

**Regulation 16 Consultation – Draft Sutton Replacement Neighbourhood Plan**

ECDC published for consultation the draft Sutton Replacement Neighbourhood Plan for the period 2 January to 14 February 2024. The table sets out all comments received during the publication period. A total of 11 were received. Original copies of the representations are held by ECDC.

Name	Comments
Andrew Smith	<p>I have the following comments to make:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As we are no longer in the EU nor bound by its laws the following should be deleted or replaced: "be compatible with European Union (EU) obligations and human rights requirements."</li> <li>2. I very much support the new objective 8</li> </ol>
Anglian Water	<p>Anglian Water do not have any further comments in relation to the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan (Replacement). We consider our representation on the pre-submission draft (Reg 14) Neighbourhood Plan has been appropriately considered with subsequent amendments made by the Parish Council, which we endorse.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Thank you for the consultation on The Replacement Sutton Neighbourhood Plan dated 03 January 2024. We have reviewed the plan as submitted and have the following comments to make.</p> <p>We have no concerns with the report but wish to make the following advisory comments. Please note that the view expressed in this letter is a response to the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan only and does not represent our final view in relation to any future planning or permit applications that may come forward. We reserve the right to change our position in relation to any such application.</p> <p><u>Allocated Sites</u></p> <p>Section 6.6 'Neighbourhood Plan Policies' shows the three sites that were allocated in the 2019 Neighbourhood Plan. As stated in previous response, AC/2019/127997/01 dated 23 January 2019, these are not in an area of Flood Risk any other constraint, and therefore we do not consider these of concern.</p> <p>We spoke about allocation NP4 in the previous response. However, as mentioned in 6.7, this has subsequently been granted planning permission and it is therefore no longer necessary to allocate it for development in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><u>Ouse Washes Project</u></p> <p><b>Background</b></p>

Name	Comments
	<p>On behalf of central government, the Environment Agency is creating new grassland habitat adjacent to the internationally designated Ouse Washes to support certain breeding and wintering bird species that use the site. Unfortunately, the numbers of these birds have declined in recent decades due to an increase in the frequency of spring flooding and increased depth and duration of winter flooding. In response the Ouse Washes Habitat Creation Project was commenced in 2007. The project has been securing land at two sites adjacent to the Ouse Washes these being at Byall Fen near to Wardy Hill, and at Sutton. The reasons for these two areas being chosen include their close proximity to the Ouse Washes and the presence of peat soils.</p> <p>The first phase of work at the Byall Fen site started in 2014 and to date 143 hectares (452 acres) has been changed from arable to grassland grazed by cattle and sheep. During the bird breeding season the water table is raised close to ground level to create the ideal conditions for feeding birds. This is achieved through the construction of water control structures and other features designed to manage the distribution and level of water across the site. The grassland is fenced to contain the grazing animals and to deter predators. Since 2014 the Byall Fen site has seen a significant increase in the number of breeding birds present.</p> <p>At Sutton the ambition is to establish grassland to the southwest of the village over an area of approximately 200 hectares (494 acres). Much land has already been purchased but we still need to acquire additional land before the project can progress further. Until that time, we cannot say with certainty the location and extent of the grassland. As was the case with the Byall Fen site some of the structures needed to manage water will likely require planning permission. However, unlike Byall Fen for the Sutton site we do not envisage the construction of a large water storage lake. The overall progress of the project is determined by how quickly we can negotiate the purchase of land and so it may be some time yet before a planning application is submitted.</p> <p>It has been a number of years since we have spoken to the Sutton community about the habitat creation project, our last public event at Sutton was an exhibition and drop-in at the Pavilion in 2011. This pause is largely because our focus since then has been on Byall Fen. It is our plan to re-establish contact with the parish council in order to update them.</p> <p><b>Suggested Change to the Neighbourhood Plan</b></p> <p>We welcome the opportunity for the Neighbourhood Plan to acknowledge the potential for habitat creation at Sutton and that this fits with the policies already proposed within the Plan.</p> <p>Our suggestion is that for Policy SUT7, which includes in the title “enhancement of internationally designated sites”, the following wording is added at the end of the policy: <i>There will be a general presumption in favour of development that enhances designated sites, such as through the Ouse Washes Habitat Creation Project.</i></p> <p><u>Foul Water Treatment Capacity</u></p> <p>Where new development is proposed, the sewerage undertaker must be contacted with regard to available capacity in the public sewer.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u></p>

