

SUTTON

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

2017-2036



CONSULTATION STATEMENT

NOVEMBER 2018

Contents


1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	BACKGROUND TO PREPARATION OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN.....	3
3	REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION.....	13
4	PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION RESPONSES	16
	Responses received to Pre-Submission Consultation and Responses to Comments.....	16

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan (SNP).
- 1.2 The legal basis of this Consultation Statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:
- contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - explain how they were consulted;
 - summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - describe how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
- 1.3 The policies contained in the SNP are as a result of extensive engagement and consultation with residents of Sutton as well as other statutory bodies. Work has involved a household surveys, public meetings and consultation events at appropriate stages during the preparation of the Plan.

2 BACKGROUND TO PREPARATION OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 2.1 In 2014 with the Parish Plan 2008-2012 out of date the Parish Council decided to investigate the process for creating a Neighbourhood Plan due to the benefits offered.
- 2.2 Various preparatory steps were then taken. A meeting was held with a representative from a local Parish Council who had already made considerable progress in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. Contact was also made with East Cambridgeshire District Council to make them aware of our plans and to discuss how best to work with them.
- 2.3 A working party was given the remit to undertake the working process of producing Neighbourhood Plan. The working party included members of the parish council, county and district councillors, village residents and the parish clerk.
- 2.4 The next stage was to designate the boundaries for the Neighbourhood Plan. After some consideration the decision was made to use the Parish Council boundaries as the issues facing the neighbouring villages and their requirements for the future were different to ours. A six week Consultation ran from 19 November until 31 December 2014. The District Council approved the Sutton Parish Council's application to designate a Neighbourhood Area at their meeting on 8 January 2015.



2.5 With the establishment of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party, the Plan's preparation proceeded through a number of key stages up to the point at which it has been submitted to East Cambridgeshire District Council. These can be summarised as follows:

- **Household Survey**

- A survey was distributed to all houses in the village in January 2015. This provided residents with their first real opportunity to contribute to the Neighbourhood Plan.



Planning the future of our village - Have your say

The Sutton Neighbourhood Plan is your opportunity to have a real say in how our community develops. For example, do we need more housing, retail and employment? If so what type and where? more or better community facilities? If so what type? what are the key transport issues for the village?

We would value your opinion, so please complete and return this questionnaire to the School, the Doctor's Surgery, the Glebe or for those living in the Gault - 'The Lillies', The Gault by 7th February 2015. Additional copies of the questionnaire can be obtained from the Parish Council Office. Alternatively you can complete this questionnaire online at: <http://spsu.spsu454>

Open Forum: Following the questionnaire we will be holding an Open Forum for all residents at The Glebe in Sutton on 19th February 2015, doors open at 7pm for a 7.30pm start to talk further about our Neighbourhood Plan and to discuss the requirements for the village.

Q1. What type of housing do you consider is needed in the Parish?

Starter homes	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Retirement homes	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Family	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Rental	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Other, please specify		

Q2. If housing is needed where would you like to see these new homes built?

Within existing village boundaries	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Land at the end of Megal Road	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Land at the top of Fieldgate	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Land east of Lawn Lane	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Other, please specify		

Q3. Do you consider that the local area needs more employment?

If so, what kind? Yes ☐ No ☐

Q4. What do you consider are the main transport issues within the local area?

HCVs (lorries)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Provision of safe cycle routes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Speeding traffic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Parking	<input type="checkbox"/>
Frequency of local bus service	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Q5. Which community facilities do you use within the Parish and how often?

Facility	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Occasionally	Never
Bus service					
Dial a Ride					
Shop / Post Office					
Chemist					
Delicatessen					
Hairdressers/Barbers					
Restaurants/takeaways					
Pub(s)					
Other licensed venues					
Church					
Doctor's surgery					
School					
Nurseries/Child Care					
Allotments					
Facilities for teenagers					
Rooms for hire					
Playgrounds					
Playing fields & rec.					
Local footpaths					
Cycle routes					
Other, please specify					

Q6. What additional or improved community facilities would you like to see in the Parish?

Q7. Which three community facilities or services do you think need most improvement or are most urgently required and why?


Q8. Do you have any other comments?

Optional: Name Address
Thank you for your input. If you have any questions please contact the Parish Office at The Glebe.

Printed and published by Sutton Parish Council, The Glebe, 4 High Street, Sutton - CB6 2RB

- **Open Forum - 19 February 2015**

- Residents had the opportunity to hear about the results of the survey and to learn more about Neighbourhood Plans in general.



OPEN FORUM
THURSDAY 19th FEBRUARY 2015
7PM REFRESHMENTS
7.30PM MEETING.
The Glebe Hall, High Street, Sutton. CB6 2RB

AGENDA

- Welcome**
Chairman – Sutton Parish Council
- Presentations from**
Mr Ian Dewar – Cambs and Peterborough Association of Parish Councils. Introduction to Neighbourhood Plan.

Cllr Richard Wisdom – Sutton Parish Council.
The Sutton Neighbourhood Plan.

Mr Stuart Morris – Cambridgeshire County Council
How well do you know your village?
- Question time**
9pm – Close of meeting.

Refreshments provided by Team Jacum

- **Open Day at the Glebe - Saturday 3 October 2015**
- Aimed at gathering information from residents for the purpose of formulating the Vision, Aims and Objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan.



Neighbourhood Plan – Your village, Your Vision.

A Fun, informative and thought provoking afternoon.

Saturday 3rd October 2015, 2pm to 5pm, The Glebe, Sutton.

Open to all Sutton residents to have a say and give ideas as to how the village should be developed for the future.

Five topics will be discussed on the day:

- Biodiversity
- Built Environment
- Sport
- Recreation and Leisure
- Traffic and Transport

BOUNCE CASTLE **Refreshments** **HOG ROAST**

- **Second Residents Survey January 2016** - The purpose of this was to provide residents with the opportunity of commenting on the proposed objectives that came out of the Open Day.



Consultation No 2 Development of Sutton Neighbourhood plan January 2016

The Parish Council Neighbourhood plan working party would like to hear back from residents on the next stage of planning.

If you have comments to make please respond by completing the form and sending it back to Rosie Hughes , Parish Clerk, The Glebe ,4 High St Sutton or by emailing it to mail@suttonpc.org.uk . We will then take account of all responses received and this will help us to go on to formulate policies that address your needs and issues.

This short Questionnaire is in three sections:

- Section A Deals with the Vision for your plan and its principal guiding objectives
- Section B Deals with the 6 Topic Areas over which we consulted in October and from which we have listed the issues raised
- Section C Gives you the opportunity to comment on any aspect of the plan that you would like to make

Please go to Parish Council's website www.sutton-pc.co.uk to see a copy on the recent report. Alternatively the Parish Council Office has paper copies. Thank you for your support and we would be grateful for your responses by Monday 29th February 2016.

Section A The draft report has identified for us a Vision and seven objectives for producing a Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish. So our question is : do you have any comments on this part of the report?		
	The Draft report says.....	What are your comments e.g. agree/disagree/seek changes ?
Vision	Sutton should be a Parish where its unique character is appreciated and cherished, the quality of the environment is maintained and continues to improve, the opportunities presented to all, young and old, to live and prosper continue to be enhanced and the life lead by its residents remains a healthy and happy one.	
New Development	Objective 1: All new development should be focussed on the way it can best meet the needs of the residents of the Parish, young and old;	
New Housing and character of village	Objective 2: New housing should be delivered in a way that ensures it is supported by essential community infrastructure and that ensures the character of the village, in particular the central core and conservation area, is retained and, wherever possible, enhanced;	
Shops and services	Objective 3: Existing shops, services and community infrastructure should be protected and supported by the policies of the Plan to ensure that Sutton remains a thriving and fully inclusive rural community;	

Section A (continued)	The Draft report says.....	What are your comments e.g. agree/disagree/seek changes?
Sport, open space and leisure	Objective 4: The retention, provision and productive use of open space and leisure facilities in and around the village should be secured and enhanced wherever reasonably possible;	
Biodiversity and Wildlife	Objective 5: The important habitats and natural assets of the Parish should be protected and strengthened and, where appropriate, opportunities for their enjoyment by residents should be enhanced;	
Businesses in village	Objective 6: Small businesses and the opportunities provided to the local workforce should be supported and strengthened through a positive approach to rural diversification and enterprise;	
Transport and traffic	Objective 7: All new development to be delivered in a way which facilitates improvements for pedestrians and cyclists alongside adequate vehicular access and where possible promotes public transport links.	

Section B The report identifies 6 topic areas against which residents have raised issues in the first consultation. Some of these can be dealt with in the Neighbourhood planning process, others will be passed on to the Parish Council for their consideration. We would welcome your thoughts, particularly if you think we have left anything of importance out?		
Topic	Do you have any comments or feel anything is missing from the issues raised for consideration on this topic in formulating the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan?	<i>Do you have any comments or feel anything is missing from the issues raised for consideration by Sutton Parish Council? (NB these issues are in italics in the report)</i>
Biodiversity and Natural Environment		
Housing and Built Environment		
Local Services and Amenities		

Section B (continued) The report identifies 6 Topic areas against which residents have raised issues in the first consultation. Some of these can be dealt with in the Neighbourhood planning process, others will be passed on to the Parish Council for their consideration. We would welcome your thoughts particularly if you think we have left anything of importance out?		
	Do you have any comments or feel anything is missing from the issues raised for consideration on this topic in formulating the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan?	<i>Do you have any comments or feel anything is missing from the issues raised for consideration by Sutton Parish Council? (NB these issues are in italics in the report)</i>
Business Retail and Employment		
Sport, Recreation and Leisure		
Traffic and Transport		

Section C Have you any other comments to make?

	<p>If you would like to add your name and contact details this would help us keep in touch as the plan progresses:</p> <p>Name</p> <p>Address</p> <p>Email</p> <p>Telephone</p>
<p>Thank you for answering these questions. It will help us to produce a better plan that reflects the needs of residents in our community</p>	<p>Please send your response to Rosie Hughes Parish Clerk The Glebe 4 High St Sutton CB6 2RB or email mail@sutton-pc.org.uk</p>



- **Business Forum**
- Held at the Elean Business Park on 19 May 2016 to gain the views of local businesses on what we require for the future.



Do you work in Sutton?

Come and discuss your key issues.

Would you like easier access to work?

Do you need larger premises?

Lunch provided.

19TH MAY 2016

BUSINESS LUNCH FORUM

Sutton Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan working party invite you to our Business Lunch Forum.

12 noon to 2pm

at Cheffins Machinery Auction Room

SUTTON PARISH COUNCIL
 The Glebe
 4 High Street
 Sutton
 Cambs

www.sutton-pc.co.uk
 Email:
 mail@suttonpc.org.uk

- **July 2016 – A set up draft policies were developed and published in July 2016** in the Parish Council Summer Newsletter and on the Neighbourhood Plan website with an online survey used to collect feedback.

Sutton's Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Plan for Sutton is our chance as residents to influence development in the village.

The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group has been looking at what matters to the Sutton community. It has held a number of consultations over the last twelve months, including a well-attended event at The Glebe last October.

The Group has listed the issues that matter, within six different topic areas:

- Housing
- Biodiversity
- Traffic and transport
- Local services
- Business
- Sport and recreation.

The next major task is to agree some draft policies that we can use in the plan. These will guide development in line with the new local plan produced by the District Council. At the same time they will reflect what matters to Sutton residents.

The first draft of these policies has also been produced. You can read these on the inserted survey. Please tick the boxes to let us know whether you support or do not support each policy. Please also add any comments at the end to help guide the working group. Thank you.



Find out more online at sutton-in-the-isle.org.uk

Who is on the Plan working group?

The members of Sutton's local plan working group are as follows:

- Richard Wisdom, chair of the working group
- Rosie Hughes, clerk to Sutton Parish Council
- Mark Inskip, chair of Sutton Parish Council
- Lorna Dupré, district and county councillor
- Jon Megginson
- Kim Osborne
- Shalagh Partridge, parish councillor
- Stan Smith, parish councillor
- Lisa Stubbs, district councillor

Land North of The Brook

A couple of months ago, Linden Homes presented to the Parish Council their masterplan for the 46 acres of land stretching from behind St Andrew's Close, The Orchards and Tower Road to the top of Mepal Road. This proposal is a test for our draft policies, and an opportunity to gain benefits for Sutton if it goes ahead.

Challenges

All development has challenges. Will there be traffic disruption while major construction is under way? Will the utilities cope with the increased pressure? Will local services be funded to expand for the increase in numbers?

Opportunities

However, such a large development can also provide opportunities to improve facilities. Based on feedback from local residents, Sutton Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

have suggested several issues that we feel Linden Homes should address, and several community benefits that should be included in the next draft of their Masterplan.

Money for local projects
 Sutton will also receive a proportion of the 'Community Infrastructure Levy' that developers pay for each house built.


If a Neighbourhood Plan is in place before the final planning permission is given, Sutton's share increases from 15% of the total levy payable, to 25%.

Getting the balance right

If this large development is to take place, we would want to balance the disruption to our environment and community against the benefits it could bring, together with the legacy of a significant sum of money for the village through the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Let us have your views

We would welcome any comments you would like to make on this. Please use the Comments section of the inserted survey - thank you.



Initial ideas for the Linden Homes masterplan for land north of The Brook, as presented to Sutton Parish Council.

So what could Sutton gain from the Linden Homes proposal?

Opportunities identified for the village include:

Biodiversity

1. Provision of extensive landscaping to the north of the site.
2. Safeguarding the existing biodiversity of trees and hedges, linking (1) to form wildlife corridors within the development.
3. Provision of new green space and new play areas for toddlers, juniors and youths.
4. Use of best practice green building techniques.
5. Linking to the footpath and cycleway network.
6. Provision of land for new burial ground (perhaps not on this immediate site).
7. Provision of land for allotment.

Built environment and housing

8. The site should be broken down with different styles and ranges of accommodation to meet housing needs, and should include for at least 30 per cent affordable housing and detailed mechanism for its delivery
9. There is scope to build on the existing community facilities to create a village green resource focused on new playing fields, the school and the Brooklands Centre.
10. Ensure stepped development of local services, and safe transport and traffic links.

