

Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan

Decision Statement

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 – Regulation 18)

1. Summary

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

2. Background

2.1 Martlesham Parish Council, as the Qualifying Body applied for Martlesham Parish to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area under The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Following consultation, a revised area was agreed, which omitted land at Adastral Park, Martlesham as well as that part of the parish which relates visually and functionally to the neighbouring town of Woodbridge. The revised [neighbourhood area](#) was designated by Suffolk Coastal District Council on 5th May 2015.

2.2 The Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan was published by Martlesham Parish Council for pre-submission consultation (Regulation 14) between November 2016 and January 2017.

2.3 Following the submission of the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan ([submission version](#)) to Suffolk Coastal District Council the Plan was publicised and comments invited over a six week period which closed on 18th August 2017.

2.4 Suffolk Coastal District Council, with the agreement of Martlesham Parish Council appointed an independent examiner, Rosemary Kidd DipTP 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 [Examiner's Report](#) received 5th March 2018 concluded that subject to modifications identified in the Report, the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions. This is summarised in paragraph 5.2 of the Report which states:

“I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan meets all the statutory requirements, in particular those set out in paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country

Planning Act 1990 and, subject to the modifications I have identified, meets the basic conditions namely:

- has regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
- is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area;
- does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations and human rights requirements.”

2.6 The Examiner goes on to recommend that subject to the modifications listed in the Report, the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum. She further recommends that the referendum area should be the same as the designated neighbourhood area.

2.7 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. This is set out in the table in section 3 below. Ahead of this consideration, the Report and its findings have been subject to discussion between the Council and Martlesham Parish Council.

3. Decision and Reasons

3.1 Suffolk Coastal District Council, under powers delegated to the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning, has considered each of the modifications recommended and concurs with the reasoning provided by the Examiner in her Report dated 5 March 2018. The Council further agrees with the Examiners conclusions as set out in paragraph 5.2 of her report that “..*the Plan meets all the statutory requirements..*”. With the Examiner’s recommended modifications, Suffolk Coastal District Council has decided that the Martlesham 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, the submission version of the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan will be modified as recommended, for it then to proceed to referendum.

3.2 The Council has considered the referendum area as recommended by the Examiner 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 for the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan.

3.3 The list of modifications and actions required are set out in the following table. As a consequence of these changes the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan will be re-published and titled the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum Version).



Cllr Tony Fryatt
Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Planning

Dated: 27/03/2018



Examiner's recommended modification	Reason for change (summarised)	Action by SCDC
<p><u>R1: Neighbourhood Plan Period</u> Show the lifespan of the Plan on the front cover.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 1.1 of the Neighbourhood Plan and 1.8 of the Basic Conditions Statement state that the lifespan of the Neighbourhood Plan is to be from 2016 to 2031. It would be helpful to plan users to show the lifespan of the plan on the front cover</p>	<p>Agree. Lifespan of plan added to front cover.</p>
<p><u>R2: Introduction</u> Revise the Introduction as follows: Revise paragraph 1.1 to include reference to the “adopted Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document and “saved” policies”.</p> <p>Add the following at the end of paragraph 1.3 “within the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan area.”</p> <p>Delete “and, under the guidance provided by the NPPF, is up to date” from paragraph 1.17.</p> <p>Reference the criteria in policies by numbers and/or letters rather than use bullet points.</p> <p>Correct the policy numbers in the Policies Map key. Correct the numbers of the figures.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.1 should be updated to refer to the adopted Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document and the commencement of the review of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan policies can only replace the saved policies as they apply to the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>	<p>Agree. Amendments to paragraphs 1.1; 1.3 and 1.17 comprise factual corrections which aid clarity and understanding. Paragraphs have been amended as per recommendation.</p> <p>Criteria in policies are now referenced by letters.</p> <p>The Key to the Policies Map has been updated to show correct policy numbers.</p>
<p><u>R3: Table 3.1</u> Revise Table 3.1 to demonstrate how the vision statements are to be delivered</p>	<p>Table 3.1 shows how each vision statement is to be addressed through various types of development and input by the community</p>	<p>Agree. Amending Table 3.1 will aid clarity and understanding. Table 3.1 has been amended to include</p>