Name	Comments
	<p>None of the proposed sites are at risk of fluvial flooding (i.e. from Main Rivers). There may be other sources of flooding (surface or groundwater) that the East Cambridgeshire District Council (ECDC) may be aware of in the area.</p> <p>I would recommend that you consult the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), Cambs County Council with regard to surface water drainage at the allocated housing sites. We trust this advice is useful.</p>
<p>NHS Property Services / Cambridgeshire Peterborough Integrated Care System</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to input into the above consultation. The following representation is submitted by NHS Property Services (NHSPS) for and on behalf of Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough Integrated Care Board (ICB).</p> <p><b>Foreword</b></p> <p>Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough Integrated Care System (ICS) is working together to improve the health and wellbeing of our local people throughout their lives. We bring together health and care organisations, as well as local councils, alongside Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector organisations to make a real difference to the lives of local people and communities.</p> <p>NHSPS is wholly owned by the Department of Health and Social Care. NHSPS manages, maintains and improves NHS properties and facilities, working in partnership with NHS organisations to create safe, efficient, sustainable, modern healthcare and working environments. NHSPS has a clear mandate to provide a quality service to its tenants and minimise the cost of the NHS estate to those organisations using it. Any savings made are passed back to the NHS.</p> <p><b>Promoting Healthy Developments</b></p> <p>East Cambridgeshire seeks to maintain a high quality of life for its residents as a part of its spatial vision. A way in which this is to be achieved is through ensuring new developments are of high quality and are sustainably designed as a part of the Local Plan's strategic objectives (East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015, as amended 2023).</p> <p>Paragraph 13 of the NPPF states that Neighbourhood Plans should support the delivery of strategic policies within local plans or spatial development strategies. As the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan encourages developments that are both sustainable and of quality for its residents, we seek to recommend the ways in which the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan can be better reflective of these through the promotion of healthy developments.</p> <p>There is a well-established connection between planning and health, where emerging developments have the potential to foster good mental, physical and social health and wellbeing within the existing and future members of the community. The vision for Sutton seeks to facilitate a place wherein its residents live a healthy life, and one of the ways in which this can be achieved is through the planning of healthy developments.</p> <p>NHSPS and Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough ICB support the "Health First" principle (The Healthy City, Key Cities, 2022). In supporting a healthier population and prioritising good mental, physical and social health, it is necessary to recognise that healthy places and environments are underpinned by a number of factors. Whereby, a holistic vision and approach to health in the built</p>

Name	Comments
	<p>environment needs to be adopted with the purpose of encompassing the central vision of the principle for places which are 'Healthy, Attractive, Accessible, Adaptive, [and] For All'.</p> <p>Site specific policy requirements to promote healthy developments should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development proposals to consider local health outcomes, and where appropriate to the local context and/or size of the scheme include a Health Impact Assessment</li> <li>• Design schemes to encourage active travel, including through providing safe and attractive walking and cycling routes, and ensuring developments are connected by these routes to local services, employment, leisure, and existing walking and cycling routes.</li> <li>• Provide access to healthy foods, including through access to shops and food growing opportunities (allotments and/or providing sufficient garden space).</li> <li>• Design schemes in a way that encourages social interaction, including through providing front gardens, and informal meeting spaces including street benches and neighbourhood squares and green spaces.</li> <li>• Design schemes to be resilient and adaptable to climate change, including through SUDs, rainwater collection, and efficient design.</li> <li>• Consider the impacts of pollution and microclimates, and design schemes to reduce any potential negative outcomes.</li> <li>• Ensure development embraces and respects the context and heritage of the surrounding area.</li> <li>• Provide the necessary mix of housing types and affordable housing, reflecting local needs.</li> <li>• Provide sufficient and high quality green and blue spaces within developments.</li> </ul> <p>As drafted, supporting paragraph 12.2 of Policy SUT 19 of the Neighbourhood Plan recognises the way in which health contributes to a well-designed place in line with National guidance (2021). In considering the design of new proposals Policy SUT 19 provides a range of design principles (a-k), taking account of the local context, landscape characteristics, amenities and highways/movement. To further support Policy SUT 19, it is our recommendation that the principle and specific requirements of Healthy Planning, detailed above, be incorporated within the Neighbourhood Plan. We do, however, recognise the specificity of these considerations and therefore welcome any future opportunities for further engagement on how these can be positively incorporated within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Submission consultation for the Sutton Replacement Neighbourhood Plan, and hope our recommendations are constructive and helpful. We look forward to continuing to work with the Sutton Parish Council in seeking to further improving the health and wellbeing of its residents through the planning process.</p>
Fenland District Council	Thank you for consulting Fenland District Council about the replacement Sutton Neighbourhood Plan (SNP).

