

Stutton Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

Stutton Parish Council



CONTENTS

PART 1

The Big Conversation - consultation in the village

Opportunities to get involved; what people told us; and how this has informed the Plan - initial responses and Pre-Submission Consultation responses

PART 2

Representations from statutory consultees and our responses

PART 3

Representations from residents and our responses

APPENDIX 1

Appendix 1: List of Statutory Consultees Notified of Reg 14 Pre-Submission Consultation



PART 1 THE BIG CONVERSATION

Creating opportunities for involvement

- 1.1 The Big Conversation, which started in September 2018, was an on-going series of events in the village designed to ensure that everyone who lives in Stutton could get involved in shaping the future of the village. It informed and guided the development of our Neighbourhood Plan, but we also looked more widely at how we can shape life within the village.
- 1.2 It was organised by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party. We held regular meetings (except during the first lockdown period), and continued to meet on zoom. Anyone was welcome to join or attend.
- 1.3 We chose an open consultation process, with the aim of creating depth and breadth, rather than using surveys to gather tick box responses.
- 1.4 We wanted to reach as many people as possible, acknowledging different levels of interest within the village. During the first stage of developing the Plan, we provided a total of 17 opportunities to get involved, including:
- consultation events in the Community Hall
 - a breakfast for local businesses and sole traders
 - 5 tea-party events held in different parts of the village
 - drop-ins at the village shop
 - a meeting with residents of extra care housing in the village
 - working with children from the village primary school
 - attending meetings held by village organisations, including the Annual Parish Council meeting.
- 1.5 During this first stage there were 397 attendances at consultation events, with about 96 people attending more than one event, which means that a total of 301 people were involved (277 aged over 16 and 24 children). This represents just under 40% of people aged over 16 in the village. A Housing Needs Survey was also included as a vital piece of evidence.

- 1.6 We used different methods to gather people's views: conversations - both one-to-one and in groups, a 'rant wall', feed-back forms, etc. We produced an early summary of the themes and emerging policies and held a lively drop in event (with lots of cake) in the Community Hall in September 2019.
- 1.7 From February 2019 to November 2021, nine Neighbourhood Plan newsletters were distributed to each house in the village. These kept residents informed of progress, and invited responses at all stages of our work. Regular updates were also provided in the village's bi-monthly newsletter, as well as via the village website, Twitter, Facebook and Next Door.
- 1.8 During the Pre-Submission Consultation (8th November - 20 December), we advertised the Plan widely within the village. This included a Newsletter to every household, banners at strategic points within the village, posters on lamp posts, and announcements (with links to our website) on the local Facebook, twitter and Next Door.
- 1.9 We held a lively drop-in on a Saturday afternoon in the Community Hall with mulled wine and mince pies, and placed copies of the plan in the Community Shop, the King's Head pub, the local hairdressers and in the Community Hall. People were able to take copies of the Plan away to read at their leisure. Feedback forms were provided and residents were also invited to respond via the village website. An audio summary of the Plan was also placed on the website.
- 1.10 Babergh District Council provided us with a list of 46 organisations from whom we also invited responses to the draft Plan, together with 5 local landowners. (See list at Appendix 1). The representations we received from some of these organisations and our responses are provided in Part Two of this Consultation Statement.



What village residents told us and how this has informed the Neighbourhood Plan

Stage One Responses

- 2.1 301 people were actively involved in consultation. We recorded 745 comments in total during the first stage of consultation. These fell into 7 main themes, 20 sub-themes (illuminating the headlines) and 79 micro themes which present the real nitty gritty. These can be viewed in full in our report [The Big Conversation](#) [add hyperlink].
- 2.2 The main themes raised by people involved in the various methods of consultation were:
- Infrastructure (roads, traffic, public transport, footpaths etc)
 - Housing and development
 - Community and village facilities
 - Ecological sustainability
 - Natural environment
 - Business and work
 - Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.3 Concerns about traffic and related issues were most mentioned by people (40%), followed by housing (20%). We received more comments about increasing and speeding traffic than any other issue followed by suggestions for different methods of traffic calming. Residents also commented on how difficult it is for pedestrians to move from one end of the village to another owing to narrow and sometimes non-existent pavements.
- 2.4 The most common comments about housing concerned the need for small and affordable housing, followed by comments about type of housing and design. The majority of responses received about housing accepted the need for future new development in the village as long as it was small houses and/or affordable.
- 2.5 Detail of comments received about these and other issues is contained in our earlier consultation report, [The Big Conversation](#).

301
people involved

745
comments

7
themes

Pre Submission Responses

- 3.1 Our extensive consultation while we were developing our ideas for the the Neighbourhood Plan meant that, when we presented it to the village at the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission stage, there was considerable support for the policies contained within it.
- 3.2 During the Pre-Submission consultation we received 25 formal feedback forms from local residents and held many conversations at the drop-in. The main messages were that people supported the Plan and the great majority said they were likely to support it at Referendum.



"This is an excellent plan which addresses key issues for the next few decades: more affordable housing to be built; encourage a more diverse population; more encouragement of walking and cycling and less traffic passing through."

"It's a very well thought out, comprehensive plan for the village. It deals with the main issues which affect the quality of life now and in the future. We feel proud of living in a village where people have come up with such a great plan, which celebrates what is good and at the same time embraces change to secure the future of the village in line with preserving nature and encourages active transport - less cars. What a beautiful document!!! In words as well as images."



- 3.3 There was support for the Plan's approach to housing development, in particular for keeping the village's boundaries distinct; a housing mix suitable for families and older people; and addressing infrastructure issues.



"I especially like the Plans regarding future development in the village with clear guidance about protecting the outskirts of the village so that Stutton remains a separate village"

"In favour of more houses, smaller, eg 2 bedroom - for people who want to downsize or for first-time buyers."

"I agree it is important to keep Stutton a distinct village, but allowing small developments of new housing to encourage younger people to move in (rent or buy). This is essential for the school to survive and to maintain a vibrant future for the village. Drains are clearly an issue that needs further investigation!"



3.4 As in the first stage of our consultation, increased traffic and the difficulties caused by inadequate pavements in the village were raised by a number of people. Policies SN17 and SN18 were developed in response to these concerns as were Community Actions 10, 11 and 13.



“Traffic calming is correctly identified as a key community action to follow - RHS and Alton Water massively increase traffic flow which needs managing”



“Quality of pavements is a real issue, as is the width in places.”

3.5 The Greenway proposal (Community Action 12) came from the first stage of our consultation and there was unsurprisingly considerable support for its inclusion in the Plan.



“Paramount importance SAFETY. It is not possible for people in wheelchairs or mobility scooters to get to the Community Hall or shop from the Holbrook direction in safety. I think the proposed GREENWAY from Alton Hall Lane to Bentley Lane, continuing along Woodfield Lane to the shop area, would provide a large part of the solution. Safety measures where it would cross Bentley Lane would be important. Much much safer for Oak House residents. Later stage could continue to Lewis Lane possibly. Children and prams safer too.”

“Love the idea of the Greenway and think it would be really beneficial to both young and old who struggle with the uneven path on the main road. Will also help join both halves of the village together.”



3.6 A number of people did, however, express concerns that the Plan did not adequately deal with the increasing volume of traffic in our village.



“The traffic gets ever heavier. I saw nothing in the plan that in reality offers a solution. In particular, the footpath at the west end of the village is often woefully inadequate and sometimes non-existent. This is dangerous for walkers.”

“Church Road needs some form of traffic calming, since the new houses have been built there is an increase in traffic and some residents in the surrounding area seem to have little regard for pedestrians.”



3.7 We did try to respond to residents' concerns about traffic and inadequate pavements when drawing up the Plan. However, we are limited in what the planning framework allows us to do. In addition, Suffolk County Council reminded us that, as the Highways Authority, they have set out their operational priorities and that the Parish Council “cannot have different priority in terms of maintenance”.

