



Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement (The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 – Part 5, paragraph 18(2))

1. Summary

1.1 Following an independent examination, Suffolk Coastal District Council now confirms that the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum subject to the modifications set out in section 3.

2. Background

2.1 Rendlesham Parish Council, as the qualifying body successfully applied for Rendlesham Parish to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area under The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The neighbourhood area was designated by Suffolk Coastal District Council on 29th October 2013.

2.2 The Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan was published by Rendlesham Parish Council for pre-submission consultation (Regulation 14) in April 2014.

2.3 Following the submission of the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan (submission version) to Suffolk Coastal District Council in September 2014, the plan was publicised and comments invited over a six week period which closed 13th October 2014.

2.4 Suffolk Coastal District Council, with the agreement of Rendlesham Parish Council appointed an independent examiner, Mr Nigel McGurk BSc(Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI to review the plan and to consider whether it met the Basic Conditions required by legislation and whether it should proceed to referendum.

2.5 The Examiners Report concludes that subject to modifications identified in the report the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to Referendum. The Examiner further recommends that the referendum area should be the same as the designated neighbourhood area, which is the same as the administrative boundary for Rendlesham parish.

2.6 Following receipt of the Examiners Report, legislation requires that Suffolk Coastal District Council consider each of the modifications recommended the reasons for them, and decide what action to take.

3. Decision and Reasons

3.1 Suffolk Coastal District Council, under powers delegated to the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and IT, has considered each of the modifications recommended and concurs with the reasoning provided by the Examiner in his Report dated December 2014. With the Examiner's recommended modifications, Suffolk Coastal District Council has decided (decision dated

8th January 2015) that the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions mentioned in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and is compatible with the Convention rights and complies with provision made by or under Section 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. As a consequence, Suffolk Coastal District Council will modify the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan accordingly, for it then to proceed to referendum.

The Council has considered the referendum area and has decided there is no reason to extend the neighbourhood area for the purposes of referendum. The Referendum area will be the same as the designated Neighbourhood Area covering the entire parish of Rendlesham.

3.2 The list of modifications and actions required are set out in the following table. As a consequence of these changes the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan (referendum version) has accordingly been re-formatted (paragraph numbers/ page numbers etc).

Modification Reference	Examiners recommendation	Reason for the change	Action by SCDC
M1	Delete final paragraph page 4. The paragraph relates to matters relevant to pre-examination but which would add little to the final version of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan and to aid clarity and understanding.	Page 4 final paragraph deleted
M2	Delete Figure 1 on page 5 – the diagram is a guide on how to produce a neighbourhood plan and not relevant at this stage	Agree with the Examiner. Improve the plan and to aid clarity and understanding	Page 5 Fig 1 deleted
M3	Remove Appendices (except Village Assets Map) to a separate document – The other appendices comprise background information that would be better located in a separate Appendices document so as not to distract from the content of the Neighbourhood Plan itself.	Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan and to aid clarity and understanding.	Appendices removed to separate supporting document with exception of Village Assets Map. Village Assets Map re-numbered as Appendix A
M4	Delete page 6	Factual correction as a consequence of M3	Page 6 deleted
M5	Para 2.07, the Framework was not published in March 2014, move this date reference to follow “National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)”	Factual correction.	Paragraph 2.07 amended to read : <i>“The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published in March 2014 supports and informs the government’s National Planning Policy Framework and sets out the Government’s planning policies for</i>

			<i>England and how these are expected to be applied”</i>
M6	There is sufficient explanation of the planning system. Delete para 2.09, which is unnecessary and rather confusingly worded. Similarly, delete para 2.10, which is overkill, particularly given the inclusion of Figure 4. The bullet points in para 2.10 comprise repetition.	Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan and to aid clarity and understanding	Paragraphs 2.09 and 2.10 deleted
M7	Paras 2.11 to 2.13 relate to conformity matters. They are unnecessary. Delete these paragraphs.	Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan and to aid clarity and understanding	Paragraphs 2.11 to 2.13 inclusive deleted
M8	Delete para 6.02 – The “What this Plan Covers” chapter is a useful introduction to what follows. However, the definition of sustainability appears as an unnecessary afterthought and does not fit into this chapter	Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan	Paragraph 6.02 deleted
M9	Delete Chapter 7 and plan. Retain the two photographs. Chapter 7 is the only Chapter in the introduction/background section that fails to add to the content of the Neighbourhood Plan....Its inclusion detracts from earlier chapters and adds unnecessary “wool” between the introduction and the policies.	Agree with Examiner Improve the plan by providing more focus on information contained in other chapters	Chapter 7 deleted but photographs titled community centre and consultation feedback retained for illustrative purposes
M10	Delete paras 9.03.02 to 9.03.03 inclusive. The paragraphs simply repeat policy from elsewhere , which is unnecessary and detracts from the content of the Neighbourhood Plan	Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan by removing unnecessary repetition	Paragraphs 9.03.02 to 9.03.03 inclusive deleted.
M11	Change titles on pages 46 and 47 to “Change of land-use in the centre of the village to housing”	Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan. Wording is more correctly reflective of a land use planning document	Titles on pages 46 and 47 to amended to “ <i>Change of land-use in the centre of the village to housing</i> ”