Name	Comments
	<p>As you will be aware a sizable new reservoir is proposed to be constructed by Anglian Water and Cambridge Water on an area north of Chatteris which if given consent is likely to be operational by 2040.</p> <p>Amongst the wide range of potential benefits will be the opportunity for residents in nearby settlements (including those outside Fenland district) to access the reservoir using active travel modes.</p> <p>It would therefore be good if the replacement SNP could recognise this potential opportunity and incorporate appropriate wording to support the provision of active travel routes from Sutton to the reservoir.</p> <p>It would appear that at present a route might exist utilising existing Public Rights of Way and quieter roads from Sutton via Mepal, the Ouse Washes (west side), Welches Dam and the Forty Foot Drain, but this is likely to need significant upgrades with a safe crossing of the A142 between Sutton and Mepal and a new foot/cycle bridge over the Old Bedford River near Mepal Causeway.</p> <p>This would require the involvement of key stakeholders including Anglian Water, Cambridgeshire County Council and the Environment Agency and if realised could be of significant benefit to the local community.</p> <p>Should such an active travel route be provided this would enable the continuation of the existing cycle/pedestrian route between Ely and Sutton.</p>
Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 03 January 2024.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p><b>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</b></p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information.</p> <p>Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species .</p> <p>Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission standing advice.</p>

Name	Comments
	<p>We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.</p> <p>Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Annex 1 - Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities</a></u></p> <p><b>Natural environment information sources</b></p> <p>The Magic (<a href="http://magic.defra.gov.uk/">http://magic.defra.gov.uk/</a>) website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on the Ordnance Survey base map) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones). Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment. A list of local record centres is available from the Association of Local Environmental Records Centres .</p> <p>Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation, and the list of them can be found here (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england</a> )</p> <p>Most of these will be mapped either as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, on the Magic website or as Local Wildlife Sites. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.</p> <p>National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan. NCA information can be found here (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making</a> ).</p> <p>There may also be a local landscape character assessment covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online.</p> <p>If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape. You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website.</p>

Name	Comments
	<p>General mapped information on soil types and Agricultural Land Classification is available (under 'landscape') on the Magic (<a href="http://magic.defra.gov.uk/">http://magic.defra.gov.uk/</a>) website and also from the LandIS website (<a href="http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm">http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm</a>), which contains more information about obtaining soil data.</p> <p><b>Natural environment issues to consider</b></p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2</a>) sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. Planning Practice Guidance sets out supporting guidance.</p> <p>Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.</p> <p><b>Landscape</b></p> <p>Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.</p> <p><b>Wildlife habitats</b></p> <p>Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed here <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england</a>), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or Ancient woodland (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences</a>). If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.</p> <p><b>Priority and protected species</b></p> <p>You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed here <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england</a>) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice here <a href="https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals">https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals</a> to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.</p> <p><b>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</b></p>

Name	Comments
	<p>Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 112. For more information, see Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land</a> .</p> <p><b>Improving your natural environment</b></p> <p>Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment and should provide net gains for biodiversity in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you should follow the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy and seek to ensure impacts on habitats are avoided or minimised before considering opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. You may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development and how these could contribute to biodiversity net gain and wider environmental goals.</p> <p>Opportunities for environmental enhancement might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restoring a neglected hedgerow.</li> <li>• Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.</li> <li>• Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.</li> <li>• Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.</li> <li>• Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.</li> <li>• Think about how lighting can be best managed to reduce impacts on wildlife.</li> <li>• Adding a green roof to new buildings.</li> <li>• Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way.</li> </ul> <p>Defra's Biodiversity Metric should be used to understand the baseline biodiversity value of proposed development sites and may be used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains where detailed site development proposals are known. For small development sites the Small Sites Metric may be used. This is a simplified version of Defra's Biodiversity Metric and is designed for use where certain criteria are met.</p> <p>Where on site measures for biodiversity net gain are not possible, you should consider off site measures.</p> <p>You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists) in your community.</li> </ul>



Name	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision. Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework sets out further information on green infrastructure standards and principles</li> <li>• Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see Planning Practice Guidance <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space</a> ).</li> <li>• Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks or on verges, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency).</li> <li>• Planting additional street trees.</li> <li>• Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links.</li> <li>• Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore).</li> </ul> <p>Natural England’s Environmental Benefits from Nature tool may be used to identify opportunities to enhance wider benefits from nature and to avoid and minimise any negative impacts. It is designed to work alongside Defra’s Biodiversity Metric and is available as a beta test version</p>
British Horse Society	<p>On behalf of the British Horse Society (BHS) I would like to take the opportunity to comment on the Sutton’s Neighbourhood Plan (SNP) as follows:</p> <p>Policy SUT 15 - Public Rights of Way Development proposals which improve and extend the existing network of public rights of way will be supported. As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, such development proposals should take account of the existing value of the right of way concerned as a biodiversity corridor and where practicable incorporate measures to enhance biodiversity as part of the proposal. The BHS fully supports this proposal. Any new ROW created should be bridleways or byways. Local equestrians would like to see more of the ROW access available to them. Public money should be spent inclusively and include all non-motorised users. This includes money from Developers for new ROW.</p> <p>10.7 When compared with nearby parishes, there is a generally limited network of public rights of way in Sutton and, for example, there are no circular walks from the village centre. The current network of public rights of way is illustrated on Map 7 There are instances where landowners allow paths across their land to be used even though they are not part of the public rights of way network. There may be further opportunities to create additional “permissive” paths to improve access to the countryside and prospects for walking to achieve healthy lifestyles. The Parish Council will work with landowners and the County Council’s Rights of Way officer to improve and promote existing and new permissive access to provide several circular routes for walkers out into the surrounding countryside from the village. BHS response- Any new permissive paths should include equestrians, as horse riding is a recognised</p>