<p>through the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. Those vision statements that are not delivered through the plan policies should be deleted or revised.</p>	<p>and Parish Council activities including input into the Masterplan for Adastral Park. However no assessment has been undertaken to show how the vision statements will be delivered through the policies in the neighbourhood plan. Table 3.1 should be revised to make this explicit.</p>	<p>relevant policy references.</p>
<p><u>R4: Physical Limits Boundaries</u></p> <p>Include the area of Deben Avenue within the Physical Limits Boundary on the Policies Map.</p> <p>Add the following after paragraph 4.2: <i>“Although Deben Avenue is within the physical limits of Kesgrave (as shown in Map 40 in Appendix 6a of the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies - Development Plan Document January 2017), it is within the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan area”.</i></p>	<p>The physical limits boundary shown on the Policies Map excludes the area of Deben Avenue. This area of housing is shown within the Physical Limits Boundary on Map 40 of the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD January 2017. Whilst the housing is part of the community of Kesgrave, it lies within Martlesham Parish. I can see no reason why the area should not be shown as within the Physical Limits Boundary of the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan map.</p>	<p>Agree. The Policies Map has been amended to include a Physical Limits Boundary around properties in Deben Avenue.</p> <p>Additional wording added as per recommendation but included as a separate paragraph after paragraph 4.2.</p>
<p><u>R5: Areas to be Protected from Development</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR2 to read: <i>“Areas to be protected from development, as identified on the Policies Map, comprise local scale sites, gaps, gardens and spaces that make an important contribution to the character and setting of Martlesham in their undeveloped form. Accordingly, development within these areas will be</i></p>	<p>Saved policy AP28 has been updated and included in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies DPD adopted January 2017 as SSP39. The wording of MAR2 is the same as that of saved policy AP28. Policy SSP39 includes a revised form of wording that has taken account of current national guidance. The policy wording of MAR2 should be revised to be consistent with policy SSP39.</p>	<p>Agree. Policy re-worded as per recommendation.</p> <p>Reference to AP28 deleted from paragraph 4.16</p>

<p><i>severely restricted.”</i></p> <p>Delete reference to saved Policy AP28 from the justification.</p>		
<p><u>R6: Development within Martlesham Heath</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR3 as follows: Revise the first paragraph to read: “...<i>new</i> development <i>should</i> be in keeping with” Revise paragraph 2 to read: “In particular, development <i>should</i> be...”</p> <p>Revise paragraph 4 to read: “Any existing leisure uses on sites accessible to the public should be retained or re-provided in line with Policy MAR9.”</p> <p>Replace the “; and” at the end of the third bullet point with a full stop.</p> <p>Revise the last paragraph to read: “Any development proposals must demonstrate that they have engaged with the Clinical Commissioning Group in respect of the existing primary healthcare facility. Proposals shall not <i>prejudice</i> the potential for expansion of the existing healthcare <i>unless it is clearly demonstrated</i> that this is not necessary to support the growth proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan area</p>	<p>The policy refers in the first and second paragraph to “development will be expected to” this should be re-phrased to be more positive by the use of the word “should”.</p> <p>Concern has been expressed that policy MAR3 would restrict development opportunities on land adjacent to the GP surgery at The Square pending a decision about whether the surgery should be expanded as there is scope to provide additional health care facilities at Adastral Park.</p> <p>The Qualifying Body has informed me that discussions are on-going with regard to this matter and proposed wording revision to MAR3 and a consequential revision to paragraph 4.20.</p> <p>I have recommended the text to be incorporated to update and improve the clarity of the policy. The addition of text to paragraph 4.20 would provide a useful cross reference to the Non-Policy Action following deletion of the section on health facilities.</p>	<p>Agree. The revised wording reflects discussion held between Martlesham Parish Council and this Council.</p> <p>Policy MAR3, and paragraph 4.20 have been amended as per the recommendation. Additional wording has been added after paragraph 4.20 as per recommendation.</p> <p>Table 9.1 updated in relation to Surgery Facilities.</p>

<p>and at the strategic site at Adastral Park during the plan period.”</p> <p>Revise paragraph 4.20 to read: <i>“Any future planning decisions made in the village centre (as defined on the Policies Map) should take account of the demonstrated need for the future expansion of the healthcare facility.”</i></p> <p>Revise the wording in Table 9.1 on Non Policy Actions for Surgery Facilities to reflect the Parish Council’s aspirations as set out above.</p>		
<p><u>R7: Residential Design & Amenity</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR4 as follows: Delete second and eighth bullet points.</p> <p>Delete the word “and” from the end of bullet points except for the penultimate one.</p>	<p>Second bullet point refers to development meeting MAR2. This is already addressed in Policy MAR3 on the location of development and is considered unnecessary when considering the design of development.</p> <p>The eighth bullet point promotes high quality interior spaces and light. The design of internal spaces is not a matter that will be considered when assessing a planning application.</p>	<p>Agree. Second and eighth bullet points deleted as recommended.</p>
<p><u>R8: Housing Need / Housing Mix</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR5 to read: “Residential developments should provide a mix of dwelling sizes <i>and tenures</i>, both market and affordable housing, that meet</p>	<p>The second part of the policy seeks to provide for the significant majority of 2 and 3 bed properties as bungalows, flats and sheltered accommodation. I have been provided with information to show this. However, the policy is unduly prescriptive in the type of</p>	<p>Agree. The revised wording was subject of discussion between the Qualifying Body and this Council.</p> <p>Policy MAR 5 amended as per recommendation.</p>

