

Consultee	Summary of Consultation Response	Council Response / Comment on Response
Environment Agency	Confirmed they have no comments on the proposal.	The response is acknowledged. No further comments were provided.
Braintree District Council – Environmental Health	Indicated they have no objections or comments.	The position of no objection is acknowledged and noted.
Suffolk County Council – Public Health and Communities	Supported revocation and confirmed NO ₂ levels are below national objectives. Highlighted that no level of air pollution is entirely safe for health. Provided data showing higher-than-average prevalence of asthma, cancer, stroke and heart disease among local patients. Recommended continued pollution monitoring to assess impacts from future development.	The detailed response and support for revocation are acknowledged. The emphasis on the health impacts of air pollution is noted. The Council intends to continue NO ₂ monitoring on Cross Street following revocation. The health context and prevalence data are appreciated and will be referenced in reporting and in future air quality considerations.
Sudbury Town Council – Planning, Development and Highways Committee	Recommended extending the AQMA for six months to allow monitoring of PM _{2.5} and PM ₁₀ . Sought assurance that temporary traffic measures introduced to improve air quality would remain permanent.	The response is acknowledged. The AQMA was designated specifically for exceedances of the national NO ₂ objective, which is now being met; therefore, extending the AQMA for particulate monitoring is not appropriate. However, the need for particulate monitoring will be considered in the forthcoming Annual Status Report. Revocation of the AQMA does not affect parking restrictions, which will remain unchanged.
Resident of Cross Street	Requested continued air quality monitoring if the AQMA is revoked. Reported heavy and frequent traffic, including HGVs, causing pollution and property damage. Reported significant noise issues, rendering parts of their home unusable.	The comments and concerns are acknowledged. The decision to revoke the AQMA is based solely on sustained compliance with NO ₂ objectives. Monitoring will continue, and the Council intends to retain NO ₂ measurement at this location. Issues relating to traffic volume, vehicle types, and noise will be shared with colleagues responsible for transport planning and highways, as they fall outside AQMA requirements.

<p>Resident of Cross Street</p>	<p>Asked what revocation would mean in practical terms. Queried whether parking bays would be reinstated. Stated they could not give a view without understanding the implications.</p>	<p>The response is acknowledged. Revocation of the AQMA does not affect parking restrictions, which will remain unchanged. Monitoring will continue after revocation, but no further measures to reduce NO₂ are required once compliance has been achieved.</p>
<p>Resident of Cross Street</p>	<p>Expressed strong opposition to revocation despite improvements in NO₂ levels. Reported inability to open windows due to fumes, reliance on air purifiers, and respiratory issues. Described visible indoor pollution (e.g., curtains turning brown). Reported heavy traffic, noise, safety concerns and a general feeling that the area remains highly polluted. Requested that the Council reconsider the proposal.</p>	<p>The response and detailed concerns are acknowledged. Revocation is required once the national NO₂ objective has been met for several consecutive years. Monitoring will continue on Cross Street following revocation. Matters relating to traffic management, vehicle types, and road layout fall under the responsibility of the Highways Authority and Local Planning Authority.</p>