Business

11. Ensure the provision of highest speed broadband to all
12. Safe links by foot and cycle to all local businesses.

13. Consider the provision of small starter business units on site
14. Expansion of larger B2/B8 businesses off the immediate site.

Local services

15. Extension of health facilities, capacity in the local school, and provision of permanent library services will be encouraged in order to keep pace with the needs of an expanding local population.
16. Retention of existing shops, services and facilities will be supported, and additional retail and community facilities encouraged to broaden the village's offer.

Sport and recreation

17. Provision of two additional adults' football pitches and a new pavilion.
18. Provision of an all-weather sports pitch facility.
19. Provision of a skate park facility.
20. Providing linking access to existing footpaths and bridleways.

Traffic and transport

21. Undertake a study of the traffic generation aspects of any new development, and pressure on the A142 roundabout and Mepal Road roundabout at peak travel times.
22. Promote links to the guided bus route at Longstanton.
23. Ensure safe traffic flows through development and encourage pedestrian and cycle links to the school and retail facilities in the village.



- **Draft Neighbourhood Plan launch 24 March 2018**
- Held at the Glebe in Sutton. A series of displays expected the process, history and Neighbourhood Plan proposals.
- The display material can be viewed on the following pages



SATURDAY 24TH MARCH 2018

11AM – 3PM AT THE GLEBE.

LAUNCH OF THE DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Drop into The Glebe to see elements of the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan on display.

Free burger, drink and cake.

www.sutton-in-the-isle.org.uk For more details on Sutton Neighbourhood Plan.




Thank you to Nellies Cafe and 1st Sutton Scouts for the refreshments.

SUTTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

CONSULTATION DROP-IN EVENT

BURGERS
CAKE
DRINKS

SUTTON PARISH COUNCIL
The Glebe
4 High Street
Sutton
Ely
CB6 2RB
01353 777189
www.sutton-pc.co.uk

Proposals

Garden Close

The new local plan allocates this site for 25 homes. However, a planning application for up to 53 homes on a larger site (illustrated by the red dashed line below) was recently refused by East Cambridgeshire District Council and the applicants have submitted an appeal to the government.

Lots of residents and the Parish Council objected to the application and it is proposed that the Neighbourhood Plan will support the smaller site for up to 25 new single storey homes. It is important that the development retains the many mature trees and hedgerows as well as the important views in and around the site.



Proposed Policy GCA

Land east of Garden Close is allocated for up to 25 dwellings that:

- i) are predominantly low-density single-storey dwellings;
- ii) retain existing mature trees and hedgerows;
- iii) preserves and enhances views from the south towards the Church, from Lion Lane eastwards and Station Road westwards across the cricket fields and open spaces.

A site specific flood risk assessment of the site will be required to be submitted as part of a planning application for the development. Development of the site should provide betterment, mitigation and management of flood risk, particularly in relation to surface and/or groundwater matters.



Other Proposals

Community Actions

As well as including planning proposals, we feel it's important that the Neighbourhood Plan addresses concerns that have been raised during early rounds of consultation. These will be known as "Community Actions"

- Recommend that the Parish Council's Traffic Management and Environmental Enhancement Working Party:
1. Encourage the development of a comprehensive approach to traffic management across the village
 2. Consider provision of additional traffic management measures, along with improved pedestrian, cycling and disabled access provision elsewhere in the village to address and mitigate increased traffic volumes from new developments.



Recreation and open space



- Recommend the Parish Council:
1. Undertake a survey to identify street furniture improvements;
 2. Undertake a survey to identify signage clutter in the village
 3. Work with the County Council's Rights of Way Officer to explore ideas for ways to promote walking and new pedestrian access to provide several circular routes for walkers out into the surrounding countryside from the village



What next?

Have your say

We welcome your feedback on what you see today. It will help us to finalise the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and make sure we're on the right lines.

Please complete a comments form and leave it on the box provided

Full consultation

Once we've finalised the Draft Neighbourhood Plan we have to consult residents and businesses in the village. This will last for six weeks and you'll have an opportunity to formally submit comments.

We'll record all the comments that we receive during the six weeks period and make any necessary amendments before submitting the Plan and supporting documents to East Cambridgeshire District Council.

We hope that the Plan will be subject to a village referendum by the end of the year. The referendum will ask:

Do you want East Cambridgeshire District Council to use the neighbourhood plan for Sutton in the Isle to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?



16th July 2018 – 10th September 2018 - Pre-submission consultation stage of the Neighbourhood Plan. Details of this consultation are set out in Section 3, below.

Stakeholder consultation

- 2.6 Throughout the process, the SNP Working Group worked closely with East Cambridgeshire District Council. In particular, the initial draft of the Neighbourhood Plan was provided to planning officers for their informal views prior to the formal Pre-Submission consultation commencing. The Working Group were keen to ensure that the Plan would not draw significant objections from the District Council during the formal consultation.

3 REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

- 3.1 The Pre-Submission Consultation commenced on 10th July 2018. The Parish Council notified all residents by way of a Summer Newsletter, which was hand delivered to all residents in Sutton. Posters were put up in the village, and posted on the village Facebook pages, which has over 3000 members). The Newsletter and poster gave details of how to respond to the survey, which was made available both online and by hard copy delivered to the parish council office.
- 3.3 In accordance with requirements of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, the Parish Council notified statutory consultees based on a list provided by the Borough Council.

Email notification sent to all statutory consultees at Pre-Submission Consultation Stage

Dear «Greeting»

**SUTTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION
(REGULATION 14)**

As part of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2015 (as amended), Sutton Parish Council is undertaking Pre-Submission Consultation on the Sutton Draft Neighbourhood Plan. As a body, we are required to consult, we are hereby seeking your views on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

The full plan and supporting documents can be viewed here together with information on how to send us your comments.

This Pre-Submission Consultation runs for a period of 6 weeks ending on **10th September 2018**

We look forward to receiving your comments

**Neighbourhood Plan Working Group
Sutton Parish Council**

Statutory Consultees Consulted at Pre-Submission Consultation Stage

Contact	Company / Organisation
Mr Richard Kay	East Cambridgeshire District Council
	Huntingdonshire District Council
	Fenland District Council
Mrs Caroline Hunt	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Mr Colum Fitzsimons	Cambridgeshire County Council
	Colne Parish Council
	Chatteris Parish Council
	Earith Parish Council
	Haddenham Parish Council
	Manea Parish Council
	Mepal Parish Council
	Wentworth Parish Council
	Witcham Parish Council
	Coal Authority
	Homes & Communities Agency
	Natural England
	Environment Agency
	Historic England
	Network Rail
	Highways Agency
	Marine Management Organisation
	UK Mobile Operators Association
Mr Iain Green	Cambridgeshire PCT
Mr Stewart Patience	Anglian Water
	National Grid
Mr Jim Whiteley	UK Power Networks
Mr Mike Jones	RSPB - Eastern England
Mr Philip Raiswell	Sport England (East)

3.4 Posters were also displayed around the village on notice boards. A copy of the poster is below

- 3.5 A copy of the Neighbourhood Plan was placed on "deposit" in publicly accessible places in the village, including the Doctors' surgery, pubs, café, hairdressers, community centres and sports and social clubs.
- 3.6 The Pre-Submission consultation period was planned to run for the statutory six weeks period. It was agreed by the parish council that this would be extended to an 8 week consultation from 16 July 2018 to the 10 September 2018, to allow more time during the summer holiday period.



**SUTTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN –
PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION**
(REGULATION 14)

As part of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2015 (as amended), Sutton Parish Council is undertaking Pre-Submission Consultation on the Sutton Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

The full plan and supporting documents can be viewed on our dedicated website www.sutton-in-the-isle.org.uk or a hard copy is available at the parish council office.

This Pre-Submission Consultation period is from 16th July 2018 to 10th September 2018



Sutton Residents

Your views are important to us – please complete the survey before the 10th September 2018

Via the website – or a paper copy.



SUTTON PARISH COUNCIL
The Glebe
4 High Street
Sutton
Ely
CB6 2RB

01353 777189
www.sutton-pc.co.uk

4 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 4.1 In total 54 people or organisations responded to the Pre-Submission Consultation. The schedule of comments and the responses of the Working Group are set out in the Appendix of this Statement. As a result, the Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan has been appropriately amended as identified in the Response column.

Responses received to Pre-Submission Consultation and Responses to Comments

The tables in this appendix set out the comments that were received during the Pre-Submission Consultation Stage and the responses and change made to the Plan as a result of the comments. The table is laid out in Plan order with the general comments following the comments on the policies. Comments received on the Community Actions are set out at the end of the table.

PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 4.1 In total 54 people or organisations responded to the Pre-Submission Consultation. The schedule of comments and the responses of the Working Group are set out in Appendix E of this Statement. As a result, the Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan (ADD DATE) has been appropriately amended as identified in the Response column.

Responses received to Pre-Submission Consultation and Responses to Comments

The tables in this appendix set out the comments that were received during the Pre-Submission Consultation Stage, Steering Group responses and changes made to the Plan as a result of the comments. The table is laid out in Plan order with the general comments following the comments on the policies. Comments received on the Community Actions are set out at the end of the table.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
General Comments					
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd	N	I would welcome the opportunity to discuss the Parishes intentions towards the business park and to review the wording of proposed policies in your plan.	Noted. The consultation provided an opportunity to identify what changes would have been sought to make the Neighbourhood Plan acceptable.
10	Steven Kosky, Turley	Endurance Estates		Endurance is the Applicant of an outline planning application, with all matters reserved except for access, which was submitted to East Cambridgeshire District Council (ECDC) in July 2018 for the erection of up to 53 dwellings on land to the east of Sutton (ECDC Reference: 18/01053/OUM). The site is currently proposed for allocation in both the emerging Local Plan Policy SUT.H2 and the Draft Sutton Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP5 for 25 new 'low density' homes.	Noted
10	Steven Kosky, Turley	Endurance Estates		The current application follows a previous application Ref. 17/01445/OUM submitted on the same site. That application was refused by Planning Committee on 5th January 2018 for one single reason: "The site is currently located outside the established development framework for Sutton. Part of the site is allocated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan for the development of 25 dwellings. The development of 53 dwellings on a larger site does not therefore accord with the draft allocation SUT: H2. The proposal would result in inappropriate development in the countryside that would be contrary to Policy GROWTH2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and Policy LP3 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan with no justification to override the normal presumption against development in such areas"	We were aware of the grounds for refusal of this application in preparing the Neighbourhood Plan
10	Steven Kosky, Turley	Endurance Estates		The current application has taken the opportunity to present an alternative Illustrative Masterplan to demonstrate that the site remains able to accommodate 53 dwellings, subject to an appropriate layout. Similar to the preceding design, the updated illustrative Masterplan addresses all the issues raised by the LPA, Statutory Consultees and Local Community in relation to perceived impacts upon landscape character and residential amenity.	Noted
10	Steven Kosky, Turley	Endurance Estates		The current application again demonstrates that the site can comfortably support 53 dwellings and as such, there are now two layouts which illustrate how this level of development can be sustainably accommodated whilst making appropriate provision for public open space. Both the original and revised layouts also demonstrate that the proposed scheme would not have any adverse impact on the character of the wider area.	Noted