<p>the requirements of Suffolk Coastal Core Strategy Policy SP3. <i>In particular, this should provide two and three bedroom properties to meet the needs of older people looking to downsize and local people looking to remain in the area.</i></p> <p>Delete that second sentence of paragraph 5.10 and all of paragraph 5.11. Add the following to paragraph 5.10: <i>“Housing Needs Surveys will be undertaken in the future to determine the need in the plan area of any particular types, sizes and tenures of housing.”</i></p> <p>Redesign Figure 5.1.</p>	<p>housing sought. A more generic wording has been proposed by the Qualifying Body in response to my question on the subject. I have recommended this revised wording be included.</p> <p>Housing needs will change over time. I agree that housing needs surveys should be undertaken to provide evidence for specialist housing types of housing, such as affordable housing, bungalows or extra care housing.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.10 is amended as per recommendation.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.11 has been deleted.</p> <p>Figure 5.1 has been formatted to make it more legible.</p>
<p><u>R9: Residential Boats</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR6 as follows: Place the first paragraph and the first four bullet points in the justification to Policy MAR6.</p> <p>Revise the second paragraph to read:” The development of <i>a new mooring for a residential boat, alterations to or replacement of an existing residential boat or for the construction of jetties, platforms and sheds associated with residential boat moorings should demonstrate the following:</i></p>	<p>The first part of the policy and the first four bullet points set out the circumstances where development affecting residential boats and associated jetties, platforms and sheds require planning permission. This does not set out the policy approach to determining planning applications and should be moved to the justification section.</p> <p>The second part of the policy which does set out matters to be considered should be amended as a consequence.</p>	<p>Agree. The modifications aid clarity.</p> <p>The first part of MAR6 has been deleted and included as a new paragraph after 5.13.</p> <p>The second part of the policy has been reworded as per the recommendation.</p>

<p>Delete “that” from the first bullet point. Replace the full stops in the first and second bullet point with semicolons and add “and” at the end of the second bullet point.</p>		
<p><u>R10: Local Gaps</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR7 as follows: <i>“Development proposals within the gaps between Martlesham Heath and Martlesham Village; and Martlesham Village and Woodbridge, as shown on the Policies Map, should demonstrate that: bullet points 1 and 2.”</i></p> <p>Show the boundaries of the two areas on the Policies map and delete the three arrows.</p>	<p>The identification of local gaps accords with strategic policy SP15.</p> <p>The open land between Martlesham Heath and Kesgrave is covered by areas to be protected under policy MAR2. Further protection is unnecessary and superfluous. However reference to protection of the area under another policy may be included within the justification for completeness.</p> <p>To improve the clarity of the policy it is recommended that reference to the remaining two gaps between Martlesham Heath and Martlesham village; and Martlesham Village and Woodbridge are shown on the Policies Map. The current delineation of these areas by means of an arrow may result in some ambiguity for decision makers.</p>	<p>Agree with changes to policy and Policies Map.</p> <p>Policy MAR 7 re-worded as per recommendation.</p> <p>Policies Map amended to remove arrows and to delineate local gaps between Martlesham Heath and Martlesham Village and Martlesham Village and Woodbridge.</p> <p>Given the choice, no additional wording has been provided to the justification in respect of MAR2 and land between Martlesham Heath and Kesgrave.</p>
<p><u>R11: Special Landscape Areas</u></p> <p>Delete Policy MAR8. Retain the Special Landscape Area designation on the Policies</p>	<p>A representation has been made that this policy repeats local strategic policy SSP38. I agree the policy adds nothing locally to the strategic policy and is therefore superfluous</p>	<p>Agree. Revised text was subject of discussion between the Qualifying Body and the Council.</p> <p>Policy MAR8 deleted from text.</p>