<p>M12</p>	<p>Policy RNPP1, change to maintain/ing “or”enhance/ing, in the first, third and fourth paras – The Policy refers to the need to “maintain and enhance”. In effect, this requires all proposals to result in enhancement. I find that this would be an onerous requirement and there is no evidence to demonstrate that such an approach would have regard to national policy, be in general conformity with local strategic policy, or even be possible.</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan. The changes recommended improve the robustness of the policy.</p>	<p>Policy RNPP1 amended to read: <i>“In the Rendlesham District Centre (as defined in Fig 22) the emphasis will be on maintaining or enhancing those uses and services the community has identified. Re development or change of use of existing or established public buildings and/or key facilities will be supported provided that the redevelopment or change of use is for either leisure, education, retail or community use. Proposals for redevelopment or change of use involving employment development will be supported provided that they maintain or enhance the existing or established leisure, education, retail or community uses and future needs thereof. Proposals for redevelopment or change of use involving residential development will only be permitted where they maintain or enhance the existing or established employment, leisure, education, retail or community uses and future needs thereof”</i></p>
<p>M13</p>	<p>Policy RNPP1, second para third line, change to “...key facilities will be supported, provided that the redevelopment...” To some degree as worded, the Policy does not provide for flexibility, having regard to the national policy requirement for the promotion of sustainable development.</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan The changes recommended improve the robustness of the policy.</p>	<p><i>Proposals for redevelopment or change of use involving employment development will be supported provided that they maintain or enhance the existing or established leisure, education, retail or community uses and future needs thereof. Proposals for redevelopment or change of use involving residential development will only be permitted where they maintain or enhance the existing or established employment, leisure, education, retail or community uses and future needs thereof”</i></p>
<p>M14</p>	<p>Policy RNPP1, third para third line, change to “employment development will be supported, provided that they maintain or enhance...” To some degree as worded, the Policy does not provide for flexibility, having regard to the national policy requirement for the promotion of sustainable development.</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan. The changes recommended improve the robustness of the policy.</p>	<p><i>Proposals for redevelopment or change of use involving residential development will only be permitted where they maintain or enhance the existing or established employment, leisure, education, retail or community uses and future needs thereof”</i></p>
<p>M15</p>	<p>Policy RNPP2, change wording to “...page 63) will not be built on, other than in very special circumstances. This protected area...support this.” The detailed wording of Policy RNPP2 fails to have regard to the Framework which explicitly refers to “very special circumstances” which does not preclude development.</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan. The changes recommended improve the robustness of the policy.</p>	<p>RNPP2 amended to read <i>“The Rendlesham District Centre Local Green Space (as defined in Fig 35 – page 63) will not be built on other than in very special circumstances, because of its close proximity and its special and local character to the</i></p>

M16	<p>Policy RNPP2, change last sentence to “The Local Green Space will be retained as a community open space.” The final part of Policy RNPP2 is unclear, in that, as worded, it refers to green space in general rather than to the Local Green Space.</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan. The change recommended will improve the robustness of the policy.</p>	<p><i>community it serves. This protected area will be maintained and enhanced and, where appropriate, funds derived from development elsewhere in Rendlesham should support this. The Local Green Space will be retained as a community open space”</i></p>
M17	<p>Policy RNPP3, delete the first sentence The first sentence is background information and repeats supporting text.</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan. The change recommended will improve the robustness of the policy.</p>	<p>Amend policy RNPP3 to read <i>“New residential or mixed use development is required to make provision towards meeting identified local need for allotments, orchards and growing places”</i></p>
M18	<p>Policy RNPP3, re-word as “New residential or mixed use development is required to make provision towards meeting identified local need for allotments, orchards and growing places.” It would be appropriate if the Policy better reflected the supporting information and in particular, Objective 4, which refers to “allotments, orchards and growing places”</p>	<p>Agree with Examiner. Improve the plan. The changes recommended will improve the robustness of the policy.</p>	
	<p>Changes suggested by the Examiner to improve content (not required to meet the basic conditions)</p>	<p>SCDC and Rendlesham Parish Council considered Response</p>	<p>Action</p>
S1	<p>Para 11.22 change “shared space” to “shared use” . Suffolk County Council has made a number of suggestions. Whilst not implementing these would not lead the Neighbourhood Plan to fail to meet the basic conditions, I consider that introducing two of the proposals would improve the content of this chapter.</p>	<p>Agree revision to terminology improves clarity and understanding in what is a land use planning document.</p>	<p>Paragraph 11.22 amended to read <i>“Rendlesham has a good walking.....The good practice on new developments such as Acer Road, which promote shared use for pedestrians...within the village”</i></p>

<p>S2</p>	<p>Delete Para 14.09 Suffolk County Council has made a number of suggestions. Whilst not implementing these would not lead the Neighbourhood Plan to fail to meet the basic conditions, I consider that introducing two of the proposals would improve the content of this chapter.</p>	<p>Agree. This paragraph is unnecessary. It essentially repeats information contained in other paragraphs in this section</p>	<p>Paragraph 14.09 deleted</p>
------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------