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				Please see the attached alternative illustrative Masterplan for reference.	
10	Steven Kosky, Turley	Endurance Estates		To date, no technical objections have been received from any Statutory Consultees, which similarly reflects the lack of any objection with the originally submitted Masterplan.	Noted
10	Steven Kosky, Turley	Endurance Estates		In addition to the current (re-submitted) application, an Appeal was submitted in February 2018 by the Applicant to the Secretary of State via the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in relation to the scheme refused in January 2018. The Appeal has been validated by PINs and evidence is currently being exchanged. The Inspector will visit the site in September 2018.	We were aware that an appeal had been lodged against this refusal.
10	Steven Kosky, Turley	Endurance Estates		We respond below to the relevant sections of the Sutton Draft Neighbourhood Plan (SDNP) in the context of our submitted outline planning application at Sutton and the S78 Appeal.	Noted
10	Steven Kosky, Turley	Endurance Estates		<p>Conclusions</p> <p>Sutton is one of the more sustainable and viable development locations in the district, but has largely been overlooked in terms of the level of planned future housing growth in the Local Plan. This is compounded by the fact that the Council are reliant on new allocations in areas which have a very poor record of delivery and require special concessions to preserve viability. The DNP for Sutton mirrors these errors, by restricting development and the optimal use of sites in viable and sustainable development locations such as land to the east of Sutton.</p> <p>A primary requirement of Neighbourhood Plans is that they should contribute a shared vision for the achievement of sustainable development, which means they should plan positively. Whilst the SDNP should be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan, this does not imply that it must slavishly adhere to Local Plan growth restrictions (which have already fallen at the first hurdle) and be used as an additional instrument to prevent sustainable development.</p> <p>Our overall conclusion, corroborated by the recent Gladman Decision and the Inspector's interim findings is that the Sutton DNP should now be withdrawn in order to properly reconsider the growth strategy in the light of the demonstrable weaknesses of the Local Plan, which have been highlighted during its current Examination.</p>	The ability to deliver housing growth is reliant upon identifying available, deliverable and viable sites. Due to environmental constraints, there is not an abundance of sites that meet these criteria. It is noted that the site that is being promoted (and has subsequently been granted planning permission) only delivers 28 additional dwellings over and above what the draft Neighbourhood Plan makes provision for. It is therefore evident that there is not a significant demand for growth in Sutton despite the representors statement that the village should deliver significantly more growth.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		On behalf of our client Linden Homes Midlands, Bidwells has prepared the following representations in response to the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2036 Pre-Submission consultation version July 2018.	Noted
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		Linden Homes Midlands control Land north of The Brook and west of Mepal Road which is currently proposed, under draft Policy NP4 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, for residential development, together with associated community facilities, landscaping and infrastructure.	Noted
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		The site is allocated under Policy SUT 1 of the adopted Local Plan for 50 dwellings, comprising 2.5 hectares of land. In addition to these 50 allocated homes, the site is also designated within the emerging Local Plan, under Policy Sutton 4: SUT.H1, comprising a larger parcel of land of 18.3 hectares with the capacity to deliver up to 250 dwellings. A plan showing both parcels of land within our client's control is enclosed with this letter.	Noted
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		The south eastern part of the site proposed to be allocated under draft Policy NP4 is subject to a current planning application (ref: 16/01772/FUM) for the residential development of 77 dwellings which would form the first phase of the allocation. The application was recommended for approval by East Cambridgeshire District Council but refused at Planning Committee and is now the subject of a planning appeal.	It is noted that planning permission was granted on appeal on 26th September 2018 for 77 dwellings on part of the area allocated in Policy NP4. The neighbourhood plan has been updated to reflect this situation.
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		<p>These representations seek to ensure that the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan supports the strategic development needs set out in the emerging East Cambridgeshire Local Plan and plans positively to support local development (as outlined in paragraphs 16 and 29 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)). Furthermore, to proceed to a referendum, a Neighbourhood Plan needs to meet the 'basic conditions' set out in Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and summarised in Paragraph ID41-065-20140306 of the NPPG. The basic conditions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It must have regard to national policies and advice in the form of the NPPF; ● It must contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development. The PPG emphasises that the Plan must contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions, and show how any adverse impacts have been prevented, reduced or offset; 	The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group is aware of the requirements of the Regulations. The Neighbourhood Plan will only go to referendum if, subject to any modifications required by the Examiner, it meets the Basic Conditions.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority; ● It does not breach EU obligations; and ● It meets prescribed conditions such as it should not have a significant effect on a European site. 	
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		Linden Homes welcomes the opportunity to engage positively in the Neighbourhood Plan as a local stakeholder responsible for delivering development in the parish. Consultation with key local stakeholders is vital to ensuring that the proposals on the site incorporate the views of the local community. We welcome the opportunity to discuss the Neighbourhood Plan with the Working Party and residents in more detail.	Noted
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		Linden Homes Midlands generally supports the objectives of the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan but wishes to make the following constructive objections to ensure that the Plan accords with the Basic Conditions above that require the Plan to have regard to the NPPF and to conform with the strategic policies in the development plan.	Noted
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd		This company acts as agent for Lasercharm Limited, the owner of land at Elean Business Park known as the Camro Data Campus comprising approximately 43 acres and also for Postrealm Limited which owns land contiguous to the Camro site to the north west comprising a further 50 acres.	Noted
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd		Neither I nor my clients have been consulted regarding the proposed Neighbourhood Plan which is regrettable as a major landowner in the parish. Lasercharm has invested very significantly in the Camro site including the dedication of new footpaths, power and broadband infrastructure; all elements that have potential benefit to the parish and are aligned with objectives in the Plan.	A Business Forum was held at Elean Business Park on 19 May 2016 to which all businesses on the Business Park were invited. In addition, a widely publicised Open Day was held on 24 March 2018 where the draft Neighbourhood Plan policies were on display for discussion. The Pre-Submission Consultation Neighbourhood Plan provides all with an interest in the Plan the first opportunity to comment on its proposals.
6	IForce Group	Business Elean Business park		The DC in Sutton is operated by a 3PI provider, IForce, for Fortnum & Mason. Throughout most of the year the DC supports 62 FT staff (Approx), operating across 2 shifts; 6-14, 14-22, across all functions, including admin & security. This increases from around the beginning of August as the unit commences the build up to Peak operation culminating in around 250 people during December operating across 3 shifts; 6-14, 14-22, 22-6 seven days a week. Levels of inbound & outbound vehicles increases in line with this growth in Personnel. IForce all operate PT shifts for staff only able to work limited hours due to Family/personal commitments.	Noted

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				Personnel are spread across a wide catchment area with the majority of FT & Agency colleagues living in; Chatteris, Littleport and further afield, with a minimal number of staff located in Sutton. As with most logistics operations the operation at Sutton is heavily dependent on acquiring a sufficient number of trained/trainable staff to meet the demands & requirements of the client.	
		East Cambridgeshire District Council		<p>Housing requirement for the Neighbourhood Area</p> <p>In July 2018, the government published a new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF introduces a requirement for strategic policies to set out a housing requirement for designated Neighbourhood Areas. Both the Local Plan 2015 and submitted Local Plan pre-date the new NPPF and therefore do not set out housing requirements for the district's Neighbourhood Areas.</p> <p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to provide an indicative housing requirement figure, if requested to do so by the neighbourhood planning body. Sutton Parish Council has not requested the Council set an indicative housing requirement figure, therefore no such figure will be set.</p> <p>The Council commends Sutton Parish Council's recognition of the need to deliver housing development through including site allocations in the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan, which will provide development at a rate which exceeds the adopted Local Plan 2015.</p>	Noted. A subsequent request was made to East Cambridgeshire District Council to provide an indicative housing requirement which forms part of the evidence base for the Plan.
		East Cambridgeshire District Council		<p>It is noted that sites Land North of the Brook and west of Mepal Road (Policy NP4) and Land east of Garden Close (Policy NP5) are both proposed for allocation by the submitted Local Plan, which is currently being examined. National Planning Practice Guidance states that "Although a draft Neighbourhood Plan or Order is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process is likely to be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a Neighbourhood Plan is tested."</p> <p>The precedent for making site allocations which are also identified by the submitted Local Plan has been set through the examination of the Fordham Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted
		East Cambridgeshire District Council		<p>Conformity with strategic policies</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans are required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. At present,</p>	Noted.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				<p>strategic policies are set out in the Local Plan 2015. However, the policy context is somewhat complex as a new Local Plan is currently being examined which, if found sound, will replace the adopted Local Plan 2015.</p> <p>The amount of housing growth identified by the draft Neighbourhood Plan exceeds the Local Plan 2015 but is aligned with the submitted Local Plan, which has been informed by up-to-date housing needs evidence. As discussed in our comments on policies NP4-6, national planning guidance states that the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process is likely to be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions. In addition, it is accepted practice that Neighbourhood Plans can promote more development than a Local Plan. For other (non-housing) matters, the draft Neighbourhood Plan policies appear to be broadly aligned with the strategic policies contained within the Local Plan 2015 and submitted Local Plan.</p> <p>The District Council is therefore satisfied that the draft Neighbourhood Plan does not undermine its current or emerging strategic policies and is capable of meeting the requirement for 'general conformity'.</p>	
		East Cambridgeshire District Council		<p>Other obligations</p> <p>The District Council has undertaken a Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment screening exercise of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. As a result of this screening exercise, the District Council considers that the draft Neighbourhood Plan has satisfied the requirements of relevant EU obligations, namely the 'SEA Directive' and 'Habitats Directive'.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Council considers that (subject to addressing the points raised in this letter), the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan is capable of satisfying the basic conditions and other relevant legal obligations.</p>	Noted
Executive Summary					
10	Steven Kosky, Turley	Endurance Estates		<p>There is an over-reliance on an emerging Local Plan which has been challenged on the grounds of soundness and which has substantial questions and shortfalls to resolve during its current public Examination. The mirrored policies of the SDNP are premature as there is a high risk that the Local Plan will either be found unsound during the Examination or quickly become out of date. The recent Gladman Decision underlined this point</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan will be examined against the adopted Local Plan and has been prepared in this context while having regard to the status of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>It is unclear what point is being made in relation to the status of the five-year land supply situation. The Neighbourhood Plan does not need to demonstrate that it delivers a five-year supply and, because it is being submitted before 24 January 2019,</p>

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				by confirming that the Council could only provide for around 77% of its five year housing land supply requirements before the start of the Examination. These requirements have since been modified by the Local Plan Inspector (see below) however recent monitoring confirms that housing delivery continues to be below 50% of the annual district requirement and the Council has confirmed in writing (as part of its Sutton Appeal case) that it still does not have a five year land supply.	neither does it need to comply with the 2018 NPPF. While the District Council does not have a five-year supply, the Neighbourhood Plan does allocate additional sites for housing than are allocated in the adopted Local Plan and it therefore satisfies the requirements of the Written Ministerial Statement dated 12 December 2016 in that the Plan, once made, can be used for the determination of planning applications for a period of two years even if the District Council does not have a five-year supply.
10	Steven Kosky, Turley	Endurance Estates		National planning guidance is to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan in accordance with adopted policy and there is no requirement to be in complete compliance with any emerging policy. The recently published Local Plan Inspector's interim findings regarding the Stage 1 Examination hearings (July 2018) (Appendix 1) states that it is not appropriate to continue to attribute significant weight to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-operation (2013) and the Joint HMA Statement on Housing Redistribution (2017) and continue to discount the district's housing figures. As such, The Inspector has requested that the Council accommodate an additional 1,125 new homes, increasing the minimum housing requirement for East Cambridgeshire from 10,835 dwellings to 11,960 dwellings between 2016- 2036. Therefore, the SDNP needs to be paused in order to reconsider the growth strategy in the light of the confirmed weaknesses of the Local Plan.	Disagree. The District Council has not required the Neighbourhood Plan to plan for additional houses in their response to the pre-submission consultation. It is therefore assumed that they are satisfied with the amount of housing planned in the Neighbourhood Plan.
Chapter 2 – The Neighbourhood Area					
6	IForce Group	Business Elean Business park		Para 2.10 Housing Given the constraints and health of the national economy IForce pay above the minimum wage but are unable to match the salaries offered by the companies based within Peterborough and Cambridge and, therefore, are driven to recruit from the lesser skilled members of the local/regional community. As one would expect this means the potential employees are drawn from the lower earning strata of the community, who have limited opportunities to rent/own properties within the Sutton catchment area. This constraint would not necessarily affect young parents whose partners are in alternative FT employment. Thus any move to increase the level of 'Social Renting' accommodation/properties can only benefit not only IForce but also any of the other local	Noted

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				employers. Also increased levels of affordable child care within the local community. These would also only serve to increase the number of local residents attracted to local employment (Employment 2.11).	
6	IForce Group	Business Elean Business park		<p>Para 2.14 - Transport Links</p> <p>Transport links are also a major factor affecting anyone considering applying to work within the Elean Business park area. Public transport is non-existent from anywhere other than Ely and even this is severely restricted and does not align with the shift patterns operated at our Sutton site, in fact if a member of staff lived in Little port the journey via train and bus takes around 2.5-3 hrs. Public transport, not only for the Business Park but also for the local community does in no way offers any viable method of commuting to or from any areas of significant employment, retail or leisure. The route from Ely is serviced via a Cycleway but routing from any other area/location does not contain this option, making commuting from other areas prohibitive without access to personal motorised transportation.</p> <p>All major roads leading to Sutton are single lane carriageway, with the road from Earith/Willingham being particularly challenging for cyclists. Road closures are a frequent occurrence, whether through maintenance or road traffic incidents/accidents and with any diversion adding significant mileage to journeys that are already quite challenging.</p>	Noted

Chapter 3 – Planning Policy Context

6	IForce Group	Business Elean Business park		<p>Para 3.4</p> <p>Currently Elean business park supports a small numbers of businesses with the greatest density of which are located upon the road that runs from Brett's transport to IForce, around 5-6 employers. Large areas of the business park remain undeveloped and are not maintained, which gives the impression of the Business Park being in decline and is possibly unattractive to any future/potential tenants. The road the majority of the businesses are located on is in poor repair and signage and lighting are virtually non-existent. Increased numbers of tenants would do much to improve the appearance of the Business park and increase local employment but this would require a significant improvement of</p>	Noted. The longevity of the Power Station is a matter for the operators to consider.
---	--------------	------------------------------	--	---	--

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				<p>the infrastructure and facilities, especially if compared to Lancaster Way.</p> <p>We would encourage the further development of Elean Business Park as a means to draw more of the local community to work in the area, there is a significant portion of land unused, even when taking into account the potential data centre which, when built, would bring further jobs to the park. The longevity of the power-station should also be considered as I believe it is on a limited duration.</p>	
Chapter 4 – Key Issues					
6	IForce Group	Business Elean Business park		<p>Para 4.9 Provision of a better Public Transport system (liaison with providers)</p> <p>Potentially the Business Park could benefit from incorporating a 'Park & Ride' facility, which would improve the levels of public transport for the local businesses and the local community.</p> <p>Or, alternately, a designated Bus Stop within the Business Park as the number of tenants increase. Either option could be linked into improved links to local train station thus reducing the dependency on personal transport.</p>	Noted. This would be a matter for the County Council, as highways authority, to consider.
6	IForce Group	Business Elean Business park		<p>Key issues 4.10- 4.15</p> <p>4.11.1 & 2; Increased & improved range of retail facilities, possibly closer the Elean Business Park, a fundamental requirement for supporting the workforce on the Business Park.</p> <p>5; Will improve the appearance of the Business Park and portray it as a vibrant and flourishing facility/area.</p> <p>7; Please see 4.9 above</p> <p>8; As above</p> <p>4.12; Overall the interaction between the parish council and the iForce site has been minimal however we would encourage greater communication given the level of employment the site brings to the area</p>	Noted
6	IForce Group	Business Elean Business park		<p>Key Issues - Traffic & Transport</p> <p>Access to Elean Business Park from Sutton – whilst pedestrian and bicycle access is available the business of the A142 roundabout makes it an unpleasant experience; this could be resolved by either a subway or pedestrian bridge near the roundabout.</p>	Highway matters of the nature referred to are a matter for the County Council, as the highways authority, to consider.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				<p>Public transport could easily be extended to include a stop just within the business park – there is already a lay-by between the two roundabouts which would only require the bus to make a small detour but then passengers are in the park rather than down the road in Sutton itself.</p> <p>There is, currently, no designated cycle way from Earith-Chatteris etc, reducing the ability to bring in workers to support any expansion of the area.</p> <p>There is little, easy or quick access to major roads; A10, A14 etc. and any improvement in this access can only serve to support the neighbourhood plan for the area.</p> <p>The challenges of providing viable employment options given the proximity of larger town/city locations; Cambridge, Peterborough and the companies based there remain and can only be addressed via considered local, integrated development covering the needs of local business and the community.</p> <p>Much of the above would certainly be affected by, or may come within the constraints and scope of the East Cambs local plan 2015. It should be stated that any plan to develop the local area, whilst retaining the natural environment, Historic character and Biodiversity can only be seen as a positive move. Once again we would encourage greater communication between Iforce and the parish council given the level of employment the site brings to the area.</p>	