- 3.8 Six residents registered objections to specific aspects of the Plan and their concerns are summarised below together with our responses. Their full responses are included in Part 3 of this document.
- 3.9 **Objection** to the Site Options report and its assessment of site SNP3 as not suitable for allocation for development. A number of inaccuracies in the report were listed and it was requested these be corrected and the site identified as suitable for development.
- 3.10 **Our response:** We sent this feedback to the consultants who drew up the Site Options report on our behalf. They have amended their report and have re-assessed SN3 as "potentially suitable for allocation subject to specific local need for housing being demonstrated, the sites being identified as available, the settlement boundary being redrawn, and landscape issues being addressed in line with Local Plan policy". We have not, however, allocated the site for development. Our decision not to allocate any site for development was based on the fact that the 65 houses recently or currently being built meet the indicative housing allocation for Stutton as set out in the draft Joint Local Plan. These new developments also meet the need for affordable housing identified in the Housing Needs Survey.
- 3.11 **Objection** to the Settlement boundary and the fact that it goes through some people's gardens.
- 3.12 **Our response:** Our understanding is that Babergh District Council have drawn the Settlement boundary in this way in order to discourage 'back garden development' in the AONB. We do not propose to change the settlement boundary.
- 3.13 **Objection** to the naming of the Fringe Character Areas as it could be read that eg Crowe Hall and Manor Farm have authority over the land in these areas.
- 3.14 **Our response:** These names were chosen by the landscape architect who carried out the Landscape Study on our behalf. However, we have asked her to remove the names and this has been done and we have also removed them from the Plan.

- 3.15 **Objection** to the part of the Plan "that tries to change how people choose to heat, insulate, etc their own homes" (Community Action 15).
- 3.16 **Our response:** This objection refers to a Community Action rather than a planning policy although it does reflect government policies about encouraging energy efficiency and renewal sources of energy. We feel that we all have a responsibility to combat climate change.
- 3.17 **Objection** to designation of Quiet Lanes on the grounds that they shouldn't be drawn attention to as we "want to keep them secret".
- 3.18 **Our response:** This refers to a Community Action. Two Quiet Lanes have recently been designated in our village. The hope is that having a sign informing cars (particularly visitors to the area) that a lane is so designated will encourage them to drive more slowly and carefully.
- 3.19 **Objection** to the identification of site SNP1 as suitable for potential development on the grounds that "such a development would prejudice and significantly reduce the rural character of the village".
- 3.20 **Our response:** This site was assessed as potentially suitable for development (subject to certain conditions being met) by the consultants who were asked to carry out a Site Assessment report on our behalf. We have not allocated it as suitable for development.

PART 2 REPRESENTATIONS FROM STATUTORY CONSULTEES AND OUR RESPONSES

	General Comments	Our responses
Babergh DC	References to the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) are correct for the 2021 version. We suggest writing this as 'NPPF (2021)' rather than 'NPPF 2021' and being consistent with including the year or not.	The date is given the first time we refer to the NPPF. Subsequently we refer to NPPF without the date.
Babergh DC	Contents page would benefit from inclusion of page numbers.	This will be done at final layout stage.
Babergh DC	On the Contents pages, there is a duplication of Policy SN22 New and Expanding Businesses (page 6).	This will be done at final layout stage.
Babergh DC	Paragraph numbering should be restricted to explanatory and supporting text, leaving the policy text clear. This will require significant re-numbering. Also, be mindful of and update as necessary any paragraph cross-references.	This will be done at final layout stage.
Babergh DC	Be consistent in how you refer to the Joint Local Plan (JLP). In paragraphs 5.6 to 5.10 for example, you varyingly refer to it as the JLP, the submitted JLP, the draft Local Plan, and the draft Joint Local Plan. For clarity and consistency, use 'the JLP' or 'the emerging JLP'.	After the first use of the words Joint Local Plan it is followed by the notation JLP. JLP is used consistently throughout the documents thereafter.

	General Comments	Our responses
Babergh DC	The Plan contains several separate policy maps. Consideration should be given to creating a master Policies Map that combines all these elements in one place. Typically, it would sit at the end the Plan and, where appropriate, could use inset maps to aid clarity.	A master Policies map located at the end of the Plan has been included.
SCC*	*Suffolk County Council - A single "Policies Map" should also be created, consolidating each of these maps together to show the wider context of parish.	Single composite Policies map is now included.
Babergh DC	Where possible, every effort should be made to improve the quality of maps. For example, the keys to Map 3, Map SN12 and Map SN20 are unclear or are difficult to read.	Revisions to maps have been made to improve their quality.
SCC	Some of the maps are poor quality, and somewhat pixilated. In particular Map 3, Map 5, Map SN12, SN15, SN19, SN20, where it is very hard to read details. It is suggested to use images of a higher resolution, to ensure that features can be clearly seen.	Revisions to maps have been made.
Babergh DC	<p>We see that the settlement boundary at Map 2 differs slightly from the JLP (Nov 2021), most notably around the 'Land North of the Village Hall' scheme - where Map 2 excludes the informal recreation space identified in the planning application.</p> <p>At this stage, we would normally instruct you to amend all relevant NP maps to use the JLP boundary. However, we must now also consider recent decisions linked to the JLP examination where, as part of a wider remit, the Inspectors have asked this Council to prepare "up-to-date and robustly justified settlement boundaries reflecting commitments and allocations." [See: Core Doc G09 - Letter from Inspectors to BMSDC, 9 Dec. 2021]</p> <p>While this may not result in any significant change to the proposed JLP settlement boundary, with the probable exception of our now including the Hastoe scheme at Holbrook Road, it does present the Stutton NP Group with</p>	<p>The settlement boundary map has been amended.</p> <p>The settlement boundary included in the consultation draft has been changed to include two housing schemes: 6 houses on Holbrook Road which have been built and are now occupied; housing development currently under construction off Manningtree Road to the rear of the Community Hall, and the inclusion of the Parish Council's playing field adjoining.</p>

General Comments	Our responses
<p>the opportunity to propose a new settlement boundary through this Plan. That will need justification and it will require a conversation outside of this response.</p> <p>NB: In Map 2, we suggest dropping the word 'settlement' from 'New Settlement Developments.</p>	<p>In map 2 the word "settlement" has been removed from the key.</p>
<p>Babergh DC</p> <p>Add a title to map on page 8. We assume this should be 'Map 1 Stutton Neighbourhood Plan Area', as per the contents page.</p>	<p>Title will be added at layout stage</p>
<p>SCC</p> <p>The map on page 8 in the Introduction section does not have a label.</p>	<p>This the same point as above and has been rectified.</p>
<p>Suffolk Preservation Society</p> <p>Para 2.4 The JLP is now unlikely to be adopted until early 2023 (subject to change) and so almost certainly will not be adopted before the Stutton NP. You should re-word the last sentence in para 2.4 to reflect this.</p> <p>Suffolk Preservation Society (SPS) commented that is the only countywide amenity society dedicated to protecting and promoting the special historic and landscape qualities of Suffolk. We also represent the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England in Suffolk and work closely with parish and town councils and other bodies who share our objectives. As Neighbourhood Plans offer the opportunity for protecting or improving the heritage and landscape character of an area, SPS are supportive of plans being drawn up in Suffolk, particularly where they are centred on settlements such as Stutton distinctive by its architectural heritage and landscape quality.</p>	<p>That paragraph has been amended to reflect this comment.</p> <p>Noted</p>

General Comments

Our responses

Holbrook
Parish
Council

The Neighbourhood Plan is very well written. The structure is logical and it clearly shows a great deal of effort has been made to produce the regulation 14 draft.

A clear strength is the level of engagement with the local community at a number of informal consultation events. The plan also shows how much research has been conducted to understand the significant heritage assets in the village and important landscape features. The group have commissioned reports from AECOM and a landscape architect to provide robust independent evidence to justify the policies within the Plan.

The only area that might have given it more strength might have been a more structured parish questionnaire with quantifiable results to demonstrate the strength of opinion across the Parish.

Overall the Plan appears to be well-balanced and provides clear guidance for future development.

We wish you well for the next stages.

Holbrook Parish adjoins Stutton to the north east and east.

The comments are supportive of the plan.