<p>Map and delete the reference to Policy MAR8 in the key.</p> <p>Revise the supporting text to read: <i>“Special Landscape Areas are a county level landscape designation recognised in Core Strategy Policy SP15 (Landscape and Townscape). Part of the Deben Estuary/ Fynn Valley SLA is located within the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan area. The Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan makes no change to the SLA boundary as previously designated which is shown on the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan Policies Map. In the interests of applying a consistent approach to applications for development within SLAs, Policy SSP38 of the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Document will apply, superseding “saved” policy AP13. This means that development will not be permitted in these areas where it would have a material adverse impact on the qualities of the landscape that make it special. Where development is considered acceptable, landscape improvements should be included as an integral part of the development proposal.”</i></p>	<p>and should be deleted.</p> <p>It would be helpful to plan users to retain the supporting text which should be updated to refer to the latest strategic policies to highlight the significance of the Special Landscape Area and relevant strategic policies. The Qualifying Body has provided suggested text.</p>	<p>Reference to MAR 8 deleted from Policies Map Key.</p> <p>Supporting text at paragraph 6.5 revised as recommended.</p>
<p><u>R12: Existing Community & Leisure Uses</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR9 as follows:</p>	<p>The fourth bullet point refers to any replacement facility being within or adjacent to the “built up boundary”. For the sake of</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Policy amended as per recommendation.</p>

<p>Revise the third bullet point to read “....relevant <i>Physical Limits</i> Boundary where....”</p> <p>Delete the final paragraph of the policy</p>	<p>clarity and consistency with Policy MAR1 this should be amended to the “physical limits boundary”.</p> <p>The final paragraph of the Policy states that outside the built-up area boundaries, Policy MAR1 will apply. It is considered that this statement is unclear and unnecessary and should be deleted.</p>	
<p><u>R13: New Leisure Uses</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR10 as follows:</p> <p>Replace “must” with “should” in lines 2 and 5 of the policy.</p> <p>Delete the final paragraph of the policy.</p>	<p>The wording of the policy is such that the matters are requirements. It is not clear whether these requirements would affect the deliverability of any new community facilities. In order to provide a degree of flexibility in the wording of the policy it is recommended that the word “should” is used in lines 2 and 5.</p> <p>The final paragraph of the policy states that outside the built up area boundaries, Policy MAR1 will apply. It is considered this statement is unclear and unnecessary and should be deleted.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Policy amended as per recommendation.</p>
<p><u>R14: Allotments and Community Growing Spaces</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR12 by deleting the second paragraph.</p>	<p>A representation has been made proposing that a minimum threshold be set for the requirement to be provided. In response to my question the Qualifying Body has replied that it will be as part of any estate size residential development outside the physical limits boundary.</p> <p>Community growing areas are an aspiration</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Second paragraph of MAR12 has been deleted.</p>

	<p>of the Local Plan review; I consider that their provision is laudable but not deliverable within the scale of development proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is recommended therefore that the second part of the policy is deleted.</p>	
<p><u>R15: Non Designated Heritage Assets</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR13 to read: <i>“Development proposals affecting non-designated heritage assets either directly or indirectly, should respect the significance of and context of the asset and demonstrate how they will contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the heritage asset.”</i></p> <p>Delete Appendix 1 and replace with the schedule of Bowl Barrows.</p> <p>Include a new Appendix 2 with a revised schedule of non-designated heritage assets that satisfy Suffolk Coastal District Council’s criteria for non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Revise the third sentence of paragraph 6.25 to read: “The remains that are still visible have been recorded by Suffolk County Council in their SMR report of Martlesham Airfield dated 25 March 2010.”</p> <p>Revise the final sentence of paragraph 6.25</p>	<p>MAR13 is a very restrictive policy which it is considered does not accord with national guidance paragraph 135. Representations have also expressed concern about the lack of evidence to assess the significance of the assets listed in Appendix 1 and the implication of including Gorseland Primary School as a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The Council and the Qualifying Body have put forward a suggestion to revise the wording. I am recommending revisions to ensure that the policy accords with national guidance. The Qualifying Body has also provided a revised schedule listing 25 assets. The schedule has been revised and categorised in line with SCDC’s criteria. I am satisfied that owners and local volunteer groups and societies were consulted as part of the neighbourhood plan preparation process. The Qualifying Body has proposed splitting the list in Appendix 1 with a schedule of the seven bowl barrows listed by Historic England as Scheduled Ancient Monuments as Appendix</p>	<p>Agree. Modifications will strengthen policy and clarify text.</p> <p>MAR 13 re-worded as per recommendation.</p> <p>Appendix 1 deleted and replaced with schedule of Bowl Barrows.</p> <p>New Appendix 2 provided listing revised schedule of non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>A background report has been put together containing the full detail of the non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Paragraphs 6.25 and 6.27 have been amended as per the recommendation.</p>