Name	Comments
	<p>form of exercise, and many middle-aged women, who may not otherwise take exercise, would benefit from more off-road paths, enabling them to also achieve healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>10.12 The flat nature of the landscape around Sutton means that it should provide an opportunity to cycle between villages either for recreation or, perhaps, to work. There is currently a shared cycle path and footway between Earith and St Ives, but there is nothing between Earith and Sutton. Delivering such links would enable residents to make longer cycling journeys, perhaps to work or for exercise. Initially, the priority for the Parish Council is to seek a link to Earith and the already established path west to St Ives.</p> <p>COMMUNITY ACTION 8 - CYCLE ROUTES The Parish Council will lobby for the establishment of a cycle route between Sutton and Earith to connect with the cycle path into St Ives, potentially using the haul road from Sutton Gault alongside the Middle Level Barrier Bank. BHS response- Any cycle routes, including the current one between Earith and St Ives, should also include equestrians. Equestrians are an equally vulnerable road user, on the same level as cyclists in the Highway Code. Public money should be spent inclusively and include all Non Motorised Users.</p> <p>In the NP it mentions that Sutton has limited Rights of Ways, predominantly footpaths.</p> <p>Would there be any opportunities to upgrade any of these footpaths to bridleways or byways, which would help to link up the disjointed bridleway network for both equestrians and cyclists. Local equestrians would like to see more of the ROW access available to them ie more bridleways/byways.</p> <p>When considering any changes to road layouts in Sutton, consideration should also be given to equestrians. In the Highway Code Hierarchy of road users – pedestrians are listed as the most vulnerable road user, followed by horses and cyclists. This new rule highlights that, irrespective of method of transport, those who can do the greatest harm have the greatest responsibility to reduce the danger or threat they may pose to others.</p> <p>Public money should be spent inclusively to include all Non Motorised Users (NMUs), which includes equestrians and disabled mobility scooters. The majority of equestrians are female, compared to the majority of cyclists being male. There should not be an inequality in how these road users are treated when it comes to road safety.</p> <p>Any changes/‘improvements’ to road layouts for the benefit of cyclists must not put equestrians at greater risk. If there is an accident, as a result of a change to the road layout which disadvantaged equestrians, in which an equestrian was injured then the Council could be considered to be liable.</p> <p>We would like Sutton NP to address the omission of equestrians in the NP, as there is no mention of them at all, and whilst they may be in the minority this group should still be taken into consideration. The value of the equestrian sector is £4.7 billion per annum, so not so minor.</p> <p>Please see below for further information regarding equestrians, including the financial contribution that The BHS Access team would be delighted to engage with you at any time to advise further.</p>

Name	Comments
	<p><b>Additional Comments and information from the British Horse Society</b></p> <p>I welcome the opportunity to comment on the local Neighbourhood Plan, and to be able to put forward an equestrian point of view which can often be overlooked by Councils when considering Active Travel proposals.</p> <p>Safe routes for equestrians are desperately needed because the accident statistics in respect of horses on the roads are horrific. There have been 5,784 incidents reported to the British Horse Society since 2010, 44 people have lost their lives, 1350 have been injured, 441 horses have been killed, 1,198 horses injured, and 75% of these incidents involved vehicles passing too close to the horse and/or too fast.</p> <p>The British Horse Society is the UK's largest equestrian Charity, with over 119,000 members representing the UK's 3 million equestrians. Nationally horse riders have access to just 22% of the rights of way network and carriage drivers to just 5%. This network has become increasingly fragmented by roads, which were once safe rural routes, but have now often become busy thoroughfares.</p> <p>Whilst the Society supports the national initiative to encourage more cycling and walking as part of Active Travel Plans, it is imperative that the Council recognises that Active Travel also includes equestrians.</p> <p><b>Central government support for including horses</b></p> <p>The government's Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy Safety Review says: "1.2 But safety has particular importance for vulnerable road users, such as walkers, cyclists and horse riders. All road users have an equal right to use the road, and safety and the perception of safety are key factors in determining how far people use these modes of transport. The safer they feel, the more they will use these active modes of travel. The more people who use Active Travel, the fitter and healthier they will be, and the more their communities will benefit from lower congestion and better air quality, among a host of other benefits"(Jesse Norman, Minister for Transport.</p> <p>Jesse Norman in House of Commons debate on Road Safety, 5 November 2018:</p> <p>"We should be clear that the cycling and walking strategy may have that name but is absolutely targeted at vulnerable road users, including horse-riders"</p> <p>And final point by Jesse Norman in debate: "Horse riders are vulnerable road users—there is no doubt about that, and there never has been—and they have been included in the work we are doing."</p> <p><b>Newly Constructed Paths</b></p> <p>Any physical creation of new paths to achieve Active Travel objectives within the county is to be welcomed (provided that equestrians are included, as a minimum, on those outside of large town centres), as this will enhance the ability of the public to increase its access to safe off road routes for leisure and commuting. District Authorities should take a strategic approach to Active Travel proposals within</p>

