit of the NP but will be passed to the PC for consideration at planning / reserve matters stage.	
Health	We would like to see some kind of Health Centre and Care Home within the development area.	There is already provision within the NP for the support of such a facility	
Cycling in General	Could the NP be more ambitious in its desire to promote cycling as the favoured mode of transport?	<p>The NP agrees that this is an ambitious statement and will pass to the PC a request that it produces an Action Strategy which identifies the best routes to cycle to access services, facilities, education and employment and takes all available measures to identify the best way to invest in the types of traffic calming measures making it easier for cyclists to move around.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there is nothing in legislation covering cycleways and their provision.</p>	To be passed to the PC for action.

1.9	Should reference be made of the need to consider The Bury St Edmunds growth strategies? Sustainable development for Thurston would in fact be better to the west of the Thurston Parish boundary.	Disagree - the Engagement process has shown a desire for the village to be kept separate from Bury St Edmunds and the Vision for Thurston 2036 reflects this.	
2.20	Could include the dualling of the A14 and the completion of National Cycle Network NCN51 both of which have added to the connectivity of the village.	Agree – insert at 2.22 “The dualling of the A14 in Suffolk in xxx and the completion of National Cycle Route 51 in xxx, both of which have added to the connectivity to the village.	
2.31	There needs to be more emphasis within future plans to favour non-motorised use and active travel. We should be aspiring to reach EofE levels for these, not favouring car investment.	<p>The NP covers the encouragement of other means of sustainable travel.</p> <p>This section reflects the use of the motor vehicle as per the 2011 census.</p>	
2.35-2.37	This shows that development to the north and east as opposed to the SW has created significant problems for the village. [comment 1.9 above refers] appreciate we are talking different planning authorities, but there does need to be pro-active communication. Mid Suffolk and St Edmundsbury should not be working in silos.	<p>Not in the hands of the NP to influence the way in which the LPAs work. The aim within the NP is to further promote walking and cycling.</p> <p>The NP understands that there is a duty to cooperate in both areas within their Local Plan and would encourage this.</p>	
2.40	Add 'and crossings' after cycleways	Agree as this section covers all types of crossings.	

2.43	There are also buses travelling between Thurston Community College and the Sixth Form in Beyton during the day	<p>Agree – as this type of movement also needs to be noted within the section.</p> <p>Add: “Mini-busses regularly travel between the Thurston and Beyton campuses of the College during the day.”</p>	
2.71.2	NCN 51 should be recognised as it provides an important off-road pedestrian and cycle access to and from Moreton Hall, new Secondary school, sport and business park facilities and Bury St Edmunds within 20 mins cycling.	<p>Agree as it provides connectivity with facilities at Bury St Edmunds via a dedicated cycle route. Add a new at Line 2.71.3 ' NCR 51 provides an important off-road pedestrian and cycle access to and from Moreton Hall, new Secondary school, sport and business park facilities and Bury St Edmunds within 20 mins cycling.</p> <p>Reference will be National Cycle Route 51 as per Sustrans website</p>	
2.73.6	Add 'and employment' This could include access into Bury by active travel. e-bikes could be a distinct possibility already.	Agree as this looks to future employment provision on a local basis	
3.2.4	Add a new para after 3.2.4 to address the need for active travel to be planned in. Words to the effect 'Need for footpaths, cycleways and crossings, of sufficient width for safety and flow, to enable sustainable active travel for pedestrians, wheelchairs, pushchairs and cyclists to the main trip generators'. You haven't addressed 2.31 in the Challenges.	<p>Noted 2.31 shows high car ownership.</p> <p>Agree to insert as a challenge to address the issues of sustainability and alternate modes of transport - add a new paragraph to 3.2.4.</p>	