Vision and Objectives

No comments received

Policy NP 1 Local Green Spaces

		East Cambridgeshire District Council		<p>The policy proposes the designation of a number of Local Green Spaces. The Fordham Neighbourhood Plan has recently been examined and, subject to some modifications, was found to satisfy the basic conditions and other legal obligations. The Fordham Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of Local Green Spaces.</p>	<p>Noted. Sites 6 & 7 in the policy are designated in the emerging Draft Local Plan. A separate Local Green Space Assessment has been prepared to accompany the Plan at Submission stage and reference is made to this in paragraph 7.3 Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------	--	--	---

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				<p>The designation of Local Green Spaces in Fordham was informed by an Open Spaces Assessment. The examiner concluded that "...a robust analysis underpins the [Local Green Spaces] policy, and I consider that it satisfies the Basic Conditions."</p> <p>The Council suggests that Sutton Parish Council submit an assessment of Local Green Spaces, akin to Fordham's Open Spaces Assessment, which is robust yet proportionate.</p>	
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y	Perhaps ban dog walkers from these areas?	Not a planning matter, issue for parish council
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required
6	IForce Group	Business Elean Business park			None required
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required
10	Steven Kosky, Turley	Endurance Estates			None required
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y	But what about cricket ground?	Would prevent amenity buildings, e.g. cricket pavilion
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	N	Not enough green space at all	No suggestions of additional sites therefore no action
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y	Stop cars parking on grass in residential areas .. Churchill Close, Millfield Restrict number of houses being built	Not a planning matter, parking restrictions on grass in residential areas would be a matter for the relevant land owner
21			N		No alternative suggested
22			N		No alternative suggested
23			N		No alternative suggested
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	I agree with the identified sites, however I would want additional green spaces sites identified. In particular, the area around the existing houses in Sutton Park - which provides a	It is not appropriate to designate sports pitches as Local Green Spaces as this would prevent amenity buildings, e.g. cricket pavilion being built. Policy NP12 protects these features.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				visually important setting of the village; the cricket field; the meadowland adjacent to Garden Close (currently identified as a housing site) & the village green. All these sites are not only of historic importance but also features of the village & give enjoyment to residents, for example, visual amenity, recreation & sport.	The designation of Local Green Spaces must conform with the criteria specified in the National Planning Policy Framework..
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y	Attempting to designate the extra areas seems to be an entirely reasonable thing to do. Signposting some circular walking routes is an excellent idea, otherwise it's far from clear where people can or cannot walk.	None required
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident	N	All these sites not to be developed in any circumstances.	National planning policy states that development will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances.
29	G				None required
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident			None required
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y		None required
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	Sadly several of these "green spaces" are spoiled by litter!	Observation not a planning matter
33	Bob Harker	Resident	N	It is an oversight not to include the Station Road cricket ground where village cricket has been played for over 100yrs. See 12.3 in NP Otherwise ok.	Would prevent amenity buildings, e.g. cricket pavilion
34	David Smith	Resident			None required
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y		None required
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required
40	Liz	Resident	Y	What is happening with the gault? The focus is all on Sutton and a couple of the houses in the gault	Not clear what additional action is required
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	Y		None required
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required
52			N	This is not a comprehensive list of green spaces I would like to see preserved.	No specific additional green spaces listed
Policy NP2 Protecting and Maintaining Feature of Landscape and Biodiversity Value					
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y	N.B. Hedging and trees do NOT stop traffic noise from being heard from about 3.30am onwards.	Observation but not a planning matter
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required
6					None required
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required
10	Steven Kosky				None required
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required
21			N		None required
22			N		None required
23			N		None required
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	What is 'landscape 25'?	It is believed this response relates to the Contents page?
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y	Strongly agree. Witness the proposals from Endurance Estates to destroy the ancient and biodiverse green space at the back of Garden Close, and replace it with - well, with	None required

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				nothing of any merit. You should go further - where land is best suited to remain as ancient meadowland, it should be actively protected.	
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident	N	There has been major development in recent years and the village has increased considerably in size. Many green spaces have been covered in concrete and bricks such that there are no gaps along the main road through Sutton. Little regard has been given to the biodiversity of the village. Wildlife such as butterflies, hedgehogs and birds have dwindled as there is little habitat. The development proposals are all on green field sites. Cambs is currently a rural area but the proposed large developments such as Northstowe, Waterbeach, Bourn etc. will destroy the current environment and pleasure of living in the villages. The Local Plan clearly indicates the very limited clout the Parish Councils have with the wishes of ECDC.	This is a comment on recent development, in many cases outside of the Neighbourhood Plan area. No specific changes to the policy requested.
29	G				None required
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	N	Don't understand the policy as documented not clearly explained by parish	Not clear what clarification is sought
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y	All new development must consider the impact on local services & facilities, such as the Priors Field Surgery & the Primary School.	This policy does not address local services and facilities
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y		None required
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required
34	David Smith	Resident			None required
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y		None required
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required
40	Liz	Resident	Y	We need to protect and if possible improve diversity. To this end could you look into getting the dirt road near lee packing plant looked into. This would get the traffic from tractors and lorries out of the village and our road	Not a planning policy but a matter the parish council can address if new planning applications are made with respect to the packing plant
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	Y		None required
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required
52			N	There is no option to be neutral. This is MUCH too vague to support.	No specific changes requested

Policy NP3 Sutton Development Envelope

		East Cambridgeshire District Council		Policy NP3 offers in principle support to proposals within the Development Envelope. The policy indicates that proposals on land outside the Development Envelope (i.e. within the countryside) "will only be allowed for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which can demonstrate a need to be located in the countryside." Through their strategic policies, the adopted Local Plan 2015 and submitted Local Plan identify a range of types of development which may be appropriate in locations outside the Development Envelope, including, but not limited to, rural exception sites for affordable housing (policy HOU4) and Community-led development (Growth 6). The Parish Council should ensure the policy achieves general conformity with the strategic policies of the Development Plan.	The Parish Council believes that this policy is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan 2015.
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	The detailed map show the field adjacent to the road and west of NP12 as being outside the development envelope. Planning permission has already been granted on this small area for 2 new houses	Noted. The Development Envelope on the Inset Map has been amended to reflect this permission.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident		Too many houses at top of Mepal Rd with only one route out unless you are a pedestrian or a cyclist. Have not noticed hordes of cyclists ever!	The proposed number of houses is consistent with Emerging Local Plan which seeks to satisfy identified housing need.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd	N	This policy appears to seek to constrain business development save for small business units. In my view these policies would benefit from further consultation and improved clarity.	Policy NP10 encourages the provision of small business start-up units on the Business Park.
6					None required
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required
10	Steven Kosky		N	Please see attached statement	Response to comments elsewhere in this Statement
11	Allen Marking	Resident	N	I do not agree with agricultural land being used for housing development. We import food that we can grow.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan seeks to limit the amount of good quality agricultural land that is lost to development.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	N	Far too many houses planned. The roads can't cope as it is. The school is bursting at the brim and having to mix yr groups, the doctors takes weeks to get an appointment	The proposed number of houses is consistent with Emerging Local Plan and the Highways Department and Education Department have not objected to this level of development, which seeks to satisfy identified housing need.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required
21			N		None required
22			N		None required
23			N		None required
24	Alison Harker	Resident	N	The Development Envelope Proposals Map includes the area designated as NP5 & at present is allocated for residential development. Development envelope designation takes account of the surrounding land & this site bears no relationship to the adjoining land to the north, east & south & therefore should not be included in the envelope. The site sits in countryside & this has been identified as countryside in previous Local Plan documents. There has been no change in in the nature of this site to warrant its inclusion into the development envelope.	This is an objection to the inclusion of the land East of Garden Close. This has previously been considered by the Parish Council and is also identified in the Emerging Local Plan
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y	This is the first mention I've seen in this document of traffic. It's going to be a huge problem, particularly with additional peak-time traffic on the High Street as a result of excessive development on the south-eastern slopes of the village (Garden Close) and I haven't so far seen this document paying much attention to it.	Cambridgeshire County Council Highways Department has not objected to this level of development at Garden Close
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident	N	The Development Envelope will be decided by the Govt and ECDC. It has to satisfy the assessed number of dwellings needed to meet the Govt requirement. If it does not then the developers have the opportunity to propose further developments above the level in the Local plan.	Observation, not suggesting any specific changes
29	G		N	Insufficient constraints put in place to protect existing service infrastructure (roads, sewage, water supply, telco, electricity, schooling, surgery, a&e consideration)	Dealt with where appropriate in NP4. Specific details will be considered if or when detailed planning applications are submitted. The service providers have not objected to the allocation during consultation on the draft Plan.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	N	Too much in small area	Objection to number of houses – these details are in NP4 and NP5
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y		None required
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y		None required
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required
34	David Smith	Resident			None required
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y		None required
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required
40	Liz	Resident	N	Need to keep the development to a close area to Sutton. Though you are expanding the village massively. Do we really need that many houses? How will traffic be dealt with? It's turning into a town and no longer being a village adding that many houses	Sutton has been identified as a location for further growth by East Cambridgeshire District Council due to the levels of services and facilities available in the village or capable of being provided. The adopted Local Plan already identifies a large amount of growth for Sutton that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot go against. The County Highways Department has not stated that the roads cannot cope with this level of growth.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	Y		None required
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required
52			N	I think we should stop being NIMBYs and talk about the infrastructure necessary to build houses our kids can live in.	None required

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy NP4 Land north of The Brook and west of Mepal Road					
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	Suggest adding the words underlined. Developer contributions – in <u>excess of CIL payments</u> – maybe necessary	The regulations concerning the collection of developer contributions are very specific as to when they can be collected. However, additional locally specific contributions may be necessary to overcome a site specific issue and therefore the Policy has been amended as follows: “Developer contributions, in addition to CIL payments, may be necessary.”
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident		Re 250 house development west of top of Mepal Road being wide has acted as a race track, most of the day and night, as is Ely Rd/The Brook. With 250 houses being built you have at least/must consider the huge increase in vehicles for the only access to A142/Earith. Traffic calming is essential. The roundabout is already a danger spot as vehicles from A142 just see a straight road and Not a roundabout. See FB posts	The policy requires that a detailed Travel Assessment and Travel Plan must be prepared and submitted as part of the planning application for the development
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required
6					None required
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required
10	Steven Kosky				None required
11	Allen Marking	Resident	N	See item 4 for comments	Addressed in NP3
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	N	Too many houses!!!!!!!	Sutton has been identified as a location for further growth by East Cambridgeshire District Council due to the levels of services and facilities available in the village or capable of being provided. The adopted Local Plan already identifies a large amount of growth for Sutton that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot go against
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y	Must have accompanying infrastructure improvements especially schools places	The Policy addresses this matter
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required
21			N		None required
22			N		None required
23			N		None required
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	This site is the most appropriate one for housing development in the village - as identified by the majority of residents in the consultation on Sutton Village Vision.	None required
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y	Providing this new development does not become a ghetto and increase movement of traffic to One Stop Shop in High Street where there is already inadequate parking for GP Surgery and said shop.	The policy requires that a detailed Travel Assessment and Travel Plan must be prepared and submitted as part of the planning application for the development
26	Peter Wood	Resident	N	Traffic: Experience with the objections to the Garden Close development has shown that County Highways won't enforce any sort of meaningful traffic survey and mitigation plan. They just look for hot-spot injury/fatality locations, and if they don't find any, they just roll over. They don't live here, and they seem, as policy, to do their best to agree to any development that's being proposed. They're spineless and clueless. We need to (try to!) insist that *local* *knowledge* is added to traffic assessment, to vet the proposals for assessment areas. Otherwise, I'm afraid, experience says we'll be ignored.	The policy requires that a detailed Travel Assessment and Travel Plan must be prepared and submitted as part of the planning application for the development
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident	N	Sutton does not need a further 250 houses. It has increased significantly in size. This development will split the village in two The Brook highway being the separation line. The infrastructure should be the first priority before a development of this magnitude is acceptable. Many of the items needed are suggested in the summer Sutton Parish news.	Sutton has been identified as a location for further growth by East Cambridgeshire District Council due to the levels of services and facilities available in the village or capable of being provided. The adopted Local Plan already identifies a large amount of growth for Sutton that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot go against
29	G		N	Insufficient constraints put in place to protect existing service infrastructure (roads, sewage, water supply, telco, electricity, schooling, surgery, a&e consideration)	These items should be addressed as part of the detailed planning application. The service providers have not objected to the allocation during consultation on the draft Plan.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	Y	Better for access and less impact on local environment	None required
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y	Why do we need a burial ground? More people chose cremation.	The need has been identified by extrapolating the existing demand, which shows around 10-12 years of existing capacity
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	Both developments should be allowed providing the Developers contribute to local facilities (Surgery & School). I see no need for a new Burial ground within that site.	None required
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required
34	David Smith	Resident			None required

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y	we have concerns about the number of dwellings proposed and the infrastructure to support them, particularly the amount of traffic this will bring to the already very busy roads and also water and drainage, schools and medical facilities	The policy requires that a detailed Travel Assessment and Travel Plan must be prepared and submitted as part of the planning application for the development. School and medical facilities concerns should be addressed by the requirement to phase development in line with the expansion of local infrastructure, particularly schools and health facilities.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required
40	Liz	Resident	N	Same with last	Addressed in NP3 response
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	Y		None required
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	N	The proposed location of the playing field extension prohibits any future development of the land to the west linking in with this development and given the geography of the site would be better situated on the land adjacent to the west of the existing playing fields.	The policy that designates and protects sports pitches does not preclude their loss should a new pitch be provided of at least the equivalent quantity and quality and in a suitable location to meet the needs of existing users (Policy NP2). However, there are no plans to develop further to the west at this time.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	N	Our village is big enough. There is absolutely no way that more houses will benefit our village. The school is full. How do you propose to expand the school? There is no land nearby to that. The Doctor's Surgery is full. Always impossible to get an appointment immediately. The area allocated for these 250 houses is beautiful and full of wildlife. Why pick our village? Wicken and Mepal have plenty of open land to develop. Our village is becoming a small town!	Sutton has been identified as a location for further growth by East Cambridgeshire District Council due to the levels of services and facilities available in the village or capable of being provided. The adopted Local Plan already identifies a large amount of growth for Sutton that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot go against. School and medical facilities concerns should be addressed by the requirement to phase with the expansion of local infrastructure, particularly schools and health facilities.
52			N	Again sensible proposals, but I can't give you a 'yes' without seeing details of several other aspects including expansion of other local amenities	None required.
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		Policy NP4 – Land north of the Brook and west of Mepal Road We support the proposed site allocation of Land north of the Brook and west of Mepal Road under Policy NP4 of the draft	Noted