Name	Comments
	<p>their administrative boundary - giving consideration to potential links outside their boundaries that could contribute to a more integrated network and achieve maximum benefit for all users.</p> <p><b>Use of Existing Public Rights of Way</b></p> <p>I recognise that some of the routes within this consultation could be in urban areas. However, many horses are kept on the urban fringe, so it is important that equestrians are not excluded from routes that exit the urban areas into the surrounding environs.</p> <p>Active Travel routes should not, in any way, compromise the use of the public rights of way by making them less amenable to existing lawful users of the right of way. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where existing routes are considered as part of the plan, it is important that all user groups are consulted so that the impact on other lawful users can be assessed and, if necessary, alternative measures discussed.</li> <li>• For each specific proposal which uses a public right of way or minor road, the width, the proposed surface and the impact of increased estimated numbers of cyclists must be considered in order to design a route suitable for all legal users in each specific location.</li> <li>• Any newly constructed paths should be integrated/physically linked with the existing public rights of way network where possible and needed, clearly waymarked and recorded on either the definitive map or another publicly accessible map as appropriate.</li> <li>• Where proposed new, or improved routes have crossing points or junctions with the main highway network, appropriate signal-controlled (or even grade-separated) crossings should be provided suitable for all user groups.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to the use of 'Quiet Lanes' where the speed of traffic is reduced.</li> <li>• Where motorised traffic is to be prohibited on either a right of way or minor road to facilitate cycling and walking, it must be remembered that this is likely to also benefit equestrians. Signage and structures must not impede equestrians.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Considerations to Note</b></p> <p>Commuting cycling is likely to take place at times other than when recreational use takes place. Thus, a path used for commuting may well be used for recreational travel especially if it provides a circular route by connecting to other paths.</p> <p>Several categories of public rights of way (bridleways, restricted byways and byways) and minor public roads are already shared by cyclists and other user groups. Thus, as a general principle, we believe that, for maximum public benefit and fairness, the reciprocal approach should be implemented, i.e. that new cycle paths should be shared with other user groups unless there is a specific, unresolvable reason not to do so.</p>

Name	Comments
	<p>Use of Traffic Regulation Orders to prohibit use of a public right of way by a specific user group for the benefit of cycling needs to be fully justified and take into account the rights of other lawful users. It should be noted that the Defra Statutory Guidance to local authorities on Rights of Way Improvement Plans, 2002, states in para. 2.2.21:</p> <p>‘There is potential for conflict on ways carrying higher rights between different classes and types of users. Wherever possible proposals for improving rights of way should not unduly benefit one class of user at the expense of another. Improvements that are intended to benefit cyclists, harness-horse drivers, horse riders or walkers should not unduly restrict lawful MPV use of public vehicular rights of way’.</p> <p>Equestrian use must be considered when Active Travel routes are proposed in new developments, so that new links can be created to the countryside beyond. Where new bridges/underpasses are proposed these should be suitable for equestrian use.</p> <p><b>Effect of excluding Equestrians from Active Travel Routes</b></p> <p>If equestrians are not an included user on active travel routes, the consequence is that equestrians are left on the carriageway with lorries and cars passing them on the outside and cyclists passing them on the inside, which is another accident waiting to happen. It is therefore important that this aspect is considered in the risk assessment for such routes.</p> <p><b>The Health Benefits of Horse Riding in the UK.</b></p> <p>(Data comes from research undertaken by the University of Brighton and Plumpton College on behalf of The British Horse Society)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 68% of questionnaire respondents participated in horse riding and associated activities for 30 minutes or more at least three times a week. Sport England estimate that such a level of sporting activity will help an individual achieve or exceed the government’s recommended minimum level of physical activity.</li> <li>• Women have been identified in government studies as a social group with relatively low levels of participation in physical activity. Some 93% of questionnaire respondents were women and 49% percent of female respondents were aged 45 or above. These are comparable figures to a major Sport England survey which found that 90 percent of those participating in equestrianism are women and 37 percent of the female participants in equestrianism are aged 45 or above. The gender and age profile of equestrianism is not matched by any other sport in the UK .</li> <li>• Amongst the horse riders who took part in the survey, 39% had taken no other form of physical activity in the last four weeks. This highlights the importance of riding to these people, who might otherwise be sedentary.</li> <li>• Horse riders with a long-standing illness or disability who took part in the survey are able to undertake horse riding and associated activities at the same self-reported level of frequency and physical intensity as those without such an illness or disability.</li> </ul> <p>For further information, please see:</p>