<p>Policy 1 C a ii</p>	<p>Add 'and sustainable access to secondary education'. What if Thurston Community College were to close as a result of the new home to school bus rules? The village would not want more cars driving students to and from school/college in Bury St Edmunds.</p>	<p>Disagree as the NP does not believe that this is a tenable view and that the viability of the College is not in question. The NP cannot address supposition i.e. the closure of the Community College.</p> <p>Sustainable travel to all facilities is covered under Movement Section of the Plan.</p>	
<p>Policy 2 D</p>	<p>Add after sheltered housing 'and space for co-operative old age community housing'</p>	<p>Disagree – wording of Policy 3 has been rewritten to incorporate a variety of need for specialist care as recommended by SCC and MSDC</p>	
<p>5.26.11</p>	<p>Add new Para. 'Plan for filtered permeability of sufficient width, within developments and the village, to favour pedestrians, wheelchairs, pushchairs and cyclists, rather than the car. To encourage change of use to active travel.</p> <p>This paragraph should also be moved higher up as it needs more emphasis.</p>	<p>The NP has not gone into the details of filtered permeability, but this would be one of a number of possible strategies to provide a network of wide walkway and cycleways used by the Parish Council at the relevant planning stage.</p> <p>Sustainable travel to all facilities is covered under Movement Section of the Plan.</p>	<p>This will be passed to the PC for consideration in conjunction with stakeholders</p>
<p>Policy 4</p>	<p>Needs to include reference to active travel. Reference is made at 4B to parking & refuse but nothing about walking and cycling.</p>	<p>Noted - but this section is about the Character of Development coming forth and these have been encouraged in the sections on</p>	

		movement.	
6.11	Need to include reference to active travel. Could the reference to road network be left out altogether?	Agree - include the words 'active travel' before access.	
Policy 5.c	Include 'a foot and cycle path network for all' Encouraging non-motorised users to encourage a change to active travel and improved health	This section covers Community Buildings and Spaces and their use rather than travel which is dealt with under the movement section	
7.6	There are also buses travelling between Thurston Community College and the Sixth Form in Beyton during the day and reference to this fact needs to be made at this point.	Discussion at this point deals with fluctuations of traffic in particular the variation of traffic flow at peak times rather than general traffic movement	
7.7	Reference should be made to National Cycle Network NCN51 which passes through the village providing a popular and easily accessible active travel route for commuting, education and recreation.	Agree – add in as a new paragraph 7.7 after 7.6	
7.17 Cycling	Add after vehicle density ..”speed and the need for segregation from traffic”...	Agree – wording to be changed to read: “..its speed, and the lack of a comprehensive network of designated cycleways segregated from traffic through the village.”	
7.19.1	Delete walkways and replace with 'shared use paths of minimum 3m width'. Also after walking in the second from last line add 'cycling - active travel -'	In part agree to add in the word cycleways to “network of walkways/cycleways” and “cycling – active travel – “ only as this is not the place to bring in the point regarding shared use	

		<p>paths.</p> <p>The NP has made the assumption that all new footpaths/cycleways will be shared use paths of minimum 3 mtrs. width</p>	
Policy 6	<p>Add a new point D 'include reducing the speed of traffic for safety and to encourage a modal shift to non-motorised use and active travel'. Forward plans should not be about speeding traffic up but controlling vehicle speeds. Tightening radii of corners, introducing filtered permeability by reducing through routes for cars, will also help reduce speeds and encourage modal shift.</p>	<p>Traffic speeds and how they are managed is outside of the remit of the NP. However, the NP does acknowledge the encouragement of modal shift and agreed to amend Policy 6 –</p> <p>“To encourage greater levels of walking, cycling and disabled access instead of car use, it is important to ensure that residents can walk and cycle safely to the schools, railway station, shops, bus stops and other important facilities serving the community of Thurston. To achieve this objective, Key Movement Routes have been shown on the Policies Maps and are expected to address the following...”</p>	
Policy 6	<p>Add a new point C 'crossings at grade are introduced to prioritise walking, disabled and cycling access'</p>	<p>This is beyond the remit of the NP as it is a highway matter. However, the amendments made above reflect disabled access.</p>	
Movement	<p>Need to have an overall transport plan for the village which should cover all modes of transport as they impact on one another – trains, buses, vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	<p>Whilst it is recognised that there is a need for an overview of traffic in the village, which the</p>	