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				Neighbourhood Plan. It is broadly consistent with draft Policy SUT.H1 of the emerging East Cambridgeshire Local Plan.	
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		Draft Policy SUT.H1 of the emerging Local Plan states, at criterion (b), that a concept plan for the whole site will need to be prepared and submitted as part of a planning application, for approval by the Council. The Neighbourhood Plan states, at paragraph 8.6, that it supports the allocation under Draft Policy SUT.H1 of the emerging Local Plan and <i>'provides greater clarity for developers and the local community by including a "concept" plan as required by the Local Plan'</i> . The concept plan is then included as Figure 1.	Agreed
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		Linden Homes Midlands are supportive of the Concept Plan included at Figure 1, apart from the reference to provision of allotments. The provision of allotments on the site has not been raised in discussions to date between Linden Homes Midlands and the Parish Council and this provision is also not a requirement under Policy SUT.H1 of the emerging East Cambridgeshire Local Plan. Linden Homes Midlands therefore request deletion of the reference to the provision of land for allotments on the site.	On further investigation it has been concluded that there is no demand for further allotments at this time and it is unlikely that there will be further demand in the future. This requirement has therefore been deleted from the Concept Plan.
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		Linden Homes Midlands have prepared an Indicative Masterplan for the site (enclosed with this letter) which broadly complies with the concept plan. The Masterplan would deliver the development principles identified in Policy SUT1 (from the adopted East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015), Policy Sutton 4 and SUT.H1 of the emerging East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (Proposed Submission version) and draft Policy NP4 of the emerging Sutton Neighbourhood Plan. The principles identified in the Masterplan are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● dwellings (inc. affordable housing); ● new football pitches; ● land for a burial ground; ● public open spaces and areas of play; ● vehicular access off Mepal Road; ● pedestrian and cycle routes to key village locations; and ● landscape and wildlife corridor at the northern boundary. 	Noted
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		However, as referred to in the representations made by Linden Homes Midlands on the emerging East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2016 – 2036 (Proposed Submission version), we consider that the site could accommodate more dwellings than currently proposed in Policy NP4, and request that the number of	The draft Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in accordance with the emerging Draft Local Plan. It is considered that, despite the recent appeal decision, it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the construction of 350 homes on this site would not have a detrimental impact on the infrastructure and

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				<p> dwellings is increased from 'up to 250 homes' to 'up to 427 i.e 77 dwellings on the current allocation and 350 dwellings on the remainder of the proposed allocation. The exact number of dwellings will be determined following further discussions with the Council and policy requirements. The requested increase to the number of dwellings would provide development at appropriate densities of between 22 and 25 dwellings per hectare and make effective and efficient use of land whilst still respecting the area's prevailing character and setting, in line with the Revised NPPF and Policy LP22 of East Cambridgeshire District Council's emerging Local Plan.</p>	<p>services of the village, especially given the reliance on a single access to the site off Mepal Road.</p>
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		<p>The Masterplan shows the distribution of the proposed uses across the site and shows residential areas with a range of densities and building heights that take into account the neighbouring uses and the surrounding area. The Masterplan demonstrates that 427 dwellings could be accommodated on the site; 77 dwellings in Phase 1 and up to 350 dwellings in Phase 2. We consider that if less housing were provided on the site than shown on the Masterplan the density would be too low and it would represent an inefficient use of land, contrary to guidance contained in the NPPF and draft policy LP22 of the emerging East Cambridgeshire Local Plan.</p> <p>The densities of the different phases of the proposed shown on the enclosed Masterplan are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 (77 units) – 27.5dph • Phase 2 (350 units) between 22.2dph and 25.5dph – depending on whether sports pitches and burial ground are included. <p>The densities of both Phase 1 and Phase 2 are comparable to existing established residential areas within Sutton and are entirely appropriate for an edge of settlement location. In contrast, a development of 250 dwellings on Phase 2 would deliver a density of approximately 16dph which we consider is too low and would represent an inefficient use of an allocated site.</p>	<p>The draft Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in accordance with the emerging Draft Local Plan. It is considered that, despite the recent appeal decision, it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the construction of 350 homes on this site would not have a detrimental impact on the infrastructure and services of the village, especially given the reliance on a single access to the site off Mepal Road.</p>
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		<p>We therefore support Policy NP4 in principle as it relates to the site allocation on land north of The Brook and West of Mepal Road but request that the number of dwellings specified in the Policy, under criterion (i), is increased from 'up to 250</p>	<p>It is considered that, despite the recent appeal decision, it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the construction of 350 homes on this site would not have a detrimental impact on the infrastructure and services of the village, especially given the reliance on a single access to the site off Mepal Road.</p>

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				homes' to 'up to 427 homes', subject to further discussions with the Council and policy requirements.	
Policy NP5 Land East of Garden Close					
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	Suggest adding Flood risk and <u>drainage</u> of the site and its effect on surrounding land to the south	The site specific flood risk assessment required in the policy will address drainage.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y		None required.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	Policy NP5 of the SDNP allocates land East of Garden Close for only 25 new 'low density' homes. Whilst supporting the recognition of the site and its suitability for residential development, to avoid the SDNP rapidly becoming out of date the Parish Council must plan for more sustainable growth in Sutton and more optimal use of land. The submitted application demonstrates that the site can sustainably accommodate 53 dwellings whilst still being in accordance with national and local planning policy. Indeed the new NPPF requires that land densities are optimised to ensure best use of sites released for new development	East Cambridgeshire District Council has not objected to the amount of growth planned in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. The comment concerning the ability of the site to accommodate 53 dwellings was made ahead of any decision being made on an application or the then pending appeal being determined. The requirement to optimise site densities should not be the sole consideration in determining the suitability of a proposal, as noted elsewhere in the NPPF.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	Without implementing the changes identified above, the SDNP will be ineffective in shaping the sustainable growth of Sutton and will remain an out of context and restrictive local policy document. The approach to growth therefore needs to be fundamentally reconsidered in the SDNP.	Disagree. The draft Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies of both the adopted and emerging local plans. It therefore meets the Basic Conditions.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	Paragraph 065 of the Government's online Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) states that only a draft neighbourhood Plan that meets each of a set of basic conditions can be put to a referendum and be made. The basic conditions outlined below are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The basic conditions are:	The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group is aware of the requirements of the Regulations. The Neighbourhood Plan will only go to referendum if, subject to any modifications required by the Examiner, it meets the Basic Conditions.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				<p>a. having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the order (or neighbourhood plan).</p> <p>b. having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, it is appropriate to make the order. This applies only to Orders.</p> <p>c. having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area, it is appropriate to make the order. This applies only to Orders.</p> <p>d. the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>e. the making of the order (or 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).</p> <p>f. the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</p> <p>g. prescribed conditions are met in relation to the Order (or plan) and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order (or neighbourhood plan)</p>	
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	<p>Primarily we consider the SDNP to be inconsistent with national policy and advice and not be in accordance with basic condition 'a'. The SDNP is over-reliant on being in complete accordance with the emerging Local Plan which is obviously flawed in a number of respects, based on recent S78 Appeal outcomes and the Inspector's interim findings. The emerging Local Plan is also subject to substantial wider objection from Endurance and is still undergoing the second stage of Examination, with the settlement-specific hearings yet to take place.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is being submitted for examination against the adopted 2015 Local Plan while being mindful of the stage that the emerging Local Plan has reached. We do not wish for the Plan to be delayed should, as the respondent suggests, the Local Plan is found unsound. This approach will ensure that there is an up-to-date planning framework in place for Sutton.</p>
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	<p>The SDNP essentially uses the emerging Local Plan to constrain the growth of Sutton as it incorrectly assumes that all the emerging Local Plan policies are 'up to date'. This is not the case, given the recent Gladman Decision, the Inspector's interim findings and the statements of the Council in relation to the lack of a five year supply (which confirms that the presumption in favour of development is engaged). In addition, the adopted plan is already out of date and there is no legal requirement to test the DNP against emerging policy. The</p>	<p>Disagree. The Neighbourhood Plan is being submitted for examination against the adopted 2015 Local Plan while being mindful of the stage that the emerging Local Plan has reached. We do not wish for the Plan to be delayed should, as the respondent suggests, the Local Plan is found unsound. This approach will ensure that there is an up-to-date planning framework in place for Sutton.</p>

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				primary test of the SDNP is therefore against the basic conditions, some of which have not been met, as set out further within these representations.	
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	Secondly, the SDNP fails to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and is not in accordance with basic condition 'd'. This is due to its narrow focus and complete alignment with an emerging Local Plan which is still confirmed to be out of date. The strategy behind the SDNP pre-dates the Gladman Decision and the recent published Inspector's interim findings which require the plan to provide for additional new homes and so views growth as a matter which must simply be constrained. The function of the SDNP is not just to reiterate the policies of the emerging Local Plan, and whilst the DNP should be in general conformity with the main strategic provisions of the Local Plan, it must also primarily contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.	Disagree. The Neighbourhood Plan is being submitted for examination against the adopted 2015 Local Plan while being mindful of the stage that the emerging Local Plan has reached. We do not wish for the Plan to be delayed should, as the respondent suggests, the Local Plan is found unsound. This approach will ensure that there is an up-to-date planning framework in place for Sutton. As noted in the 2012 NPPF (against which the Neighbourhood Plan will be examined), sustainable development has, three strands. Environmental, Economic and Social sustainability. Sustainability is not just about maximising the amount of housing that a village should accommodate, but also ensuring that the environment and social infrastructure can accommodate such growth. The Neighbourhood Plan demonstrates a rounded sustainable growth as required by the NPPF.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	Arguably, the SDNP has the scope to plan for additional growth, specifically at sites which are considered to sustainable locations in principle. Whilst the submitted application at land to the east of Sutton is numerically different from the emerging site Local Plan allocation, the proposed development of 53 dwellings is a much more efficient use of land. The scale of the development proposed is also justified by all the technical evidence prepared in support of the application and so broadly accords with the Development Plan, taken as a whole.	Disagree. Proposals for the construction of 53 dwellings have been refused by the District Council and an appeal against the refusal has yet to be considered.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	Over-reliance of the SDNP on the Emerging Local Plan There are significant risks in submitting a DNP for Examination which is so completely tied to the spatial strategy and growth limitations of an untested, emerging Local Plan. The emerging Plan is currently still under Examination and substantial objections have been made to all of its provisions. In the interim, the recent Gladman Decision and the newly published NPPF have essentially rendered both the emerging Local Plan and the constraint strategy of the SDNP completely out of date. This has been confirmed in the Local Plan Inspector's interim findings, which indicates that without an additional 1,125 new dwellings the Plan risks being found unsound.	It is for this reason that it is intended that the Neighbourhood Plan will, as with the recent Fordham Neighbourhood Plan, be examined against the adopted 2105 Local Plan. While it is noted that the Inspector has made interim findings against the emerging Local Plan, the examination of the Plan has not been halted and, therefore, it is to be assumed that she considers that the Plan can, with modifications, ultimately be found sound.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	Our submitted objections to the emerging Local Plan demonstrate the low levels of growth proposed for the district	Then Local Plan and the matters being considered by the Inspector are not a matter for examination here. In particular, the