The one negative comment was the suggestion that a structured parish questionnaire to deliver more quantifiable results would have been beneficial. At the outset this approach was not adopted as it was considered that more free flowing opportunities to engage would deliver a more valuable community response.

However, Holbrook PC does recognise that the level of community engagement was strong. The consultation approach adopted throughout the Plan's preparation has been able to provide a strong basis for gauging the opinions of the community. The consultation report provides quantifiable evidence to support the direction and detail of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Historic
England

Thank you for consulting Historic England about your plan. I enjoyed reviewing it, and was pleased to note the positive approach to conserving Stutton's local historic environment it contained. Please contact us if you have any specific queries, but otherwise we look forward to seeing the Regulation 16 Submission version and its adoption in due course.

No action required.

Chapter 5 Spatial Strategy

POLICY SN1

Our responses

Babergh
DC

The policy should be amended to make specific reference to the policies map after the reference to Map 2.

Policy amended to include this point.

Chapter 6 Housing

Our responses

SCC

In Section 6, SCC would also encourage a note relating to archaeology and development, in order to give clarity to developers for any future site:

“Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service advice that there should be early consultation with the Historic Environment Record (HER) and assessment of the archaeological potential of the area at an appropriate stage in the design of new developments. Suffolk County Council Archaeological service is happy to advise on the level of assessment and appropriate stages to be undertaken”.

Paragraph added: Suffolk Country Council Archeological Service advise that there should be early consultation with the Historic Environment Record (HER) and assessment of the archaeological potential of the area at an appropriate stage in the design of new developments. Suffolk Country Council Archeological Service is happy to advise on the level of assessment and appropriate stages to be undertaken.

POLICY SN2

Our responses

Babergh
DC

Amendments to policy suggested to avoid the use of 'smaller homes' which might be seen by developers as providing homes smaller than average build sizes.

The suggested rewording is included in the revised policy.

The addition of a sentence to encourage homes capable of adaptation:

In all new housing developments, the emphasis should be on providing 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom homes that reflect identified local needs, including homes for single people, couples and young families, or older generations wishing to downsize.

Any proposed housing mix must be justified by an up-to-date assessment of housing need and/or an explanation of site-specific circumstances.

Homes capable of adaptation are also encouraged.

	POLICY SN3	Our responses
Babergh DC	The first part of the policy should correctly refer to sites of <i>'ten or more dwellings or sites of 0.5ha or more'</i> , i.e., the NPPF definition of major development sites.	Policy amended to include this reference.
Babergh DC	The Council's Strategic Housing Team fully support any measure which enables us to seek more affordable housing and for this to be tenure blind but also offer a note of caution as on-site delivery may not always be feasible or practical. For example, 35% of 5 dwellings = 1 affordable home, which would not be picked up by a Registered Housing Provider. In such scenarios, a 'commuted sum' would be sought, which may or may not get spent in Stutton.	This first point clarifies what might be achievable. Whilst this point is understood it is not felt necessary to make any changes to the text of the plan.

Babergh
DC

In supporting text, the NP could helpfully seek to manage expectations around affordable housing delivery and, perhaps also include mention of the Community Land Trust as being one way that the supply of affordable housing could be boosted locally.

This comment is accepted and an addition to the text has been made in the Context and evidence section relating to affordable housing. It now reads:
During the course of drawing up and consulting on this Plan, interest has been expressed in a Community Land Trust as a way of meeting the need for affordable housing. This is therefore the subject of Community Action 4.

POLICY SN4

Our responses

Babergh
DC

This also replicates a policy that we have seen elsewhere. We are now recommending modifications to clarify where such housing could come forward, to better express the parish first approach, and to emphasise the need for would be applicants to have a pre-registered need:

1) Amend the first paragraph (i.e., 6.15) to read:

"...sites outside but adjoining or otherwise well related to the Settlement Boundary ..."

2) Amend the second bullet to read:

"is for people that have a registered housing need on the Councils Choice Based Letting Scheme (or any subsequent scheme) because they are unable to buy or rent properties in the village at open-market prices"

3) Amend the third bullet point to read:

"is offered in accordance with the local connection criteria set within the deed of nomination attached to the s106 legal agreement. In the first instance, this means to people with a demonstrated local connection to the parish. Where there is no parish need, a property should then be offered to those with a demonstrated need for affordable housing in neighbouring parishes."

These comments are accepted and the Policy has been amended to include the suggested changes.

POLICY SN5

Our responses

Babergh
DC

The policy intention is clear, but we remind you that, in a Written Ministerial Statement dated 25 March 2015, it is made clear that it is not appropriate for NPs to refer to any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction etc. of new dwellings. Policy SN5 is therefore contrary to national policy, would fail the general conformity test and should be deleted One option; which comes from the adopted Wilby NP (May 2021), is that in policy SN2 you might include a sentence that reads “Adaptable homes are encouraged.” Para’s 6.33 to 6.35 could, with some rewording, then remain as supporting text.

It is accepted that the policy wording must not conflict with national policy. The Policy has been rewritten to say to offer support and encouragement to deliver adaptable and adapted homes to meet the needs of people throughout their lifetime.

The supporting text has been appropriately reworded to reflect the policy position.

SCC

It is suggested that there could also be further considerations for the needs of residents who are living with dementia in the community, and the potential for making Stutton a “Dementia-Friendly” village. The Royal Town Planning Institute has guidance on Town Planning and Dementia, which may be helpful in informing policies.

Policy SN5 amended to include reference to RTPI guidance and supporting paragraph added.

POLICY SN6

Our responses

Babergh
DC

The positive impact that good design can have on an area cannot be underestimated but policy SN6 comes across initially as setting a very high bar that all development, regardless of scale and type, must reach. To allow some flexibility we suggest amending the third sentence to read: “*Appropriate to the scale of the proposal, applicants should be guided by the design principles [...] in Appendix 3 to this document.*”

The policy has been amended to include this point.

SCC SN 6 should be amended to read
“A proportion of parking should be provided on-street within any new developments, but is well designed, located and integrated into the scheme to avoid obstruction to all highway users or impede visibility.”

The salient point of this consultation comment has been acknowledged and the Policy now includes the following *“Follow Suffolk Guidance on Parking to ensure that new development does not exacerbate the issue of road and footway parking and to make provision for electric vehicle charging and cycle storage”*.

SCC SCC would recommend additional support for more sustainable modes of travel. This could include secure cycle storage spaces to be required as part of new housing development, and/or provisions for safer walking and cycling routes. Safe routes for walking and cycling are important to ensure the safety of residents of all ages, especially those that are very young or very old, and have mobility issues or are frail.

It should be noted that the design Guide section ref EN05 Storage seeks secured spaces for bicycles within all new residential developments.

Policy SN6 has been amended to include the following *“...and to make provision for ...cycle storage”*.

POLICY SN7

Our responses

Babergh DC See also our comment above on policy SN5. The Written Ministerial Statement) is also relevant here. For SN7 to meet the basic conditions, it will need to make it clear that '
This policy only applies to non-residential development”.

The key point here is that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot put forward policies that conflict with national policy - - which means we cannot apply a requirement to residential properties. We have therefore redrafted the policy to indicate that only support will be given rather than a requirement (which cannot be enforced).

SCC Policies SN7 (Renewable Energy) and SN8 (Sustainable Drainage) are supported by SCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority. However, it is suggested that Policy SN8 could also include “rain garden” in the list of examples

Policy SN7 amended to include rain garden

POLICY SN8

Our responses

Babergh DC	<p>So that it is not lost, we suggest separating out the last sentence in the second paragraph. This is presumably a reference to the guidance linked below. If so, it may be helpful to include this link as a footnote.</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances/</p>	Amendment made including web link as suggested.
---------------	--	---

Chapter 7 Landscape and Natural Environment

Our responses

SCC	<p>We would like to see PROW mentioned in Sections 7 and 8, as they are both an important part of the landscape and natural environment, and leisure and tourism within the Plan Area. Mention could be made of links to the Stour and Orwell Walk and the forthcoming National Trail England Coast Path.</p>	Reference added in Background to Section 8, and also in Section 7 (see below).
SCC	<p>All of the Stutton Fringe Character Areas contain PROW, and this should be acknowledged within the plan.</p>	This is now acknowledged in the Background to Section 10.
SCC	<p>The following amendments are proposed to paragraph 7.8, to provide further clarity:</p> <p><i>"In landscape terms, the land to the south of Holbrook Road/Manningtree Road (the B1080) lies within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB. In July 2020, the AONB was extended to the west of the village down to the Samford Valley. The protection and enhancement of AONBs is given great weight in national planning policy which is advanced by a landscape an AONB management plan and planning policy guidance, produced by the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths unit Team that contains policy and objectives to help conserve and enhance the nationally protected landscape."</i></p>	Accepted. Text amended to include this comment.
Babergh DC	<p>Map SNgA</p> <p>For consistency, the map key title should also read 'List of Key Views' rather than 'important views',</p>	Map title changed to 'Key Views' - and further changes made for consistency..