		<p>NP has tried to achieve, it is not within the remit of the NP to undertake a transport plan for the whole of the community.</p> <p>This may need to be carried out by LPAs as development in both MSDC and West Suffolk continues.</p>	
Movement	New para between 7.20 and 7.21 'Plan for crossings at grade, to prioritise the flows of those walking, in wheelchairs, pushchairs and cycling'	<p>This is a Highways matter and outside of the remit of the NP.</p> <p>The NP and PC support the provision of crossing points in the village but do not agree with uncontrolled crossings such as that on Sandpit Lane as it causes confusion to pedestrians, cyclists and vehicle users alike.</p> <p>This will be passed to the PC for consideration within their Action Strategy which should identify the best routes to cycle and to access services, facilities, education and employment and takes all available measures to identify the best way to invest in the types of crossings that will making it easier for all users to move around.</p>	This will be passed to the PC for consideration in conjunction with stakeholders
Policy 7	<p>Should this also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the staggered crossroads outside the Library - T-junction at Barton Rd and Norton Rd 	<p>Advice has been sought from SCC on those areas that are of particular concern from their</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - T-junction at Norton Rd and Sandpit Lane - one-way direction for traffic at Thedwastre Rd railway bridge 	<p>traffic assessments and these have been included under Policy 7.</p> <p>It has been recognised within the NP that these areas are of concern and, where appropriate, traffic assessments will be carried out for future development coming forth.</p>	
Policy 7	<p>Within Policy 7 should it be the Highway Authority 'and the Parish Council'. It would be useful to have the Highway Authority working in collaboration with the Parish Council.</p>	<p>The wording has previously been changed on the advice of SCC however it should be noted that the PC is not a statutory body when it comes to Highway Matters.</p> <p>There is an expectation, as in previous cases, that the Highways Authority will seek to work with the Parish Council.</p>	
Roads	<p>The roads surrounding this area are narrow, twisty, poorly surfaced, riddled with pot-holes, already dangerous for traffic passing in opposite directions even with the existing traffic levels so are only going to be even more dangerous with the increase in traffic movements that will inevitably come with an almost doubling in the population of the village. The Barton Road and Thedwastre Road railway bridges create pinch-points for smooth and safe traffic flow, and the Pokeriage and Fishwick corner junctions are already well known and regular accident sites. What this all highlights is that major improvements, not just 'tinkering' changes, in all these areas are absolutely needed immediately and before the additional heavy traffic arrives that will be a feature of our roads during</p>	<p>Would agree with the general observations made but these have been taken up by the Parish Council. The developments are scheduled to start most likely ahead of the adoption of the NP.</p>	

	the building of the new developments.		
Traffic Calming	Support modifications and extensions to the speed limits as and where necessary but would be strongly against any use of road narrowing schemes or speed bumps as both create new hazards of their own. They increase pollution due to the constant breaking and accelerating that negotiating them dictates, and, in the case of speed bumps cause at the very least additional wear and tear and potentially severe damage to the wheels and suspension of vehicles with the associated carbon footprint that any resultant maintenance or repairs require. Also, surely the emergency services must hate them. Who would want to be a patient in an ambulance having to travel at speed over a series of speed bumps, and what about the delay caused to a fire engine trying to get to an emergency as quickly as possible where seconds can count.	No specific traffic calming measures have been cited in the NP.	The PC will continue to liaise with SCC over the issue of speeding and appropriate traffic calming measures
Parking	Increased provision for parking at critical points in the village will be necessary to meet the demands of increased traffic movements, the new school and any other new facilities built, and in order that increased use of the rail link can be encouraged, and appeal to villagers wishing to commute to places of work outside Thurston.	These issues have been taken up in Policy 8.	
Community Facilities	Proper consideration should be given to the provision of new facilities and services to meet the requirements of the increased population with healthcare and meeting spaces being considered as priorities in order to foster a wider sense of community amongst the enlarged population.	Community Hub The NP recognises the need for care facilities; health facilities and further recreational facilities to meet the increase in population over the life-time of the NP.	
Environment	Particular concern for the wildlife present in the Sandpit Lane/Cloverfields/Development Site C area. At present this area is alive with a variety of species that we constantly hear are widely seen in greatly reduced numbers or even considered threatened species. These include sparrows, starlings, thrushes, various tits and finches, swifts, swallows, house martins and	Would agree with these observations – Policy 11 and 12 should provide cover for this need.	