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				during the plan period, the weakness of the Council's five year housing land supply position and the irrational distribution and scale of the new dwelling allocations proposed. The issue of the lack of a five year supply has been decided and is likely to be further eroded given the spatial evidence presented in Matters 2 and 4 of Part 1 of the Local Plan Examination. As such, none of the existing provisions of the emerging Local Plan can be relied upon as a foundation for the SDNP as they are obviously unsound, requiring a complete review of both the Local Plan and the SDNP. Endurance made the above case at the Examination that the emerging Local Plan is flawed on numerous counts, including its disproportionate reliance upon Soham as the main driver of new housing growth in the district, particularly in the short term. Endurance demonstrated that Soham has very low levels of viability and therefore a need for reduced levels of affordable housing and CIL to facilitate investment. Soham also has a poor record of housing delivery and so new developments in Soham will not be able to support an affordable housing contribution of more than 20% without being unviable	Neighbourhood Plan does not consider the deliverability of sites in Soham or their viability. That is a matter for the local plan examination. Hence, the Neighbourhood Plan will, as with the recent Fordham Neighbourhood Plan, be examined against the adopted 2105 Local Plan. While it is noted that the Inspector has made interim findings against the emerging Local Plan, the examination of the Plan has not been halted and, therefore, it is to be assumed that she considers that the Plan can, with modifications, ultimately be found sound.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	Similarly the CIL charge is also required to be at less than half the standard rate, compared to other more viable settlements in the district. Furthermore, given that the Council's CIL 123 list now only relates to specific educational projects, there will be a future requirement to also pay for general education provision from S106 contributions. However the fragile viability of Soham suggests that further concessions will need to be made, resulting in a widening of existing funding gaps. The Local Plan spatial strategy of focusing growth at Soham in the short term is therefore unsound and representatives of Soham Town Council also attended the Matter 2 Examination Hearings to corroborate this view. The emerging Local Plan relies upon the early adoption of the Government's draft standard housing methodology, or the continued use of the latest OAN, with the recovery of significant housing delivery shortfalls undertaken via the inappropriate 'Liverpool' method	We are not sure what this has to do with the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan. These arguments are a matter for the Local Plan Inspector to consider.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	The recently published Inspector's interim findings have confirmed that the use of the standard methodology is a sound approach, but only if applied to the whole housing market area. Therefore the Inspector has deemed that it is not appropriate for ECDC to continue to attribute significant weight to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Memorandum of Co-	Noted.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				operation (2013) and the Joint HMA Statement on Housing Redistribution (2017) in order to continue to discount the district's housing figures. As such, the district's needs, as calculated by the new standard method, must be solely catered for within East Cambridgeshire.	
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	In view of these findings and the resulting additional 1,125 dwellings which now need to be provided for within the district, the submitted spatial strategy for East Cambridgeshire and the limited role of sustainable Large Village settlements, is unsound and must be reconsidered to allow for the provision of further sustainable development. A pre-requisite action by the Council must therefore be to revisit its existing emerging allocations to ensure that the dwelling yield is appropriate and optimised in accordance with the requirements of the new NPPF.	Noted. This is a matter for East Cambridgeshire and their emerging Local Plan.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	In this respect, Paragraph 123 of the revised NPPF states: "Where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site".	Noted. The requirement to optimise site densities should not be the sole consideration in determining the suitability of a proposal, as noted elsewhere in the NPPF.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	Policy NP5 of the SDNP allocates land East of Garden Close for 25 new 'low density' homes, however the submitted application (ECDC Reference: 18/01053/OU) demonstrates that 53 dwellings can be suitably accommodated within the site whilst not having any adverse impact on the wider area. It is clear the proposals represent sustainable development in a known sustainable location and therefore any impacts of a higher number of dwellings are not considered significant and demonstrable enough to outweigh the significant benefits. This is demonstrated by the attached illustrative Masterplan which forms part of the re-submitted application for Sutton.	Noted. The requirement to optimise site densities should not be the sole consideration in determining the suitability of a proposal, as noted elsewhere in the NPPF. As noted in the 2012 NPPF (against which the Neighbourhood Plan will be examined), sustainable development has, three strands. Environmental, Economic and Social sustainability. Sustainability is not just about maximising the amount of housing that a village should accommodate, but also ensuring that the environment and social infrastructure can accommodate such growth. The Neighbourhood Plan demonstrates a rounded sustainable growth as required by the NPPF.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	To avoid the SDNP rapidly becoming out of date the Parish Council must basically plan for more sustainable growth in Sutton. The submitted proposals will use the site area more efficiently in line with new national guidance and will provide a significant further sustainable yield of new housing on a site which is already identified and supported for new residential development.	East Cambridgeshire District Council has not objected to the amount of housing proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	Failure of DNP to Contribute to the Achievement of Sustainable Development	Noted.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				With regard to achieving sustainable development, this basic condition has not been complied with, as the SDNP lacks any ambition and seeks only to mirror the limited growth policies of the emerging Local Plan. This is evident in the SDNP Vision and Objectives where reference to any future housing growth beyond the existing allocations fails to be mentioned. Whilst the SDNP seeks to ensure that new development is supported by essential community infrastructure, this approach does not constitute sustainable development in its wider sense and is not consistent with the above basic condition.	The requirement to optimise site densities should not be the sole consideration in determining the suitability of a proposal, as noted elsewhere in the NPPF. As noted in the 2012 NPPF (against which the Neighbourhood Plan will be examined), sustainable development has, three strands. Environmental, Economic and Social sustainability. Sustainability is not just about maximising the amount of housing that a village should accommodate, but also ensuring that the environment and social infrastructure can accommodate such growth. The Neighbourhood Plan demonstrates a rounded sustainable growth as required by the NPPF.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	Essentially as new growth generates economic stimulus, any impacts arising from further growth can be mitigated at source via the use of CIL and S106 obligations, particularly in areas which are identified as viable, such as Sutton. These negative presumptions are carried forward into the main body of the SDNP which recognises that growth is required in Sutton but focuses on the fact that this is only to be 'limited growth'. As such the SDNP only provides for only 275 new homes between two sites, including additional potential infill and windfall sites between 2017 to 2036 (19 years) within the settlement boundary.	East Cambridgeshire District Council has not objected to the amount of growth planned in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	When evaluating the past and projected growth of Sutton, the adopted Local Plan (April 2015) states that Sutton has approximately 1,680 dwellings of which a total of 342 dwellings were built in the 12 year period between 2001-2013. In comparison, taking into account the 19 year period in the SDNP between 2017 to 2036 and the planned growth of only 275 homes, it is evident that this is considerably less growth than what has already previously been achieved in Sutton. It should be noted that from 2008, the district was in the grip of a national economic recession which considerably suppressed housing growth in the earlier ten year period. Accordingly, it is somewhat disingenuous to suggest that the annual growth rate should be 20% less in the years between 2017 and 2036 when considerably higher levels of growth took place in the preceding decade and under much more onerous economic conditions.	The Neighbourhood Plan will not be examined on whether it is "disingenuous" but upon whether it meets the Basic Conditions as set out in the Regulations. We are satisfied that the Plan does meet the Basic Conditions.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	In contrast, Soham is required in the first five years of the emerging Local Plan to supply 1,075 dwellings or 215 dwellings p.a. Whilst Sutton will contribute only up to 300	Soham is not Sutton. Matters of viability of allocations and growth at Soham are a matter for the Local Plan Inspector to consider.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				<p>dwellings throughout the entire Plan period to 2036, or just 15 new dwellings per year. Despite its clearly acknowledged lack of viability, the expected housing contribution from Soham is therefore nearly 2,100 dwellings in the Plan period or seven times that of Sutton. As such, the acceptance of such low levels of growth in the Sutton DNP is not indicative of a Neighbourhood Plan which intends to contribute to achieving sustainable development.</p>	
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	<p>The Opportunity for Additional Sustainable Development in Sutton</p> <p>Policy LP3 of the emerging Local Plan recognises Sutton's status as a 'Large Village'; i.e. having a population of over 1,500 and containing a wide range of services and facilities to meet daily needs. This includes a primary school, good employment opportunities and good public transport. Sutton therefore plays a key service role for its rural hinterland as stated in the Local Plan. As recognised by the SDNP, the emerging Local Plan proposes to allocate a strategic 17 hectare extension to the existing Elean Business Park which lies north of Sutton of which 18 hectares of the park is already predominately developed. Once fully developed the Business Park will total 35 hectares. The Business Park is one of the five strategic employment sites in district and the second largest area for employment in East Cambs.</p>	The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the role of Elean Business Park and seeks to add value to the emerging Local Plan policy to ensure that there remains a sustainable balance of homes, jobs and services in Sutton.
10	Steven Kosky	Endurance Estates	N	<p>Taking into consideration the planned major expansion of the nearby Business Park this will inevitably further enhance the sustainability of Sutton. However, although there will be a major planned boost in local employment opportunity and sustainability, the role of Sutton and its growth targets within the emerging Local Plan are heavily constrained in comparison with nearby Soham. Notwithstanding, these targets can and should be revisited by the SDNP. In the light of the Gladman Decision and further endorsed by the Inspector's need for the Council to find an additional 1,125 new homes. Therefore to avoid the SDNP quickly becoming out of date, the Parish Council must take the initiative and plan for more sustainable growth in Sutton. In particular, considering existing allocations to make optimal use of the development potential of each site, notably the Site proposed by Endurance.</p>	East Cambridgeshire District Council has not objected to the amount of growth planned in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	N	Too Many	Number set at 25 to align with emerging local plan
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y	But must be low rise to protect views and a maximum of 25 homes	None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		None required.
22			N		None required.
23			N		None required.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	The Development Envelope Proposals Map includes the area designated as NP5 & at present is allocated for residential development. Development envelope designation takes account of the surrounding land & this site bears no relationship to the adjoining land to the north, east & south & therefore should not be included in the envelope. The site sits in countryside & this has been identified as countryside in previous Local Plan documents. The site relates well to the recreation ground & also gives wonderful views up to the Conservation Area, St Andrews Church & listed buildings in Station Road. There has been no change in the nature of this site to warrant its inclusion into the development envelope. It is noted by East Cambs that 'Isle character and imposing church tower most obvious when viewed from outside village.' 'Views of the church from the surrounding fen to the south should be protected.' The site has been identified in the Draft East Cambs Local Plan, however the Plan has not yet been formally adopted. A hearing will be held this month. Is this proposed allocation justified & appropriate? (see comments above re development envelope)	Sutton has been identified as a location for further growth by East Cambridgeshire District Council due to the levels of services and facilities available in the village or capable of being provided. The adopted Local Plan already identifies a large amount of growth for Sutton that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot go against. In assessing suitable sites for development, consideration has been given to potential impact on the historic and natural environment and the deliverability of sites. The number of houses proposed on this site has been pegged at 25 dwellings despite the developer seeking to construct in excess of twice as many on an enlarged site that extends further south into the countryside.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	N	Too many single storey dwellings already built down steep hills in the village, unsuitable for mobility impaired and elderly and would potentially increase need to drive out of top of Lawn Lane which is already a dangerous junction, given the number of vehicles parking in contravention of the Highway Code.	Site is already identified in the local plan, single storey dwellings are identified to be in keeping with neighbouring properties and to preserve views.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	N	Well, it's my back yard, and I'm a NIMBY, so of course I don't want it. But if it has to happen, then, as you say, it really must be single-storey. The majority of the surrounding development	Interpreted as agreement that if site is identified for development the details in the policy are supported.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				is single-storey, and at around 15 dwellings per hectare, not the 35dph that Endurance are trying to stuff in. Traffic is a real problem. 25 bungalows suggests a preponderance of people who aren't, let's say, commuting to/from work morning and evening. 53 "family" houses, by contrast, will put huge amounts of traffic onto the high street at peak times; causing further congestion down the single-track pinch points around the church at the junction with station road, and along the long single-track leapfrog stretch between the pharmacy and the junction with the brook. Madness. Oh, and add in horses, we're an equestrian village... There's also a major privacy issue (Human Rights and 2010 Equalities Act) at the top left corner of SUT.H2, which means the site may legally have to be restricted anyway.	
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident	N	For the sake of 25 houses this pleasant green area will be destroyed forever.	The site is already identified in the emerging local plan, this policy seeks to put constraints on any development
29	G		N	Insufficient constraints put in place to protect existing service infrastructure (roads, sewage, water supply, telco, electricity, schooling, surgery, a&e consideration)	The more detailed aspects regarding infrastructure would need to be added in any detailed planning application. The service providers have not objected to the allocation during consultation on the draft Plan.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	N	Why is this new application here. Will any new low volume builds be listed together to show the cumulative effect in relation to this. The residents of the area are unhappy access is terrible and the extra noise will be significant.	The site is already identified in the emerging local plan, this policy seeks to put constraints on any development
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y	Why not?	None required.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y		None required.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	N	This was the least favoured of four sites for local development as evidenced by residents in 2015. Is this not on meadowland? In which case development should be refused (see 7.6)	The site is already identified in the emerging local plan, this policy seeks to put constraints on any development
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y	the developer's proposal for 53 dwellings is far too much and where will there be safe access to the high street for so much more traffic? The preferred development of 23 single story properties would still cause problems for traffic entering the high street. Parking in the Oats Lane area of the high street would have to be reconsidered.	Detailed traffic issues would be addressed as part of any planning application
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y		None required.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	N	Strongly object and will oppose any development here. This is a lovely peaceful area of Sutton, with views to the church and across the fields. Any development here will drastically degrade the quality of life for existing residents.	The site is already identified in the emerging local plan, this policy seeks to put constraints on any development including the protection of views.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y	Probably the better of all the sites available.	None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y	This is a good area and as it is only 25 Dwellings, that should be sufficient. Anymore dwellings in our village will be detrimental to the environment, peace and village life.	None required.
52			N	Much too vague to back.	The policy provides an appropriate level of detail in order to guide and influence the content of detailed planning applications for the site.
Policy NP6 Lane North of Millfield, Mepal Road.					
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident	N	I am unhappy with the word 'predominantly', surely ALL the properties should be single storey	Appears to be a comment t NP5 not NP6
3	Jon Megginson	Resident		No Comments	None required.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	N	Who wants to live right beside the very busy A142. No thought for quality of life of residents.	None required.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
6					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				None required.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	N	See item 4 for comments	Land already has outline planning permission and is currently not agricultural
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	N	Too Many	Land already has outline planning permission
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		None required.
22			N		None required.
23			N		None required.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	N	Too close to A142	Land already has outline planning permission
26	Peter Wood	Resident	N	Another one up there? Mepal road's gonna get very busy! Sure we don't want to lobby to re-instate the A142 junction...?	Land already has outline planning permission
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident	N	This area provides screening from the A142	Land already has outline planning permission
29	G		N	Insufficient constraints put in place to protect existing service infrastructure (roads, sewage, water supply, telco, electricity, schooling, surgery, a&e consideration)	Land already has outline planning permission
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	N	Needs to be thought out more clearly with the infill as well large use of local services we don't have. Public transport to village is terrible so more cars to much	Land already has outline planning permission
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y		None required.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	Assume this site will be "affordable" homes ?!	None required.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y	the pproposed development of 10 dwellings should not pose too many problems	None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	N	Too many houses.	Land already has outline planning permission
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	Y		None required.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	N	Far too close the A142	None required.
Policy NP7 Housing Mix					
		East Cambridgeshire District Council		The policy seeks to encourage the development of a mix of house types and sizes, particularly through the development of two-bedroom houses and housing which meets the needs of an ageing population. It is noted that the supporting text provides some description of Sutton's current housing stock. However, Sutton Parish Council should prepare an evidence report which demonstrates that the policy is necessary and justified.	It is not considered that a separate evidence report is necessary to support this policy. Sufficient evidence is illustrated in the supporting text.
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident	N	I do not think mixed housing works very well, go round any new housing development and you will find that the lower end housing will not take the same responsible care as the more expensive houses. Thus degrading the whole development	This response appears to be objecting to the location rather than the inclusion of affordable housing, which is not directly addressed in NP7.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	Would have liked to see emphasis on genuine low cost housing for rent in the mix	The Local Plan contains policies for the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs and is promoting the establishment of Community Land Trusts in order to retain such housing in perpetuity.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y		None required.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y	Need to ensure housing available for village youngsters to be able to afford. Also adequate provision for elderly to downsize. Many of existing bungalows are on hill slopes which is not easy for elderly and disability	This is in line with the aim of the policy.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				
11	Allen Marking	Resident	N	No retirement homes being constructed.	Not clear why the respondent is disagreeing with the policy as it identifies the need for homes suitable for older residents for downsizing.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y	Affordable housing is key, even then prices are too high for many	In accordance with the policy.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		No reason given for objection.
22			N		No reason given for objection.
23			N		No reason given for objection.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	There must be actual evidence to support the development of 2 bedroom houses. The statements seem to be conjecture & assumption & not a matter of fact.	Paragraph 8.11 refers to the 2011 Census results that identify Sutton has a smaller proportion of two-bedroomed homes when compared with other Larger Villages.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	N	Well done, we lack downsize-type housing. However, you're missing a trick. The densities that are being proposed for the new developments - 35 dwellings per hectare for example in Endurance's latest go - mitigate against gardens. You get a postage stamp to light your barbie, and that's about it. This is a rural village with poor public transport. We're not a city, we don't have pubs and clubs and restaurants and cinemas and nightclubs and so on. People say in. Some people like to garden. There's plenty of evidence that Gardening is good for mental health. Why roll over and allow these urban developers to inflict 35dph on us, in the name of "efficiency?" Why not stand up and say that in villages, houses need gardens. People choose to live in a village 'cos they want a village life. Is it - patronisingly - not "allowed" that people should want to have a modern efficient house *and* a garden? Is gardening now to be the preserve only of the rich or those who want to live in old houses? I could go on... :-)	The NPPF requires that land is used efficiently and that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot contradict this requirement.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident	Y	The emphasis must be on low cost affordable housing to meet the needs of the mature population and the young who need to have the opportunity to get on the housing ladder.	Broadly in line with the policy as defined.
29	G		N	Affordable to whom.?	Affordable housing is officially defined in Annex 2 to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	N	Already affected by this. 2 houses at fieldgate overlook us but we were not consulted. The street lights shine in our garden at night and have destroyed our peace with extra noise. We have also lost significant trees for the birds and were blocking noise etc. We used to live in a peaceful close now we are penned in by city scapes.	Noted. None required.
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y	Must be a good mix of homes. Small as well as large.	None required.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	I think that there should be an attempt to FORCE the sale & development of two "ugly" sites, namely on High St opposite York Road and vacant site in Pound Lane. Comments please?	This is not something that can be addressed through a planning policy.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	N	Social/council housing needs to be separately developed from private, owner-occupier housing	The segregation of different types of housing tenure is not appropriate.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y	Good to have a mix of houses	Support for policy.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	Y		None required.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	y		None required.
52			N	Much to vague to say is ok.	No specific feedback as to which aspects of the policy are too vague.
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		Policy NP7 states that housing development must contribute to meeting the needs of the village and that planning proposals will be supported where development provides a mix of housing types and sizes that reflects the needs of local people, particularly in the need for two bedroomed dwellings as well as the needs of an ageing population looking to downsize into homes suitable for lifetime occupation. Whilst our client recognises the need for development proposals to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and	Noted. However, the requirement of the policy seeks to address the particular local needs for two-bedroomed dwellings, for which there is evidence of a shortfall of current provision.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				sizes, the final mix for a particular development site would ultimately be subject to negotiation between the Local Planning Authority and Applicant, in line with the most up to date, available, local evidence, unless viability or other material considerations show a robust justification for a different mix. This is reflected in Policy LP6 of the emerging Local Plan and the preamble to the policy which advises, at paragraph 4.3.2, that <i>'developers will be encouraged to bring forward proposals which will, in overall terms, secure the market and affordable housing mix as recommended by the most up to date SHMA. This housing mix is however not prescriptive, and is intended to allow developers to respond to demand and site specific characteristics/circumstances. However, unless financial viability indicates otherwise, the guidance on mix in the most up to date SHMA will be the starting point for discussion.'</i>	
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		The restrictions being placed on new development under Policy NP7 must accord with national and local policy and must also provide reasonable scope for flexibility so as to not compromise delivery.	Noted. It is not considered that the restrictions will compromise delivery
	Alison Wright, Bidwells	Linden Homes		<p>In summary, Linden Homes Midlands are in principle supportive of the objectives of the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan but make the following constructive objections which are provided to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan satisfies the Basic Conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reference to provision of land for allotments within the concept plan for Policy NP4 (Figure 1) should be removed; • Within Policy NP4, the number of dwellings should be increased from 'up to 250 homes' to 'up to 427'; • Restrictions placed under Policy NP7 must accord with National and Local policy and should ensure that it does not present onerous requirements for future developments within the Parish. <p>Linden Homes Midlands would like to be notified of future progress with the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted. It is not considered that the amendments required are necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to meet the Basic Conditions.
Policy NP8 Preserving the Historic Characters of Sutton					
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y		None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
6					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky		N	Please see attached statement	Comments addressed elsewhere in the Consultation Statement
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
22			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
23			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	Appendix 2 Lists all the buildings of historic interest together with colour photos & takes up 6 pages of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. This subject seems to be given a greater importance than other Policies of the DNP. The information is already on the District Council's website & can be easily accessed. I therefore think that reference to the EDCDC register could be included in Appendix 2 & thereby reduce the contents & extent of Appendix 2, which would give a better balance to the Plan.	Given that the information is of specific relevance to Sutton, it is considered appropriate to include it in the Neighbourhood Plan in order that it is not overlooked.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y		None required.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident	Y		None required.
29	G		Y		None required.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	Y		None required.
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y	Providing the so called "historic" buildings are worth preserving !!	None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	Providing the buildings & areas are kept in good state of repair & appearance. This policy should NOT include the preservation of the existing Village Signs - "Village of the year 2002 " !! This sign is outdated & a cause of ridicule from residents & visitors. Comments please ?	There is no reference in the policy to the preservation of signage. The focus of the policy is buildings.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y	Would prefer the word "enhance" as opposed to "preserve" in terms of the historic core in last clause of policy. Preservation is only attained if a degree of enhancement compensates for natural wear and tear.	Agree. Policy has been amended to require proposals to demonstrate how they protect and enhance the historic character and assets.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y	This is very important. The character of the village needs protecting. There are some fine old buildings to preserve.	None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y	Though all new houses being built don't seem to fit the historic nature. Could more be done for future house builds to have more old character?	Copying the style and materials of historic buildings in new development can actually detract from the quality of the original buildings. It is sometimes more appropriate to provide a contemporary design that is more reflective of its time rather than introduce pastiche.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	y	Sutton has a fantastic range of historic architecture, and this needs to be recognised and preserved.	None required.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y	But this policy should not preclude the use of good quality modern architectural and environmentally friendly solutions to the Housing and Built Environment in and around Sutton. Indeed this should be encouraged rather than perpetuate the use of plagiarise pastiche architecture that currently is the developers norm.	Agree. The policy only applies to those specific areas identified on the Proposals Map.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	y		None required.
52				Ridiculous attempt to get a mandate for anything that they fancy in the future.	None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy NP9 Protecting existing services and facilities					
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		Make sure the building companies make worthwhile contributions to Suttons facilities – not just promises we want definite plans	This is addressed through CIL payments and the contributions coming to the Parish Council will rise from 15% to 25% in relation to appropriate developments after the adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	N	Far too late re services and facilities, compare to village amenities circa 1980's.	None required.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				None required.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
22			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
23			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	Bus services have recently been reduced & yet are a valued service to the community - not only to Sutton residents, but also residents of neighbouring villages who would wish to access facilities in Sutton - eg Doctors' surgery. Perhaps other Parish Councils could join together with Sutton to put pressure on to retain & improve this service? Services & infrastructure should not be limited to children & youth facilities, but also reflect the needs of older residents. (community action 3)	The policy does not limit itself to children and youth facilities. The suggestion on bus services would need to be a Community Action, it cannot be addressed through a planning policy.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y		None required.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident			None required.
29	G		N	As above	None required.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	Y	Need review rather than preserve as not working for residents and need to be viable usable	The policy would in practice result in a review.
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y	Encourage the continuance of good bus services.	This matter cannot be addressed through a planning policy, who require a Community Action.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	Hopefully the new COOP shop will be built soon to provide competition to existing shop, and to reduce the parking problems in the High Street.	None required.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y	This is vital for the inhabitants of Sutton. We need a better bus service and another public house to give more opportunities for socialising. The existing medical facilities will need to be increased in line with the present proposal for extending the surgery.	None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y	Additional retailers need to be encouraged to serve number of proposed housing, GP surgery extended and public transport is a must to be improved currently very poor.	None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y		None required.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	y		None required.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	y		None required.
52			N	Again, what exactly are the characteristics?	Comment unclear, no response.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy NP10 Elean Business Park					
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y		None required.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd	N	Camro has planning permission with first phases implemented through construction of a major electricity substation. The data campus is a nationally significant project and the Camro team is working with the Department for International Trade to promote the site for inward investment as well as with East Cambs Council and the Combined Authority.	Noted. The Parish Council welcomes the significant contribution that Camro makes to the local economy
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd	N	My clients support the overall objectives of your Plan and welcome policies which are supportive of business development for the former airfield, however, policies NP3 and NPI0 appear to seek to constrain business development save for small business units. In my view these policies would benefit from further consultation and improved clarity.	Policy NP10 encourages the provision of small business start-up units on the Business Park.
					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y	Concerns about safety of pedestrians and cyclists getting to Elean to work. A142 extremely busy and will only get worse. No easy, economic, solution	None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				None required.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y	But what an eyesore coming out of the village..no landscaping new silos and noise at night!!! Aweful...good example of how not to do it!	Comment references the existing development rather than new development.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
22			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
23			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	Any further buildings at the Elean Park should be designed & landscaped so as not to adversely impact on the setting of Sutton & the surrounding area. Some of the existing buildings & landscaping are extremely visually intrusive - it is recognised that residential development should be appropriate to the area, but little importance has been paid to commercial buildings - as can be seen now.	This is a matter that is addressed in the development design policies of the Local Plan and it is therefore not necessary to repeat it in the Neighbourhood Plan.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y		None required.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident			None required.
29	G		N	As Above	None required.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident		What is the policy	None required.
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y	Businesses currently located in the village (eg on The Row & on The Brook) could possibly be encouraged to move to outer-village sites, which might release land for housing development.	Difficult to encourage through a planning policy.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	Encourage this long overdue development and encourage more local businesses to move there.	Difficult to encourage through a planning policy.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y		None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y		None required.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	y	Local employment and easy access to this location is essential	None required.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required.
52			N	Doesn't go far enough.	No explanation of how the policy should be extended.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
Policy NP 11 Retail Premises					
		East Cambridgeshire District Council		Policy NP11 indicates that the existing 'centre' is identified on the 'Proposals Map'. It is not wholly clear from the map which notation applies to NP11, as it is not shown in the map key. For clarity, the key should be amended.	The map key includes the Village Centre annotation and references the Policy number.
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	N	This when I read it means that the plan does not want to see shop development of Co-op at entrance to village. I do want to see this please	This is not the intention of the policy. The development of the Co-Op has already been given planning permission and the neighbourhood plan cannot revoke this permission.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y		None required.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
6					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				None required.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
22			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
23			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y		None required.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident			None required.
29	G		Y		None required.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	N	What is it	
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y		None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	see previous comment.	None required.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y	I would add that this requires a link to Policy NP8 so that any new or extended shops or services have no adverse effect on the historic characteristics of the village.	This is implicit in NP8.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y	There is a proposal for a Co-op store, but we have heard nothing more about this recently. More shops would be a great asset, but would need careful assessment of need. Local shopping for those without transport would be desirable	The Co-Op development already has planning permission and the neighbourhood plan cannot revoke this permission.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y	Incentivise new retailers to serve the new enlarged community	None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y		None required.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	y		None required.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required.
52			N	Much too vague.	No details given of the objection or what should change.
Policy 12 Sport and Recreation facilities					
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident		Reference here should be made to the need to expand sports facilities as population grows with additional housing. Certainly we should safeguard not losing any but we should be clear that there is not enough at present.	NP4 includes the expansion of sports facilities. NP12 addresses the safeguarding of existing facilities.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y	Make new areas dog-free.	This would need to be addressed as a Community Action.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
6					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				None required.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident		Need to get the right mix of new facilities maybe further consultation with young people in particular is needed	None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
22			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
23			N		No reason given for the objection or what should change.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	The cricket field should be designated as a local green space. (see above NP1)	Addressed in the response to NP1.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	N	As the parent of a disabled child living on The Row, I can say that there is absolutely nothing in this village that you could call accessible. It would be good to see at least some aspiration to provide something a little bit closer than Stirling Way!	No changes proposed but the request is noted.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident			None required.
29	G		Y		None required.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	N	Need full independent review	This cannot be addressed through a planning policy.
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y	The Stirling Way play area certainly needs improvement.	This is something the Parish Council is already addressing.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	ref (b) - I have often thought that the land called the "Great Spinney" at the top of Bury Lane, would make a beautiful parkland for the village, possibly to replace or additional to the old rec. Is this privately owned & by whom ? It is only used for occasional grazing. Any comments?	This land is in private ownership, it is not public land.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y	The more the better.	None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y		None required.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	y		None required.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required.
52			N	Too many get outs here.	Not clear what changes are being requested.