SCC	Green Spaces and Facilities. It is suggested that paragraph 7.67 could include reference to the physical and mental health and wellbeing benefits that can be gained from access to pleasant outdoor areas.	Paragraph added to include reference to such benefits
SCC	SCC would suggest the inclusion of the need to make green spaces and facilities accessible to residents with limited mobility (inclusion of benches, including Chatty Benches and well-maintained paths etc). This could help to make an elderly population feel more included as part of the community and reduce isolation of vulnerable groups.	Text added to make this point.

Policy SN9		Our responses
Babergh DC	We have no detailed comments to make on this policy at this time but may revisit this at a later date. For now, we simply suggest that: <i>(7.11) reads: "In particular, development proposals:"</i> <i>(7.12) is re-worded to say:</i> <i>"Where otherwise acceptable, proposals will be also supported that: * enhance the village entrance at [...], and * utilise opportunities, where they arise, to [...]</i> <i>Lower Street"</i>	Amendments made as suggested.
SCC	Policy SN9 is specific with clear and strong wording, and with a sound evidence base based on consultation with residents and then tested against a set of agreed criteria, public accessibility being one of them. It is suggested that this policy could include the word "significantly adversely impact" in the first bullet point.	The word "significantly" has been added to the policy.

Policy SN10		Our responses
Babergh DC	One of the additions to the NPPF (July 2021) was, at para 131, a reference to the important contribution that trees make to the character and quality of urban environments, and also their role in helping mitigate the effects of climate change. There are many references to 'trees' in the NP text (including at para 7.58), so they are clearly important to the community, but there is no specific mention of trees within policy text. SN10 may provide that opportunity.	Specific reference to trees has been included in Policy SN10 (see below).

Contd.	Have a look at the most recently published NP Examination Reports or Referendum Version NPs on our website to see if there is any wording that you could use.	
SCC	<p>This policy has protections for biodiversity assets and encourages biodiversity net gain and is welcomed by the County Council.</p> <p>The following wording is suggested to provide extra strength to Policy SN10: <i>“Development proposals will be supported where they help to restore and repair fragmented biodiversity networks.</i></p> <p><i>Except in exceptional circumstances, development proposals should avoid the loss of, or substantial harm to, important trees, hedgerows and other natural features such as ponds.”</i></p>	Both recommended additions have been included in Policy SN10.
Suffolk Wildlife	<p>Enhancing the natural environment should reference safeguarding protected species, as well as Priority Habitats and Species as listed within The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 from future development. Policy SN10 could also include more detail as to how the mitigation hierarchy and biodiversity net gain can provide targeted improvements for key species within the parish. For example, the text of the plan states that 'Stutton is a hotspot for stag beetles' (para 7.51). Targeted biodiversity features for stag beetles, such as log piles and standing deadwood, should therefore be included with Policy SN10. Policy SN10 could also reference biodiversity enhancement for farmland birds, as the parish has records for grey partridge, turtle dove, yellow hammer, linnets and skylark (Suffolk Biodiversity Information Service), all of which are red listed on the new Birds of Conservation Concern 51. Specific enhancements for farmland birds could include hedgerow planting, managing hedgerows for biodiversity, providing scrub habitat and sowing field margins with seed mixes suitable for farmland bird species. Other key species for the parish, such as those mentioned within Appendix 4, should be identified and specifically mentioned within the plan and policies in order to provide better protection and require developers to provide targeted enhancements for key species and habitats within the parish.</p>	<p>Significant changes to this policy have been made which, in the main, address most of the points made</p> <p>Not all the details requested have been included as to do so would make the policies longer and more difficult to read</p> <p>In particular reference has been made to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Migration hierarchy • the Priority Habitats <p>i.e. safeguard protected species, as well as Priority Habitats and Species as listed within The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 and to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • safeguard and enhance the environment for the farmland birds found in Stutton such as grey partridge, turtle dove, yellow hammer, linnets and skylark, all of which are red listed on the new Birds of Conservation Concern.

Suffolk
Wildlife

We are pleased to see that the Stutton Neighbourhood Plan recognises the importance of biodiversity and proposes measures to protect and enhance it within its policies. As stated within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021), development should seek to provide biodiversity net gain, so it is encouraging that this is recognised within the Parish. The new Environment Act 2021 requires development proposals to achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity; whilst not yet required in law, this level is already being implemented as good practice across the country. Therefore, we recommend that the Stutton Neighbourhood Plan should require a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain.

Minimum of a 10% gain added to Policy SN10.

Policy SN11

Our responses

Babergh
DC

The HRA Screening process is still underway, with the final report expected soon. That may suggest some modifications to the wording of policy SN11 so you will need to be mindful of those. For now:

- in the first line, capitalise 'Zones of Influence' and change to read "Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS)", as this is the first use of this description. INB: the first line of para 7.61 could then be edited to:
"The Suffolk RAMS is a key consideration..."]

Proposed changes have been included in the policy.

- amend the last few words to read "
... *effects on the integrity of the Habitats (European) sites.*",
the policy wording is acceptable.

HRA
Screening
report

GSN11: Amend the Policy Heading to read
"Mitigating the impact of development on the Stour & Orwell Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site".

Suggested wording accepted and text amended accordingly.

HRA
Screening
report

It is not considered sufficient to rely on a general policy aimed at protecting Habitats sites e.g. Policy SN11. Explicit caveats need to be included where there may be conflicts between a general policy to protect Habitats sites from development and another policy. However, this is embedded mitigation which cannot be considered at HRA screening stage; the CJEU People Over Wind v Coillte Teoranta C-323/17 ruling indicates that measures that have been added primarily to mitigate the effects on a Habitats site cannot be considered at the screening stage.

Minimum of a 10% gain added to Policy SN10.

Policy SN12

Our responses

Babergh
DC

The closing sentence refers to 'exceptional circumstances,' but these are not defined. The preferred wording is now:
"Development in the local green spaces will be consistent with national policy for Green Belts."
To be consistent, you should amend the last sentence to read the same.

Policy has been redrafted to include reference to national policy on Green Belts:

It now reads:
Development on these sites will not be acceptable other than in very special circumstances in line with national policy on Green Belts.

Babergh
DC

We see also, but make no further comment at this stage, that the allotments and the village playing field and adjoining woodland are also identified in policy SN20 as community facilities worthy of protection.

Sentence added:
It is of note that the Allotments (Site 1), the Village Playing Field (Site 2) and Canham's Wood (Site 5) whilst subject to a further review have been identified as 'Designated Open Spaces' in the emerging JLP.

Babergh DC	Appendix 5 In Appendix 5, for the Allotments (Site 1), the Village Playing Field (Site 2) and Canham's Wood (Site 5) it states that these are not designated for any purpose in the Local Plan. That is true in so far adopted Local Plan policy is concerned but we remind you that these sites are - subject to a further review - identified as 'Designated Open Spaces' in the emerging JLP.	List of green spaces now numbered.
Babergh DC	Map SN12 To aid recognition, change the bulleted list to a numbered list so this and Map SN12 can be cross-referenced.	Amendment made as suggested.
SCC	Whilst not an essential issue to the plan, SCC does query as to why the parish decided that any site larger than 2.5 hectares would be considered as an "extensive tract of land", and unsuitable for designation as a Local Green Space. As such, the parish may have missed out on designating other potential sites as Local Green Spaces.	No site larger than 2.5 hectares was identified for inclusion but we have, as suggested, removed this definition of "extensive tract of land". (Continued). Sentence added in Context and evidence after Policy SN12 referring to Suffolk's ambition to be the 'greenest county'.