Name	Comments
	<p><a href="https://www.bhs.org.uk/~/_/media/documents/marketing/health-benefits-of-riding-in-the-uk-full-report.ashx?la=en">https://www.bhs.org.uk/~/_/media/documents/marketing/health-benefits-of-riding-in-the-uk-full-report.ashx?la=en</a></p> <p><b>Benefits of catering for horses</b></p> <p>The British Equestrian Trade Association National Equestrian Survey (2019) indicated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £4,174 is spent per horse which represents a significant contribution to the economy</li> <li>• The value of the equestrian sector is £4.7 billion per annum</li> </ul> <p><b>General Statistics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 847,000 horses in Britain</li> <li>• 1.8 million regular riders of 3 million total</li> <li>• Lack of access to horses and riding facilities is a barrier for 22% of lapsed riders returning</li> </ul> <p>REASONS TO INCLUDE EQUESTRIANS in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2017 the equestrian industry excluding the racing industry, contributed £4.3bn to the economy and is the second largest rural employer.</li> <li>• The equestrian industry relies on a network of safe, off road access to the countryside.</li> <li>• It was established at a Cambridgeshire County Council Planning meeting that, with good design, it costs no more to provide access for equestrians.</li> <li>• Horses safely and happily share paths less than 3m wide all over the country.</li> <li>• No report ever of any injury to a third party on any RoW by a horse.</li> <li>• The Cambs RoWIP (Rights of Way Improvement Plan) states that the bridleway network is inadequate, fragmented and in need of improvement. Every shared pedestrian / cycle path further fragments that network.</li> <li>• The majority of cyclists are male (78% : Sustrans) whereas the majority of horse riders are female (BHS).</li> <li>• Horse riding has mental and physical health benefits. Older women particularly participate in this activity, where they may not otherwise exercise.</li> <li>• Horse riders are a vulnerable road user, in the same way as walkers and cyclists.</li> </ul> <p><b>Equestrian accident statistics</b></p> <p>In the UK the period November 2010 to March 2019 road incidents involving horses :</p>

Name	Comments
	<p>43 humans died 315 horses died</p> <p>3757 incidents were reported to the British Horse Society (BHS) although it is believed that this represents only 10% of the actual incidents.</p> <p>The East of England is one of the regions with the highest accident rate.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council has a Local Transport Policy (LTP), which sets out their transport objectives, policies and strategy for the county. A sister document of the LTP is the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP). The County Council updated its ROWIP in 2016 in line with the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. You may wish to consult this document when drafting policies dealing with Non-Motorised Users (NMU) and the Public Rights of Way network.</p> <p><a href="https://cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-road-and-parking/transport-plans-and-policies/local-transport-plan">https://cambridgeshire.gov.uk/residents/travel-road-and-parking/transport-plans-and-policies/local-transport-plan</a></p> <p>Particular interest should be given to Policies S0A1 'Making the Countryside More Accessible', S0A2 'A Safer Activity', S0A3 '57,000 New homes', S0A4 'Knowing what's out there', S0A5 'Filling in the Gaps', and S0A8 'A Better Countryside Environment' – all of which include the need for access for equestrians.</p>
RSPB	<p>Policy SUT7</p> <p>We support the Environment Agency's suggestion to include wording within this policy to support habitat creation that will enhance the Ouse Washes designated site along the lines of 'There will be a general presumption in favour of development that enhances designated sites, such as through the Ouse Washes Habitat Creation Project.'</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <p>The RSPB is the owner and manager of the majority of the Ouse Washes SPA/Ramsar/SAC/SSSI, along with the Wildlife Trust BCN and Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust. However, the site is in unfavourable condition largely due to increased severity and frequency of nuisance flooding in the spring and early summer, which destroys the nests of breeding wader species for the which the site is designated. In 2007 the Environment Agency agreed to set up the Ouse Washes Habitat Creation Project to create offsetting lowland wet grassland habitat outside of, but in close proximity to the floodbanks, to act as 'lifeboat' sites for breeding birds during flood years.</p> <p>As set out the Environment Agency submission, two sites have been selected for habitat creation, one near Coveney and another within the Sutton Parish boundary. The RSPB fully supports the creation of this grassland habitat, which will contribute towards bringing the Ouse Washes back into favourable conservation status. The Coveney site is already a huge conservation success and we</p>