	<p>hedgehogs, field mice and voles. The hedgerows and fields in this area provide the safe spaces that these creatures need in order to flourish and their removal will inevitably reduce the range of suitable habitats. Hedgehogs have been regular visitors to my garden since moving to Cloverfields in 2009.</p>		
Policy 1 – Point C/a/i	<p>Ensure development addresses evidence-based needs. The point would be that any new developments proposed for the longer term should be made on the basis that evidence shows that it is the needs of Thurston that determine whether or not further expansion should happen and not the imposed needs of nearby centres such as Bury, Cambridge, Stowmarket or Ipswich.</p>	<p>The PC will continue to diligently pursue all planning applications from the single dwelling to larger developments in line with this Policy of the NP.</p>	
Movement	<p>Desire expressed to see measures to help encourage more people to cycle.</p>	<p>As stated elsewhere, this will be passed to the PC for consideration within their Action Strategy which should identify the best routes to cycle and to access services, facilities, education and employment and takes all available measures to identify the best way to invest in the types of crossings that will making it easier for all users to move around.</p>	
Parking	<p>Can something be done regarding the parking problems that are currently experienced around the village and which will only increase given the future development of the village?</p>	<p>Parking issues are covered in the NP and this point and others will be pursued by the PC</p>	
Social Media	<p>Use of social media</p>	<p>Nextdoor is a very limited platform within Thurston and appears to cater for the older age group.</p> <p>The PC currently has a Twitter account. There are no plans to</p>	

		<p>activate further social media presence.</p> <p>The website is regularly updated and has carried links to all the discussions and documentation.</p>	
Spatial Organisation	<p>Straight street layouts – acceptable if well designed with wider plots. The curved streets design as shown from the Suffolk Design Guide on page 35 not practical. Surely a straight road provides easier access for all services.</p>	<p>The Suffolk Design Guide does not preclude easy access for tradesman, emergency services and visitors.</p> <p>The NP feels that the design on Page 35 is preferable where possible/appropriate.</p>	
Pavement / Roads	<p>Impact of a lack of pavement as shown on Page 35 – the Suffolk Design Guide</p>	<p>NP agrees that whilst it may be appropriate to have shared surfaces in cul-de-sacs, on more major roads, footpaths should be in evidence. The diagram from the Suffolk Design Guides is a guide – the NP makes reference to ‘site layouts that provide short, winding streets and roads that promote an intimacy to development (5.26.4)</p> <p>This will be passed to the PC to cover within the Planning framework.</p>	
Education – Page 16	<p>Could we now state where the new school will be?</p>	<p>As of reviewing the NP – no definitive decision has been taken on the new Primary School Site.</p>	

		<p>The option to progress the determination of the site coming forward is anticipated as being triggered once planning permission has been granted.</p> <p>This will be amended at the next review of the NP once achieved.</p>	
Barrow Foot Crossing	<p>Concern over the lack of a ready or acceptable solution to safety issues posed by the Barrow Foot crossing at the train station. Why not install gates, like the ones at much busier level crossings where pedestrians and/or traffic have to cross the track?</p>	<p>The NP and PC are actively engaging with SCC, MSDC and Network Rail on possible solutions to this issue.</p>	
Environment	<p>Mitigating against climate change – no mention as to how to mitigate against the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Planning permission for housing units intended for older people should not be granted unless the buildings have been designed to be cool and comfortable during hot weather.</p> <p>All new buildings should be constructed with climate change in mind</p>	<p>The Environment Agency, English Heritage, Forestry Commission and Natural England are the statutory environmental bodies that deliver the Government’s work to protect and improve the natural, built and historic environment.</p> <p>The NP and PC will use all opportunities to enhance the natural environment through the planning process and will aim to reduce the risk of surface water flooding; improve water quality in the local area; increase the energy efficiency of new buildings and to ensure the opinions of the statutory bodies are reflected in the design of new homes and areas coming forth.</p>	<p>The PC be encouraged to work with stakeholders to ensure that the community is more resilient to climate change and where appropriate use income from community-led renewable energy to invest in local assets and services.</p>