Policy SN13		Our responses
Babergh DC	7.69 Apart from change of use applications, very minor development and householder proposals, proposals will be expected to be accompanied by a proportionate landscape assessment that provides full justification for the proposal in landscape and visual sensitivity terms. Proposals should be of a scale and design that do not significantly and adversely impact on the primary purpose of AONB designation and shows how the area's special landscape and scenic qualities of the AONB and its setting will be conserved and where possible enhanced.	Accepted Policy SN13 amended.

Chapter 8 Leisure and Tourism Policy SN14

Our responses

Babergh
DC

SN14
Suggest rewording the first sentence so that it reads:
"Developments that provide facilities or services for visitors and tourists will be supported provided that they ..."

Amendment accepted and changes to the text have been made.

HRA
Screening
Report

SN14: Visitor and tourist development amend to include a new bullet point:
• *would not have an adverse impact on the integrity of the Stour & Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site;*

Amendment accepted and changes to the text have been made..

Chapter 9 Heritage and Leisure

Our responses

SCC

Paragraph 9.4 needs to be updated with the correct map, as it currently reads "(Map X)".

Correction made.

Babergh
DC

Map SN15 lacks a key to explain the green and yellow markers. (Based on Appendix 6, the former are Grade II and later Grade II.

Recommended changes to the key have been made.

Babergh
DC

Appendix 7, the proposed Non-designated Heritage Assets (NdHAs) are not mapped so this needs correcting. On a minor note, did the group consider including photographs of these NdHAs and/or do they have any additional evidence that could also fulfil the role of a supporting document come submission time?

Non designated heritage assets have now been included in Map SN15. The inclusion of photographs were considered but was rejected on privacy grounds.

Policy SN15

Our responses

Babergh
DC

SN15, it would seem sensible to re-emphasise the need for justification. We suggest the second sentence could read:
“Any proposal which impacts on a designated heritage asset must be accompanied by a Heritage Statement which should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and take into account the significance and the setting of the asset including, as applicable, the landscape and identified views set out in Policy Map SN9A.”

The suggested amendment to Policy SN15 is accepted and has been included in full.

Policy SN16

Our responses

Babergh
DC

SN16, include a reference to the relevant map(s) and, as above, consider:
“Development proposals affecting the non-designated heritage assets in the area, listed in Appendix 7 and shown on Map [XX], should be supported by an appropriate analysis to enable a balanced judgement to be made on how the proposal seeks to conserve those assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.”

The suggested amendment to Policy SN16 is accepted and has been included in full.

SCC

Paragraph 9.4 needs to be updated with the correct map, as it currently reads “(Map X)”.

Correction made.

Chapter 10 Getting Around

Our responses

SCC

Section 10 should also recognise that some rights of way provide routes for commuting, provide access to services and facilities, provide leisure routes, and also improve access for people with mobility issues. They also encourage people to be fit and healthy by providing convenient, free and low-cost, and attractive opportunities for being active.

Section 10 has been amended. It is our experience that the PROW network is not widely used for commuting. Elsewhere the point is made that many paths are unsuitable for people with limited mobility.

Contd.

The Community Actions to assess pavements and roadways and to create a greenway bear testimony to this objective to enable people to get around in safety.

SCC We would like to see greater emphasis on cycling as well as walking.

This point is accepted and a Community Action to devise a cycling strategy has been included.

SCC SCC would recommend additional support for more sustainable modes of travel. This could include secure cycle storage spaces to be required as part of new housing development, and/or provisions for safer walking and cycling routes. Safe routes for walking and cycling are important to ensure the safety of residents of all ages, especially those that are very young or very old, and have mobility issues or are frail.

New paragraph has been added specifying a Community Action to devise a cycling strategy. The Design Guide makes specific reference to including cycle store.

SCC

There is also currently no specific mention that the Plan Area includes a significant public rights of way (PROW) network. The NPPF states at paragraph 100 that planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance PROW and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing PROW networks (which in this case could notably include the Stour and Orwell Walk – a long distance route developed by the AONB between Manningtree and Felixstowe; and the forthcoming National Trail England Coast Path which will follow the shoreline of the River Stour). We would like to see specific mention of the local PROW network, its importance, and how it enables effective links with neighbouring parishes and beyond. It is suggested this could be set out in the Background part of Section 10.

Detail has been added to the plan in the Background part of Section 10.

SCC

SN19

"Any future development which would adversely affect the character or result in the loss of existing or proposed PROW will not be permitted unless alternative provision or diversions can be arranged which are at least as attractive, safe and convenient for public use. This will apply to PROW for pedestrian, cyclist, or horse rider use. Improvements and additions to such PROW to be delivered as an integral part of new development to enable new or improved links to be created within the settlement, between settlements and/or providing access to the countryside or green infrastructure sites as appropriate. Improvements should also improve the PROW accessibility to those with disabilities or mobility difficulties."

Policy SN19 amended to include the suggested text.

There could be reference to other strategies that support this Neighbourhood Plan. This includes Suffolk County Council's Green Access Strategy (2020-2030).

Specific mention of the strategy has been made in section 10.

Highways
England

Thank you for consulting Highways England on the above Neighbourhood Plan.

No action required.

Highways England is a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). In respect to this Neighbourhood Plan, the nearest trunk road is A11 and A12.

We have reviewed the plan and note the area and location that is covered is remote from the A11/A12. Consequently the draft policies set out are unlikely to have an impact on the operation of the trunk road and we offer No Comment.

Policy SN17

Our responses

SCC

The following amendment is proposed to Policy SN17:
“Development proposals should prioritise the safety and movements of pedestrians and cyclists over private vehicles. Developments must identify the realistic level of traffic they are likely to generate, including assessing the potential impact on pedestrians, cyclists, road safety, parking, and congestion within the parish. They must include measures to mitigate any such impact. Development that would give rise to unacceptable highway dangers will not be permitted. Development proposals that address the safety issues highlighted on Map 5 will be supported.”

Policy amended accordingly.

SCC	<p>Parking</p> <p>It is recommended that all new development accords with Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019 to ensure that new development does not exacerbate the issue of road and footway parking. SGP reference could be included in Policy SN17.</p>	Addition made to SN17.
SCC	<p>ISPA Transport Mitigation include in Section</p> <p><i>“Proposals must demonstrate contribution to the achievement of transport mode shift in the Transport Mitigation Strategy for the Ipswich Strategic Planning Area. Financial contributions or works in kind will be sought from development to assist with delivery of the Transport Mitigation Strategy for the Ipswich Strategic Planning Area, sustainable transport measures identified in the most up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the most up to date walking and cycling infrastructure plans.”</i></p>	Policy SN17 has been amended to include these comments.

Policy SN18

Our responses

SCC	<p>Policy SN18 should refer to “cycle route networks” rather than “bridleway networks.</p>	Map SN19 has been relabelled as required.
-----	--	---

Chapter 11 Community Facilities Policy SN20

Our action / comment

<p>Babergh DC</p>	<p>Policy SN 20</p> <p>JLP Policy LP31 covers Community Facilities. Under 'Loss of facilities', at criterion 3a, it refers to a sustained marketing period of 6 months. Amend the second bullet point in SN20 to be consistent.</p>	<p>The word 'sustained' has been added. To be consistent the policy now reads 6 months rather than 12 months</p>
-----------------------	---	--

Babergh
DC

The last entry on pg.87 ends with 'adjoining'. Should this read 'adjoining Community Wood', i.e., it and the first entry on pg. 88 refer to one and the same?

ii.on pg. 88, the letter 't' is missing from 'defibrillator unit'.

Community Wood should not read as a bullet point and a change in the layout has been made.

This error has been noted and changed to read unit.