Name	Comments
	<p>fully expect that a site at Sutton will replicate this. If implemented, Sutton Parish will be contributing towards the conservation recovery of some of our rarest UK breeding birds.</p>
Historic England	<p>Thank you for inviting Historic England to comment on the Regulation 16 Submission version of this Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Having reviewed the plan and relevant documentation we do not consider it necessary for Historic England to provide detailed comments at this time.</p> <p>We note that unfortunately we were unable to respond to the SEA consultation. For your records, we can confirm that we have read and concur with your conclusion included with the plan documentation.</p> <p>We would refer you if appropriate to any previous comments submitted at Regulation 14 stage, and for any further information to our detailed advice on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into a neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/</a></p> <p>We would be grateful if you would notify us on <a href="mailto:eastplanningpolicy@historicengland.org.uk">eastplanningpolicy@historicengland.org.uk</a> if and when the Neighbourhood Plan is made by the council. To avoid any doubt, this letter does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.</p>
National Highways	<p>National Highways 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).</p> <p>It has been noted that once adopted, the Neighbourhood Plan will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Where relevant, National Highways will be a statutory consultee on future planning applications within the area and will assess the impact on the SRN of a planning application accordingly.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above comments, we have reviewed the document and note the details of set out within the draft document are unlikely to have an severe impact on the operation of the trunk road and we offer No Comment.</p>
East Cambridgeshire District Council	<p>This letter sets out East Cambridgeshire District Council's (ECDC) response to the submitted plan, which is being consulted upon to 14 February 2024.</p> <p>The District Council welcomes the Parish Council bringing forward this Plan, and, broadly speaking, the Plan is considered to be well presented, with clear identification of what are policies and what is wider supporting text. There is helpful use of maps throughout.</p> <p>This letter does not comment on all matters in the Plan, but rather concentrates on those matters which we believe should be brought to the attention of the Examiner (once appointed).</p>



Name	Comments
	<p><b>Replacement (rather than modified) Plan</b></p> <p>ECDC notes on the front cover of the submitted Plan, and in the introduction (para 1.5) and elsewhere within the Plan itself, that it is made clear that this is a replacement plan for the currently adopted 2019 Sutton Neighbourhood Plan. Put another way, it is not a ‘modification’ plan whereby elements of the 2019 Plan could have been retained and other elements modified.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above clarity throughout the document, one of the text boxes on page 7 states:</p> <p><i>“Parish Referendum: modifications to a Plan which do not change its nature would require examination but not a referendum. The Examiner will decide.”</i></p> <p>The above text is not accurate for a Replacement Plan (but would be for a Modified Plan), because all Replacements Plans must go to a referendum before they can be made (adopted). It is suggested that the text box is simplified and just includes the words ‘Parish Referendum’.</p> <p>In addition, and for the avoidance of doubt, ECDC has considered the whole of the Replacement Plan, including those elements that have been rolled forward from the previous plan unaltered, and made representations accordingly.</p> <p><b>Site 1 / Para 6.7 / Policy SUT 2</b></p> <p>At the Reg. 14 consultation stage, ECDC questioned the appropriateness of deleting the allocation for ‘site 1’ (as referred to in the submitted Plan) or site NP4 (as referred to in the adopted 2019 neighbourhood plan).</p> <p>It is noted that the submitted plan continues to propose to delete such an allocation, with text at 6.7 saying ‘<i>Given the planning status of the site it is no longer necessary to allocate it for development in the Neighbourhood Plan</i>’.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the site does indeed have planning permissions in place, and the probability is that such a site will be completed in accordance with such permissions, there is always the possibility that this may not be the case. The permissions could lapse, for example. Or the developer may seek an alternative use for the site. If any such scenario occurs, any subsequent planning application would (if Site 1 / NP4 allocation was to be ‘deleted’) have no site specific policy against which the proposal would be considered. Of course, wider policies in the development plan would be available, and the previous consent would be a significant material consideration. Nevertheless, the area formally allocated as NP4 would in effect become ‘white land’ within the development envelop of Sutton, and consequently open to a future applicant to promote a development considerably different to that with consent today. We do not think such a scenario is one which the Parish Council intends to happen, but by deleting such an allocation, the submitted neighbourhood plan is clearly opening the door for such an scenario to take place.</p> <p>Whilst ECDC accepts that it is not strictly necessary to include a detailed policy for the site (in the same way existing Policy NP4 is), we think it would be prudent, and help provide certainty for all parties (including the wider community), if an allocation was retained for ‘site 1’ (currently NP4), perhaps with a simple policy requirement along the lines of the following:</p>