Electric Vehicle Charging Points	Electric vehicles are a cleaner, greener alternative to diesel and petrol. However, lack of infrastructure is an issue. The Parish Council could help facilitate the process by installing electric vehicle points at key places in the village, for example in the carpark on New Green.	Beyond the remit of the NP but to be passed to the PC for future discussions with stakeholders	
Trees and Hedgerows	The importance of trees, hedgerows and green spaces is stressed at various points throughout the Draft Neighbourhood Plan – could it be that planning permission for future developments should only be granted if the provision of greenery is incorporated into developers’ plans.	<p>The NP covers the environment within its objectives and policies and supports the objective improve the local environment, including protecting and enhancing existing assets, such as local environment, green and open spaces.</p> <p>There are current regulations within the Mid Suffolk Local Plan protecting trees and hedgerows and the NP does not seek to undermine these.</p>	
Trees and Hedgerows	More shade needs to be provided in New Green so that people can enjoy the space during hot weather.	Beyond the remit of the NP but to be passed to the New Green Trust for consideration.	
Trees and Hedgerows	Could there be a memorial woodland created on the northern edge of the New Green	Beyond the remit of the NP but to be passed to the New Green Trust for consideration.	
Pavements	Issue over the camber of existing pavements and sufficient dropped curbs to make it easier for wheelchair users, carers pushing a wheelchair, and parents and carers of young children in buggies.	Beyond the remit of the NP but to be passed to the PC for action with relevant stakeholders	
Recycling	2.73.9 makes reference to a recycling centre in the village. Could there be provision for villagers to recycle as many	Recycling is covered within the	

	<p>different items as possible: glass, clothing and shoes, batteries, small electricals, inkjet cartridges etc. Could there also be recycling bins provided around the village, alongside existing litter bins, so that people can ‘recycle on the go.</p>	<p>NP.</p> <p>The provision of recycling facilities should be passed to the PC for consideration and implementation.</p>	
<p>8.1</p>	<p>Existing Recreational areas, Open Spaces and the proposal to designate those listed in table 8.1 as “Local Green Spaces” - concerns stems from the significant lack of play facilities for young people in the Village and the limited space available for the provision of additional play facilities. By designating these areas as “Local Green Spaces” the Plan may preclude the installation of recreational play equipment or facilities. As recreational space in the Village is limited, is it appropriate to redefine these areas as “Local Green Spaces” and should it be sufficient and preferable to retain the definition of “Open Space” or “Recreational Area”.</p>	<p>The NPPF says that policies for management of development within Local Green Spaces must be consistent with those for Green Belts. NPPF green belt policy says that construction of new buildings in the green belt is generally inappropriate, with several exceptions. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; and - the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; and - the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and 	

		<p>not materially larger than the one it replaces.”</p> <p>The NP feels that this allows the re-provision of play equipment and some expansion of play areas.</p> <p>Furthermore, the NP feels that, through the consultation process, those who responded wished to ensure that LGS areas were not expected to be locations where new play provision would be made?</p>	
Policy 10	<p>Regarding the New Green Centre. Specific comment is made in the Plan about the need for a Larger Community Hall. Subject to various approvals and permissions including the Landlords it may be desirable at a future date to extend the existing Community Centre. Designation of the area near the Centre, particularly to the South as “Local Green Space” would prevent this and needs careful consideration.</p>	<p>The NP understands that for something like the community hall, re-provision with a slightly larger facility may be permissible but could not be significantly larger.</p> <p>However the Open Green Space is only drawn around the green area and excludes the community hall and the car park area.</p>	
Green Open Spaces	<p>“Green Open Spaces” – it is noted that landowners should be consulted. There is no reference to consultation in the Plan.</p>	<p>A number of Local Green Open Spaces are those as designated by the LPA.</p> <p>Both the New Green Centre and the Recreation Ground are held in trust by the Parish Council on</p>	

		<p>behalf of the community.</p> <p>In the cases of all of these Local (Open) Green Spaces there is no direct ownership / landowners to be consulted and no new land is being proposed.</p> <p>The Pre-submission Consultation was widely advertised and open to all to respond.</p>	
--	--	---	--