Policy SN21

Our responses

SCC

It is suggested that Policy SN21 could also include a similar sentiment, requiring new community facilities to be located in a way that it is accessible by sustainable and active travel.

Policy SN21 text "is accessible by sustainable and active travel" added.

Policy SN22

Our responses

HRA
Screening
Report

Amend policy to include
will not have an adverse impact on the integrity of the Stour & Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site;

The suggested additional bullet point has been included.

Our action / comment

Policy SN23

Our responses

Babergh
DC

SN 22 and SN23
We make no comment at this stage other than to remind you that JLP Policy LP31 refers to a marketing period of 6 months. The first bullet point under SN23 should be amended to be consistent.

This is accepted and Policy SN23 has been changed to read
the site has been marketed for the same planning use for a period of at least six months with no viable offers received.

Appendices		Our responses
Babergh DC	<p>Change Appendix A to read 'Appendix 1 Objectives, Policies and Community Actions'.</p> <p>Retain the general layout but, instead of repeating policy text in full, just list the relevant policy number(s). Retain the Community Actions text in full. From Appendix 1, keep the text that explains how these actions will be carried forwarded but delete the rest.</p> <p>Other consequential amendments will be needed, e.g., Table of Contents and para 3.6.</p>	<p>We feel that Appendix A provides a useful summary of how Policies and Community Actions and how they relate to overall objectives of the Plan. This has been confirmed by feedback from local residents.</p> <p>We have, however, renamed Appendix A as Appendix 1 and changed the subsequent numbering of appendices accordingly. Change required at layout stage.</p>
Babergh DC	<p>Appendix 2 This may benefit from inclusion of the planning permission references numbers. The second column 'Planning approvals STUTTON' could be updated to 'Proposal Description' (or similar). Recommend adding wording to the effect of 'correct as at [insert date]' to reflect ever-changing nature of permissions.</p>	<p>Changes made to Appendix 2. Now reads Proposed development Planning Permission reference number included. Date added.</p>
Babergh DC	<p>Appendix 6</p> <p>The information in this appendix was correct at the time of publication. The most up to date information should be sought from either the Local Planning Authority or appropriate statutory body."</p>	<p>The suggested text has been added.</p>
Babergh DC	<p>Appendix 7</p> <p>Suggest moving the text on pg. 3 of Appendix 7 ["Classification based on ... "] to before the first NdHA table, if the formatting permits.</p>	<p>This will be done at final layout stage.</p>

Babergh
DC

Consider including a short glossary of terms used throughout the Plan e.g., heritage assets, affordable housing etc.

Glossary included.

Natural
England

No specific comments on this draft Neighbourhood Plan.

No action required.

PART 3 REPRESENTATIONS FROM RESIDENTS AND OUR RESPONSES

- | | | | |
|---|------------------|--|--------|
| 1 | IPg 1SR Resident | <p>Definitely support at Referendum.</p> <p>Community Action 12: Love the idea of the Greenway and think it would be really beneficial to both young and old who struggle with the uneven path on the main road. Will also help join both halves of the village together.</p> <p>Community Action 2: Policy SN2 Housing Mix: I think the village has a high proportion of single storey dwellings (suitable for older couples) so new housing should prioritise homes suitable for young families to support the local school. In the short-term I think village activities should support the current mix of ages - ie support the high older population that lives here.</p> | Noted. |
| 2 | Resident | <p>Very likely to support at Referendum.</p> <p>I especially like the Plans regarding future development in the village with clear guidance about protecting the outskirts of the village so that Stutton remains a separate village.</p> <p>The note about protecting important trees and buildings I feel is also an important part of the Plan. It is a detailed Plan, well set out, easy to read and with plenty of information.</p> | Noted. |

3 IPg 2TB Very likely support at Referendum Noted.

Alton Reach is a real disappointment.

- This is not an 'infill' like the other two developments but a spur.
- It cuts the playing field in half at a time when the village population is expanding.
- The playing field is used by all age groups - it is an important village facility.
- The view from the playing field looking east towards the ancient oaks in the background is one of the best in Stutton. This is now gone forever.
- How long before the new residents in Alton Reach start complaining about balls landing in their garden etc?
- As another thought it's a pity that nobody runs a children's football team (under 10's perhaps) in Stutton using the top field.

Section 10: The main road and footpaths. Obviously an extremely difficult problem to solve. The traffic gets ever heavier. I saw nothing in the plan that in reality offers a solution. In particular, the footpath at the west end of the village is often woefully inadequate and sometimes non-existent. This is dangerous for walkers.

Overall, the Committee deserve much thanks for all the effort they have put into the Plan.

4 Resident Definitely likely to support at Referendum Noted.

There needs to be some form of play apparatus for children of primary school age and over. The ones at the school are not adequate.

Church Road needs some form of traffic calming, since the new houses have been built there is an increase in traffic and some residents in the surrounding area seem to have little regard for pedestrians.

5	IPg 2RY Resident	<p>Definitely likely to support at Referendum</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very professional and clear 2. Conclusions correct: 65 houses is enough for now; 2 potential future sites are the right ones, especially the field behind the War Memorial 3. Traffic calming is correctly identified as a key community action to follow - RHS and Alton Water massively increase traffic flow which needs managing 4. Excellent piece of work! 	Noted.
6	Land owner	<p>Likely to support at Referendum.</p> <p>Site Options and Assessment: Like the work undertaken with independent analysis by AECOM of potential locations for future residential development. Support the individual site findings and recommendations by AECOM. Would be supportive of appropriate and sympathetic development of sites SNP1 & 4. Consider these would have modest impact on the village with appropriate access directly to B1080.</p> <p>Supportive of AECOM's recommendation and conclusion for site SNP2 (land to the rear of Grange House) suggesting it is not appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. In addition to the access challenges and other objections outlined by AECOM my reasons for objecting to any development of this land are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the only direct access (via footpath) to AONB land from the centre of the village and therefore its development would reduce the tranquility offered at the heart of Stutton. • Being land designated AONB it offers a visual amenity a few steps from the heart of the village. It has approximately 35/40 mature trees and compliments the wider open spaces it neighbours. • Development would result in wildlife and environmental implications with the need to remove many of the mature trees which enhance the AONB of this area as demonstrated from the attached photos. 	Noted.

6	contd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed access from the B1080 is at a busy point of the village and would create further traffic challenges noting it is directly opposite the Kings Head, diagonally opposite the entrance to Catsfield and neighbouring the vets and hairdressers. Along this part of the road cars often park (residential and customers of the Kings Head) causing traffic congestion leading to the Church Land/Alton Hall Lane junction. • There is no automatic containment to this land which may result in access and further development of adjacent AONB land to the south in years to come. 	Noted.
---	--------	---	--------

7	IPg 2SS	<p>Very likely to support at Referendum.</p> <p>Congratulations on a very well produced book of the Plan. Chapter 10: Paramount importance SAFETY. It is not possible for people in wheelchairs or mobility scooters to get to the Community Hall or shop from the Holbrook direction in safety. I think the proposed GREENWAY from Alton Hall Lane to Bentley Lane, continuing along Woodfield Lane to the shop area, would provide a large part of the solution. Safety measures where it would cross Bentley Lane would be important. Much much safer for Oak House residents. Later could continue to Lewis Lane possibly. Children and prams safer too.</p> <p>Increasing amount and speed of traffic entering the village down Bentley Lane makes life dangerous - calming feature possible??</p> <p>After so many years refusing proposals to build on the site opposite the school because it quite clearly adds to the danger to children, and parents, on an already tricky corner, how has it suddenly become safer?</p>	Noted.
---	---------	--	--------

8	IPg 2TF Resident	Definitely likely to support at Referendum	Noted.
		This is an excellent plan which addresses key issues for the next few decades: more affordable housing to be built; encourage a more diverse population; more encouragement of walking and cycling and less traffic passing through.	
		Drainage down some of the smaller lanes - Lewis Lane needs adding to the list.	
		We need to encourage the private schools to rationalise their buses - a large bus with 3 or 4 children is not environmentally sound.	
9	IPg 2SJ Resident	Definitely likely to support at Referendum.	Noted.
		We have just moved to this lovely village, September 2021, myself and my wife do understand your concern about new housing plans. We moved from Frinton on Sea. Farmland opposite us had just got planning permission for 250 new homes. A lucky escape. This Hopkins and Moore estate has only 34 new homes. I think this is quite enough. Picking up on Point 6 [ie in the summary of plan on the leaflet], I think your shop, school and Community Hall will benefit more people using these facilities.	
10	Residents	Don't know yet whether would support at Referendum.	This objection refers to a Community Action rather than a planning policy although it does reflect government policies about encouraging energy efficiency and renewal sources of energy. (Contd.)
		We support the Plan except the part that tries to change how people choose to heat, insulate, etc their own homes - Community Actions page 3.	