Community Actions Comments

Community Action 1 – The parish council will work with Sutton Conservation Society to create an informal nature reserve on the old recreation ground.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
1	K Collard	Resident		The Old Rec is Poors Land Property. A small portion of which was sold/leased to Sutton pc. This main area of the field is rented by Sutton PC. Permission would need to be sought from the poors land before any development.	Agreed, the Parish Council would have to agree any changes with the Poors Land Charity.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	Very much in agreement with this and look forward to action rather than more words	None required.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y	Just hooliganism now as compared to past.	None required.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
6					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y	Very much like this idea	None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				None required.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y	The recreation ground itself cannot be landscaped or planted without the permission of Sutton Poor's Land Charity.	Agreed, the Parish Council would have to agree any changes with the Poors Land Charity.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		None required.
22			N		None required.
23			N		None required.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	Not just the Sutton Conservation Society (which does a great job), but also welcome other conservation bodies which could give help & support to protect the environment & biodiversity.	None required.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y		None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident			None required.
29	G		N	There is no need for a formal recreation area. Let it be, it works as it is.	None required.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	N	Need more professional organisation with better liability insurance and good quality management procedure. We have had enough of half measure need proper organised plan especially with increased population	None required.
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y		None required.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	Shame that the new saplings planted there were not cared for & have died.	None required.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y	Presumably will need to work with the owners of the land too i.e. Poorsland?	Agreed, the Parish Council would have to agree any changes with the Poors Land Charity.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y		None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y		None required.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	y	Excellent idea, fully support this	None required.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required.
52			N		None required.