Name	Comments
	<p><i>‘Site 1 has the benefit of planning consent for up to 250 dwellings at the point of preparing this Neighbourhood Plan, with Phase 1 (77 dwellings) of the site completed, and the remainder having the benefit of planning consent reference 19/01707/OUM and associated Reserved Matters consent. In the event that a revised planning application be submitted for all or part of the site which would have the effect of superseding planning consent reference 19/01707/OUM, then such proposals should follow the principles established by the existing permission unless there are clear beneficial planning reasons to deviate from such principles.’</i></p> <p>ECDC thinks such a paragraph (or similar) could be added at the end of Policy SUT 2, together with allocation of ‘site 1’ on any necessary maps within the Plan.</p> <p><b>SUT 8</b></p> <p>At the reg 14 stage, ECDC advised against the introduction of the policy (other than the last two paragraphs) due to the forthcoming introduction of mandatory BNG. From 12 February 2024, mandatory BNG commenced, reinforcing ECDC view that the Policy is no longer required and should be removed. Para 7.8 can be suitably updated to make reference to the latest situation with mandatory BNG.</p> <p><b>SUT 9</b></p> <p>ECDC is comfortable with the principle of a Neighbourhood Plan allocating Local Green Spaces (LGS), and we note the separate evidence document that has been submitted. Whilst some of the new LGS sites for this submitted plan (compared with the adopted Plan) are very small or linear in nature, and consequently at very low risk of loss for development, they nevertheless are demonstrated in the evidence document to have local value and therefore ECDC raises no objection to them.</p> <p>However, there appears to be some minor typos in the submitted plan, in both the map (Map 5, page 26) and the Policy (SUT 9 page 27). On the map, there are two ‘sites 8’, one of which we think should have the ‘7’ notification. Immediately prior to the policy itself, the Plan says “sites 8-10 are additions” but I think should say 8-12. It would be helpful if the Parish Council could check and tidy up any such ‘typos’ prior to any referendum on the Plan.</p> <p><b>SUT 11</b></p> <p>Whilst the principle of the Buildings of Local Significance Policy is not objected to, there would be merit in adjusting the policy to that as found in the Referendum Version of the Reach Neighbourhood Plan (see link below), Policy RCH10, which is likely to become a ‘made’ Plan on 20 February 2024.</p> <p><a href="https://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/REACH%20NP%20REFERENDUM%20Version.pdf">https://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/REACH%20NP%20REFERENDUM%20Version.pdf</a></p> <p><b>SUT 13</b></p>

Name	Comments
	<p>At the regulation 14 stage, ECDC asked for clarification on the opening paragraph of the policy in respect of whether it applied inside and outside of development envelopes. According to the submitted Consultation Statement, the Parish Council's response to our query is that <i>"The first paragraph applies to all sites with an existing employment use."</i></p> <p>ECDC is comfortable with such an explanation, but still considers that the paragraph might not be interpreted in that way. It is suggested that the opening to the first paragraph be amended to:</p> <p><i>"Proposals to expand existing businesses, including those..."</i></p> <p><b>SUT 20</b></p> <p>Whilst the principle of the Dark Skies Policy is not objected to, there would be merit in adjusting the policy to that as found in the Referendum Version of the Reach Neighbourhood Plan (see link below), Policy RCH15, which is likely to become a 'made' Plan on 20 February 2024.</p> <p><a href="https://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/REACH%20NP%20REFERENDUM%20Version.pdf">https://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/REACH%20NP%20REFERENDUM%20Version.pdf</a></p> <p><b>SUT 22</b></p> <p>Again, the principle of this policy is supported, but some slight adjustment in line with the Reach Neighbourhood Plan policy RCH13 may aid interpretation and deliverability.</p> <p><b>Conformity with strategic policies</b></p> <p>As a general comment, the Neighbourhood Plan policies appear to be broadly aligned with the strategic policies contained within the Local Plan 2015 (as amended 2023) and national policy. The District Council is therefore satisfied that the draft Neighbourhood Plan does not undermine its strategic policies and is capable of meeting the requirement for 'general conformity'.</p> <p><b>Other obligations</b></p> <p>As set out in Submission Document 5, the District Council issued a Determination Statement in October 2023 that concluded that the District Council considers that no likely significant environmental effects will arise from implementation of the Sutton Replacement Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The District Council sees no reason why the conclusions set out in the Statement issued in October 2023 do not remain valid.</p> <p>In conclusion, ECDC considers that the Sutton Replacement Neighbourhood Plan is capable of satisfying the basic conditions and other relevant legal obligations.</p>