We feel that we all have a responsibility to combat climate change.

11 IPg 2TF
Resident

Definitely likely to support at Referendum.

It's a very well thought out, comprehensive plan for the village. It deals with the main issues which affect the quality of life now and in the future. We feel proud of living in a village where people have come up with such a great plan, which celebrates what is good and at the same time embraces change to secure the future of the village in line with preserving nature and encourages active transport - less cars. What a beautiful document!!! In words as well as images. Thank you!

12 Howard
Elliot

Unlikely to support at Referendum without corrections.

We wish to take the opportunity to correct errors and pass comment on the Site Options and Assessment report compiled by AECOM on behalf of Stutton Parish Council. It would be wholly inappropriate to adopt the overall plans conclusions until the factual errors in the report are corrected and the Grange House site re-assessed accordingly.

Comments raised on the report are predicated by the below summary drawn from the granting of planning application reference DC/19/02220 which is wholly within the red outline for Grange House in the Site Options and Assessment in figure 6 and 7. In the officers report it notes:

- Heritage consultation notes the site is opposite the Grade II listed Kings Head public house which is situated on the opposite side of the road to the site – which in turn is to the rear of a property fronting the highway – and as such, the Heritage Team offers “no comment” in regards to the application. This is the same for the Grange House site.

We sent this feedback to the consultants who drew up the Site Options report on our behalf. They have amended their report and have re-assessed SN3 as “potentially suitable for allocation subject to specific local need for housing being demonstrated, the sites being identified as available, the settlement boundary being redrawn, and landscape issues being addressed in line with Local Plan policy”.

12 Howard
Elliot
contd.

- The application site comprises existing garden curtilage associated with the host dwelling known as The Hillarys. This site is bounded by existing mature hedges to the south, east and west boundaries and fronts the existing host property. This is the same for the Grange House site.
- The proposed means of access would be via the established access to the north, serving existing businesses and residential properties. This is the same for the Grange House site.
- The proposal is considered to represent sustainable development with regards to access to services. This is the same for the Grange House site.

At no point in the officer's report is intervisibility within the AONB noted or a cause for concern as we assume it is well shrouded by the existing boundary treatments provided by the Grange House site.

We highlight the following factual errors contained with the Site Options and Assessment report and other general comments:

- Under Physical Constraints page 49 point 1 it can only be classed as flat or relatively flat. The phrase "plateau" is used further on in the report to support this. The site should be considered "flat or relatively flat". Under Physical Constraints page 49 point 2 there is ample space for a two lane road to the west side of the property. The clear dimension between the house and boundary is at least 14m, so a robust highway of 7.3m can be achieved. The site should be noted as "Yes" for existing access and potential to create suitable access.
- Under Landscape and Visual Constraints page 51 point 1 we suggest low sensitivity. All the planting is immature rather than semi/mature and has all been planted whilst under current ownership. Prior to ownership the land was used as a materials store and potential development land for the previous owners building firm. Therefore the site has few or no valued

We have not, however, allocated the site for development. Our decision not to allocate any site for development was based on the fact that the 65 houses recently or currently being built meet the indicative housing allocation for Stutton as set out in the draft Joint Local Plan.

These new developments also meet the need for affordable housing identified in the Housing Needs Survey.

features and should be considered "low sensitivity".

- Under Landscape and Visual Constraints page 51 point 2 we suggest low sensitivity as the land is historically fully enclosed on the west side to the same extent as the east side. As such it is considered arbitrary to note the settlement edge as the east side of the site rather than the west/south side. As the historic boundary treatment to the West is the same as the East the site should be recorded as "low sensitivity" and would not "increase the impact of any identified views".
- Under Heritage constraints page 51 point 1 and development should be considered limited or no impact. This is demonstrated with the recent planning approval noted above. The site should be classed as "limited or no impact or no requirements for mitigation".
- Under planning policy constraints page 52 point 4 we believe it should be categorised as a mix of greenfield and previously developed land. All of the builders plant, oil drums, gas canisters and temporary storage buildings have been removed from the site by the current when they purchased the house and returned it to mown grass. As such it is considered "a mix of greenfield and previously developed land".
- Under planning policy constraints page 53 point 6 the settlement boundary is considered to be the historic edge of the whole garden on west and south sides. In Map 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan an arbitrary settlement line has been drawn along the line of a modern ornamental hedge running West to East part way up the garden. As noted above the historic garden boundary hedge is the same treatment on all three sides of the site and therefore the whole garden is considered to be "within the existing settlement boundary", not the arbitrary line as drawn part way down the garden.

contd.

- Viability page 53. Naturally AECOM are not aware, however the indicator is "No" the site is not subject to abnormal costs that could affect viability. The is based on all main services are connected to the existing house, the land is only surface contaminated from previous building materials, access is excellent and foundations would be normal.
- The overall rating page 54 considering the above should be noted as "suitable and available".
- Taking each point in the conclusion on page 54 in turn:
- Planning reference DC/19/02220 predicates building into the AONB as acceptable and supported in this location.
- The site offers excellent access for a two lane road adjacent to the existing house.
- Planning reference DC/19/02220 heritage analysis supports no impact to local listed buildings in this location.
- The site used to be used as a building store in areas prior to returning it to a domestic garden.
- Planning reference DC/19/02220 supports its location in respect of services and facilities.
- The garden in fully enclosed and its historic boundary treatment is large to negate any inter-visibility concerns.
- • As above access is available and building on the site is predicated as low impact to the AONB through planning reference DC/19/02220.

We would be pleased if you could request AECOM update their report as otherwise the Neighbourhood Plan is factually incorrect . A site meeting would be appreciated with them prior to that update. If you are not funded for them to at least make the noted corrections we would be more than happy to cover any reasonable expenses.

13	IPg 2RZ Resident	<p>Definitely likely to support at Referendum</p> <p>We would like to thank and congratulate the Neighbourhood Planning Committee for all their hard work in producing a thoroughly comprehensive Plan. We have only lived here for a year but it occurs to us that the Plan fully reflects the community that is Stutton. Further, it looks forward positively to endorse and enhance all that is good about living here. That is good planning.</p>	Noted.
14	IPg 2SW	<p>Very likely to support at Rerendum (though I don't like referenda!)</p> <p>Congratulations on producing an excellent plan, that reflects all the parts of the Big Conversation that I was involved in. I have spotted a couple of typos (p. 46 should View 6 be towards Holbrook Bay, rather than just towards Bay; p. 88 uni should be unit). I also wondered where the visitor interpretation boards that are mentioned a couple of times might be sited? I think they would need to be designed/sited with care. I also feel you might mention the massive increase (and the negative impact) in on-street parking(especially along Holbrook Rd.) that has resulted from Anglian Water introducing car parking charges. Finally I found it confusing that the term "Stutton Green" is used to refer both to the area around the church and to the small patch of grass opposite the King's Head. These are very minor niggles that in no way detract from the comprehensive, thoughtful and appropriate plan you have put together. It is illustrated beautifully and will be a fascinating document for future generations. I have lived here all my life and never knew that the oak at the end of Alton Hall Lane was planted for King George's jubilee!</p>	Noted.
15	IPg 2SW Resident	<p>Very likely to support at Referendum</p> <p>I think Stutton Presents should be included in the list of organisations on p. 96 I think SuD should be explained p. 36 & a glossary of all the acronyms should be included. It would be helpful to explain the significance of being a "hinterland village".</p>	We have added a Glossary of terms used in the Plan.