Community Action 2 – The Parish Council will work with the County Council’s Rights of Way officer to promote existing and new permissive access to provide several circular routes for walkers out into the surrounding countryside from the village

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	N	The missing ingredient here is PC <u>must</u> work with the landowners as well as R.O.W officer	Agreed. The Community Action ahs been amended to include reference to landowners
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y	Consider how to link village to Guided Busway at Willingham. That would be a huge plus point.	This would be difficult to achieve as this extends well beyond the Parish and Neighbourhood Plan boundary.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
6					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				None required.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		None required.
22			N		None required.
23			N		None required.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	Who will maintain these access routes?	Maintenance responsibilities would need to be agreed between the Parish Council and the County Council as for existing rights of way.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y	Truly excellent idea.	None required.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident			None required.
29	G		Y		None required.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	Y	Wheelchair access and better access and surfaces in village more important as need to get to footpaths	Agree. The Community Action has been amended in order to recognise the need for existing paths to be improved, where necessary

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y		None required.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	These should be advertised appropriately. (signage, leaflets etc)	The Parish Council would work with the County Council on signage and leaflets.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y		None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y		None required.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	y		None required.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required.
52			N		None required.

Community Action 3 – Play areas and youth facilities – The Parish Council will seek to identify a location for new equipped youth recreation facility in the village and to enhance the Stirling Way play area for juniors and toddlers.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y		None required.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y		None required.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
6					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				None required.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y	Please sort out the state of the existing park first. It's dangerous and a joke!!!!	The Parish Council has recently been successful in obtaining a grant of £57,241 towards improvements to the existing play area.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y	Need to site youth facilities in locations which will minimise the disturbance to nearby homes	None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		None required.
22			N		None required.
23			N		None required.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	Ensure that there is sufficient evidence to justify the provision & continued maintenance of the facilities.	Fields in Trust's benchmark guidelines for outdoor sports an play areas have been used to identify the current shortfall in provision.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y	Yes, see comment above about inaccessibility from The Row. Also, can we be sure to try to include something for disabled children? They (very) often get forgotten in the rush to put in exciting zip lines and so on...	An accessible roundabout is included in the current planned improvements. Further provision for disabled children will be considered.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident			None required.
29	G		Y		None required.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	N	Parish council have not been able to manage this properly historical ly	The Parish Council now has a Sports and Recreation working party to address these issues.
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y		None required.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	Sadly the evidence (around The Pavilion etc) suggests that the village youth are generally not capable of caring for the amenities that are currently available.	None required.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y	All such plans will be best validated by consultation with professionals working in these areas and the "customers".	None required.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y		None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	N	What about for older people as well?	Other actions, such as those relating to footpaths and the nature reserve, are more relevant to older people.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	y		None required.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required.
52			N		None required.

Community Action 4 – The Parish council will continue to lobby for weight restrictions to prevent HCV traffic using the B1381 as a short cut to and from the A14 and instead to use the Freight Advisory Routes.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y	Lorries start coming through from around 3.30am.	None required.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
6					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y	absolutely	None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y	Absolutely essential to have a weight limit to stop lorries rat-running through Sutton	None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		None required.
22			N		None required.
23			N		None required.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	In particular, the bend at the Church Lane/High Street corner is unsuitable for articulated lorries & there should be weight restrictions to ensure that these vehicles do not attempt to negotiate this corner. Evidence of the problem can be seen by damage to the Churchyard Wall.	None required.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y	A fine and noble goal, but how to achieve anything....?	None required.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident	Y		None required.
29	G		Y		None required.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	Y	Getting impatient	None required.
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y		None required.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y		None required.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y		None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y	Definitely, far too many dangerously large vehicles using the B1381	None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y	What about getting the mud road near Lees packaging plant instated as a formal road? This would take all the tractors and lorries out the village which makes a massive difference at harvest and sewing time.	This is a matter the Parish Council has raised previously when planning applications have been considered by the district council for the Lees packing plant.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	y		None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required.
52			N		None required.

Community Action 5 – The Parish council will work with the County Council to reduce traffic speed and improve crossing points in the village.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	Particularly keen to see less speeding traffic between church and along High Street. There will be a nasty accident one of these mornings.	None required.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y	Agreed re crossing point. I note that generally drivers follow the 30mph speed limit. It is particularly late at night that I hear speeding motorbikes and cars.	None required.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
6					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				None required.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
21			N		None required.
22			N		None required.
23			N		None required.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	Strongly agree.	None required.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	N	Not in agreement with the proposal for change of priority at junction of The Brook (adj. Baptist Meeting House) and High Street. Traffic approaching the junction from The Brook could potentially crash into the buildings opposite Row Lane if approaching too fast and in any event will cause confusion to road users.	The specific proposal regarding a change in priority at the junction of The Brook and the High Street is not going ahead.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y	Well, as part of the new co-op at the roundabout, County have just approved a crossing that will kill people. Not our problem, they say, the easily foreseeable accidents will just be an "enforcement issue". And they're very happy to stick 53 family houses on H2 behind Garden Close, thus tipping more peak time traffic onto the high street. So your desire to work with them is a fine goal, but, erm, good luck with it...	None required.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident	Y		None required.
29	G		Y		None required.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	Y		None required.
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y	Support the Council's efforts to install new & more effective signage at ALL entrances to the village.	None required.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	Replace current signage at entrances to village to welcome careful drivers (see previous comment about "Village of 2002" !) Install speed indication signs, as now appearing in other local villages.	The Parish Council is looking to acquire a mobile vehicle activated speed indication sign to use on The America, High Street, The Brook and Ely Road.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y		None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y	Not so sure speed is the issue but size of vehicles using the village roads. Parking outside the village shop is fine I'm not sure what the comment about "clutter" refers to but complicating parking for shoppers doesn't seem a good use of precious money to me.	Community Action 4 is looking to reduce the number of larger vehicles driving through the village.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y	See answer to 17	None required.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	y	Yes, as long as speed humps/cushions are not planned. These are noisy and can damage cars. As a classic car owner these features can cause considerable damage to older vehicles. Flashing signs such as	None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				at the A142 entrance are great reminders to slow down. Speed along the high street is an issue, and can make getting out of lawn lawn difficult due to poor parking by the junction,	
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required.
52			N		None required.

Community Action 6 – The Parish Council will investigate ways to promote 'Sport for All' across all sections of the community, including consideration of suitable locations for new facilities.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No Comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No Comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	See my comments on NP12	None required.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y		None required.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd			None required.
6					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky				None required.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	Y		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		None required.
22			N		None required.
23			N		None required.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y		None required.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident			None required.
29	G		N	Make use of what you have first before you make further investments which just end up being eye sores	This is being considered by the Parish Council's Sports and Recreation working party.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	Y	Management by parish council has ben ineffectual to date	The Parish Council has established a Sports and Recreation working party to improve management.
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y	Would this include a revamp of the Parking Area & approach to the Pavilion? This area is requiring attention.	This could be considered.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y		None required.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y		None required.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y		None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y		None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y	But this needs to focus on all ages not just toddlers and juniors	None required.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	y		None required.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	Y		None required.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	Y		None required.
52			N		None required.

Overall, do you agree with the draft Neighbourhood Plan?

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
1	K Collard	Resident	Y	No comments	None required.
2	Jill Hardy	Resident		No comments	None required.
3	Jon Megginson	Resident	Y	It's a shame more not made of protecting remaining orchards in the village. The south facing slope of the whole village was once an orchard (Ref street names). This should be celebrated not ignored	It is difficult to protect orchards given that they are in private ownership and are not protected by preservation orders.
4	Krystna Bennet	Resident	Y	Except for the increase to 250 houses at west of Mepal Rd.	The emerging Local Plan also includes this allocation, the Neighbourhood Plan policies add more details about how any develop would occur.
5	Adams Group Real Estate	Lasercharm Ltd	N	Policies with regard to Employment are not appropriate as they fail to properly take account of existing and implemented planning permissions. The NP does not identify land where the stated objectives of the plan can be achieved which is an omission.	The Neighbourhood Plan identifies Elean Business Park for retention as employment land and promotes its further development.
6					None required.
7	S Bell	Resident	Y		None required.
8	C Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
9	B Browne	Resident	Y		None required.
10	Steven Kosky		N	Please see attached statement in relation to Local Plan allocation H2 Land Rear of Garden Close	Matters dealt with elsewhere in the Consultation Statement against individual sections of the Plan.
11	Allen Marking	Resident	Y		None required.
12	S Partington	Resident	Y		None required.
13	David W Harding OBE	Resident	Y		None required.
14	MIKE CHILD	Resident	Y		None required.
15	Katie waggitt	Resident	N		None required.
16	Margaret Richardson	Resident			None required.
17	Mark Inskip	Resident	Y		None required.
18	James Houghton	Resident			None required.
19	Brett Collard	Resident	Y		None required.
20	Doreen Ashpole	Resident	Y		None required.
21			N		None required.
22			N		None required.
23			N		None required.
24	Alison Harker	Resident	Y	1. The photos on the front & back of the NP do not relate to the special character of Sutton. These photos on could be of anywhere in the country. 2. The photos of the Sutton Village Vision showed the important character of Sutton - the Village Sign & the iconic view of the	The photograph on the front cover has been changed.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
				most spectacular building in the wider area - the Grade I Listed St Andrews Church, which can be seen from miles around. Well done & thank you to all those who have spent an enormous amount of time & effort in producing this document for the village.	
25	Carol Petchey	Resident	Y		None required.
26	Peter Wood	Resident	Y	They're not complete omissions, but the plan is very light on Traffic and on Housing Density. I've gone on about this in the preceding answers, but those are the two things that really stick in my mind as "missing". You've pulled your punches in 2 areas which are fundamental to quality of life in this village, whereas stuff about bicycles really isn't that important, living where we do with the public transport that we have...	There are limited opportunities to address traffic through Neighbourhood Plan policies but there are Community Actions dealing with traffic.
27	Fenella Weaver	Resident	Y		None required.
28	Mr Chris Drury	Resident	N	Whether my input is relevant I leave for you to consider. As I have stated earlier I believe Sutton is of sufficient size. People make the choice to live in a village rather than a busy town or city. The vast amount of proposed development in Cambs is unnecessary. Most of the proposed sites are green field destroying vast swathes of countryside and that does not include the Retail and Business parks. The roads are already congested. The South East is generally affluent and has full employment. This ludicrous political Govt project should be concentrating on the areas of the UK where investment is required where there are a multitude of brownfield sites and the developers have to earn their money.	The Neighbourhood Plan needs to be in accordance with the NPPF. It cannot address broader regional and national development issues.
29	G		N	I say no. The report is way too heavy and reading it, "fluffy" for anyone to take this as a serious proposal for the next what 30 years.....	No specific suggestions provided as to what should change to make the Neighbourhood Plan acceptable.
30	Ruth Brownless	Resident	N	Think it should be more accessible and understandable to residents especially ones without computers. Think you have mixed a lot of the villagers out of this	
31	Rosemary Trollope	Resident	Y	In general yes. hope you get a good response from a worthwhile percentage of residents!	None required.
32	Michael Trollope	Resident	Y	I thank & encourage all those involved.	None required.
33	Bob Harker	Resident	Y	My only concerns are mentioned in earlier comments. I would recommend that 1) development plans better reflect earlier consultations despite the emerging ECDC local plan. Especially as proposals to the north of village include material benefits to the village, unlike all other proposals. 2) Local sports clubs are vital and the Plan should be clearer in its support. 3) Transport is key for the elderly in the village and no mention is made of the poor public transport. Cycleways are not the answer for everything!	The Neighbourhood Plan must be in conformity with the Local Plan. The Plan protects existing sports facilities from being lost. The provision of public transport services is primarily a commercial decision made by bus operators.
34	David Smith	Resident			None required.

No.	Name	Group / Organisation	Agree Y/N ?	Comments	Neighbourhood Plan Response
35	Anthony and Eleanor Monk	Resident	Y		None required.
36	Mark McGowen	Resident	Y		None required.
37	Beverley Macleod	Resident	Y	If the plan does actually improve retail facilities, increase GP practice facilities/capacity, firmly address HGV use of village roads and improve public transport whilst retaining the village's character then I would hope the plan is very much a good thing.	None required.
38	Pierre Marx	Resident			None required.
39	Simon Tompkins	Resident			None required.
40	Liz	Resident	Y	The gault is not mentioned. Will this just continue as is? Can you help with traffic calming in the gault? Can you investigate the dirt road being turned into tarmac?	Properties in the Gault are identified on the Proposals map for policy NP8.
41	Simon Brewer	Resident	N	While there are many good thing in the plan, I do not agree to building more housing in Sutton where it would affect the quality of life for existing residents.	Sutton has been identified as a location for further growth by East Cambridgeshire District Council due to the levels of services and facilities available in the village or capable of being provided. The adopted Local Plan already identifies a large amount of growth for Sutton that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot go against. The Neighbourhood Plan does need to support and align with the housing growth requirements in the district's Local Plan.
42	Ben Cook	Resident			None required.
43	Paul Martin	Resident	Y		None required.
44	John Hayes	Resident			None required.
45	Jasmine Bullen	Resident			None required.
46	Bob Wright	Resident			None required.
47	Shelley Hall	Resident	N	A policy for the Brick Lane site in Mepal should be included. What evidence base is there to suggest that the housing does not contribute to Sutton's housing need? I am aware of many people migrating from Sutton to Mepal.	The Neighbourhood Plan working party chose not to include any specific policies for the Brick Lane site as no consultation feedback was given by Sutton residents and the site is immediately adjacent to Mepal village.
48	Jess Hill	Bidwells House			None required.
49	Terry Stoodley	Resident	Y		None required.
50	Brendan Goodjohn	Resident			None required.
51	Vanessa Osborne	Resident	N		None required.
52			N		None required.