16 Resident

I would not be able to support the Plan in its current form with SNP1 included as a potential development site.

Potential Development Site SNP1 - Land north of Manningtree Road and behind War Memorial.

This site is entirely unsuitable for development for the following reasons:

- It would be immediately adjacent to and conjoin with the current Hopkins Home site for 14 dwellings
- The village would therefore have in effect a single estate of some 50 houses in a single area
- Any such development would result in the two village settlements being joined against all accepted guidelines and principles
- The footpath currently running north south from Manningtree Road up to Canham Woods would lose its current character as a rural footpath simply becoming a tarmac path through a housing estate
- Such a development would severely prejudice the amenity and character of Canham woods even more so than the current 14 dwelling development
- Some 30 more house would impose critical additional burdens on the level of traffic joining Manningtree Road (not only from each household with 2 cars each most likely but with the additional attendant delivery vehicles)
- Manningtree Road floods regularly from excess surface water following heavy rain. Any such development with the very significant resulting degree of hard surfaced areas would only exacerbate this problem
- The development would endanger a number of veteran chestnut and oak trees on the perimeter of the field
- Overall such a development would prejudice and significantly reduce the rural character of the village rendering it closer to the semi-urban character of Brantham where uncontrolled infilling has been rife

This site was assessed as potentially suitable for development by the consultants who were asked to carry out a Site Assessment report on our behalf.

We have not allocated it as suitable for development.

17	Resident	<p>Definitely likely to support at Referendum.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is a great piece of work, thanks and congratulations to the Working Party. Particularly appreciated the recommendations for the protection and use for future development of green spaces, and important landscape views and vistas.</p> <p>Given Stutton's linear nature and the discontinuity and poor condition of our pavements, the proposed Greenway is a great idea of crucial importance. Of course it should be accessible for mobility scooters, pedestrians and if possible, (individual) cyclists. I can't think of a development that would be more enhancing of village life.</p> <p>Simple measures to calm the increasing levels of traffic should be implemented too, including 'picket fence' entrances to each end of the village to emphasise the village boundaries</p>	Noted.
18	IPg 2SF Resident	<p>Definitely support at Referendum.</p> <p>In favour of more houses, smaller - eg 2 bedroom for people downsizing or first time buyers. Location is important. Eg don't have a problem with the houses opposite the school, but traffic is a problem.</p> <p>We appreciate the motivation and passion that has gone into developing the Plan and hope Babergh treat it seriously.</p>	Noted.
19	Resident	<p>We need traffic calming in the village.</p>	Noted.
20	Resident	<p>Traffic is a particular problem on Bentley Lane.</p>	Noted.

21 IPg 2SJ
Resident

Not likely to support at Referendum.

Concern regarding the Settlement boundary and the fact it goes through gardens.
Stutton Fringe Character Areas - concerns regarding the descriptions used for each area.
Could be read that the named areas, eg Crowe Hall, Manor Farm, have authority over it.
Please change the names.

Concerns around small existing properties being bought and extended making them
unaffordable for younger people and others.
We support more 1 and 2 bedroom properties.

Babergh has drawn the Settlement boundary in such a way as to discourage back garden development.

We have removed the names of the Fringe Character Areas.

22 Residents

Definitely likely to support at Referendum.

Flooding along the main road is a major issue for pedestrians.
The quality of pavements is a real issue - as is the width in some places.
Increasing traffic along Alton Hall Lane and the speed of it is a big problem.
Need to protect the trees and environment.
Maintain the gaps and spaces in the village.
New buildings should be eco friendly and sustainable.

Noted.

23 Resident

Definitely likely to support at Referendum.

Housing I agree it is important to keep Stutton a distinct village, but allowing small developments of new housing to encourage younger people to move in (rent or buy) This is essential for the school to survive and to maintain a vibrant future for the village. Drains are clearly an issue that needs further investigation! Increased traffic also needs to be considered.

Landscape & Environment The beauty and natural landscape of the village must be maintained. The Plan recognises this. My worry is that developers promise one thing and then deliver another. The green spaces and river and access routes must be protected.

Noted.

Leisure & Tourism I think that Sutton does not need too much further development at Alton Water at the moment. The roads get very busy at the weekend. It would be useful if residents could part for free at the car parks and then they would not use Alton Hall Lane for access?

Getting Around Would it be possible to have a 20mph speed limit through the village? I agree with the maintenance of existing footpaths and developers putting new ones in. Pavements could be improved - definitely for the disabled - photo opposite p.86!! Surely there can be funding for the 'Greenway'.

Community Facilities The extra work load on the GP practice at Holbrook needs to be taken into account as Holbrook also has much development taking place. Also, as work is carried out on housing/drains etc the road to the GP practice gets closed off. The alternative route down the A137 takes considerably longer especially if you are sick or elderly. How can this be minimized?

My thanks go to all who have worked to put this Plan together. A lot of work has gone into this and it will have taken a lot of time.

24 IPg 2SQ
Resident

Likely to support at Referendum

Congratulations on the first class production of the Village Plan complete with excellent illustrations. It should win an award!

I am very worried about increasing the urbanisation of our quiet country village with yet more street furniture which would inevitably draw attention to 'quiet lanes'. Why name them as such? We know them and want to keep the secret rather than get the visitors seeking them out. And traffic calming bumps are an abomination, causing more noise and use of fuel with changing into low gear.

Otherwise, thank you and good luck with what you are trying to do for Stutton.

Two Quiet Lanes have recently been designated in our village. The hope is that having a sign informing cars (particularly visitors to the area) that a lane is so designated will encourage them to drive more slowly and carefully.

25 IPg 2SN
Resident

I am happy with the Plan.

Noted.

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF STATUTORY CONSULTEES NOTIFIED OF REG 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

Position	Company / Organisation
MP for South Suffolk	Houses of Parliament
County Cllr to Peninsula Division	Suffolk County Council
Ward Cllr to Stour Ward	Babergh District Council
Ward Cllr to Brantham Ward	Babergh District Council
Ward Cllr to Orwell Ward	Babergh District Council
Parish Clerk to ...	Tattingstone Parish Council
Parish Clerk to ...	Brantham Parish Council
Parish Clerk to ...	Holbrook Parish Council
BMSDC Community Planning	Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils
SCC Neighbourhood Planning	Suffolk County Council
Planning Policy Team	Tendring District Council
Spatial Planning Team	Essex County Council
Land Use Operations	Natural England
Essex, Norfolk & Suffolk Sustainable Places Team	Environment Agency
East of England Office	Historic England
East of England Office	National Trust
Town Planning Team	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
	Highways England
Stakeholders & Networks Officer	Marine Management Organisation
	Vodafone and O2 - EMF Enquiries

Position	Company / Organisation
	Three
Estates Planning Support Officer	Ipswich & East Suffolk CCG & West Suffolk CC
	Transco - National Grid
Stakeholder Engagement Team	UK Power Networks
Strategic and Spatial Planning Manager	Anglian Water
	Essex & Suffolk Water
	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
	Norfolk & Suffolk Gypsy Roma & Traveller Service
	Diocese of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich
Chief Executive	Suffolk Chamber of Commerce
Senior Growing Places Fund Co-ordinator	New Anglia LEP
Strategy Manager	New Anglia LEP
Conservation Officer	RSPB
Conservation Officer (Essex, Beds & Herts)	RSPB
Senior Planning Manager	Sport England (East)
	Suffolk Constabulary
	Suffolk Wildlife Trust
	Suffolk Preservation Society
	Suffolk Preservation Society
Community Development Officer – Rural Affordable Hosing	Community Action Suffolk
Senior Manager Community Engagement	Community Action Suffolk
	Dedham Vale Society
AONB Officer (Joint AONBs Team)	Suffolk Coast & Heath AONB

Position	Company / Organisation
	Theatres Trust
	East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board
Planning Consultancies	Savills
Landowner 1	Landbridge (Henry Strutt)
Landowner 2	William MacLachlan
Landowner 3	Steve and Angie Mowles
Landowner 4	Cavan Browne
Landowner 5	Pam Elliot