<p>to read: <i>“The list of buildings and structures has been categorised in line with Suffolk Coastal District Council’s criteria for non designated heritage assets. The local list is included in Appendix 2.”</i></p> <p>Delete second and third sentences of paragraph 6.27. Replace with <i>“The Parish Council will seek to promote the significance of the non-designated assets and their conservation.”</i></p> <p>Prepare a background report with full details of the Non-Designated Heritage Assets including a description of each asset, an assessment of its significance to justify its inclusion in the list, a map showing the boundary of the asset and photographs.</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>To assist in the use of the Policy and its interpretation by landowners and decision makers, it is suggested that the schedule should be supported by a description of each asset, an assessment of its significance to justify its inclusion in the list, a map showing the boundary of the asset and photographs.</p>	
<p><u>R16: Access to Health Facilities</u></p> <p>Delete paragraphs 6.29 to 6.32.</p>	<p>This section discusses the concerns that have been raised during the consultation on the likely need for new or improved health facilities as a result of the proposed housing development at Adastral Park. No policy is included in the Plan on Health Facilities other than within Policy MAR3. It would be appropriate to record the concerns expressed in paragraph 6.30 of the Report of Consultation.</p>	<p>Agree, but see also modifications agreed in respect of MAR3.</p> <p>Paragraphs 6.20 to 6.32 deleted.</p>
<p><u>R17: Getting Around</u></p> <p>Add a footnote to Figures 7.1 and 7.2 to note</p>	<p>The Qualifying Body confirmed that information is based on local knowledge,</p>	<p>Agree. Footnote now added referencing back to the</p>

<p>their source</p>	<p>feedback from the neighbourhood plan survey and transport assessments prepared by developers of the Adastral Site. As the maps are not based on published Highway Authority data it is recommended that their source be noted in a footnote to each figure.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group for the information they hold.</p>
<p><u>R18: Cycling, Walking and Disabled Access in Martlesham Heath Retail Park</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR15 as follows:</p> <p>Insert “<i>adjacent</i>” after “within and” in line 1 of the policy.</p> <p>Revise the title of the Policy to read “.....<i>within and adjacent to Martlesham Heath Retail Park.</i>”</p> <p>Add the following after paragraph 7.24: “<i>The extent of the Martlesham Heath Retail Park is defined in paragraph 7.XX in the section on the Martlesham Heath Retail Park and Business Park.</i>”</p>	<p>The policy requires developers both within and adjacent to the Martlesham Retail Park to demonstrate how they will ensure easy and safe access for pedestrians, cyclists and disabled users. The word adjacent has been omitted in error from line one of the policy and policy title. To ensure consistency policy should refer to “within and adjacent to”.</p> <p>The Plan does not show the boundary for the area covered by the policy. The Qualifying Body has informed me that they are working with the Council to define the area of the Retail Park as part of the Local Plan review.</p> <p>To ensure that a consistent approach is taken to determining proposals within the Retail Park using this and subsequent policies, it is considered that it would be helpful to define the area of the Retail Park in the justification to the section headed “Martlesham Heath Retail Park and Business Park.”</p>	<p>Agreed. This modification was the subject of discussion between the Qualifying Body and the Council.</p> <p>Policy title and policy now refer to “within and adjacent to”</p> <p>New paragraph added after aragraph 7.24 amended as per recommendation.</p>
<p><u>R19: Parking Provision</u></p>	<p>The 1st and 4th paragraphs of the policy repeat</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

<p>Delete paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 from Policy MAR16 and revise the title of the policy to Parking Provision.</p>	<p>requirements on Policy DM19 which states that proposals for all types of new development will be required to conform to the District Council’s adopted parking standards. These paragraphs are unnecessary as they add no locally specific matters to the District policy.</p> <p>The second sentence in the first paragraph is not a policy statement. It is a reason for the policy.</p> <p>The 2nd paragraph states that the parking provision must be permanently available for parking use. The County Council has commented this would be unenforceable as once dwellings are occupied the use of the garage for storage cannot be prevented..</p>	<p>Policy and title amended as per recommendation.</p>
<p><u>R20: Parking Standards at Martlesham Heath Retail Park and Business Park</u></p> <p>Delete the final sentence of the first paragraph of Policy MAR17 and paragraph 7.31.</p> <p>Revise the second paragraph of the policy to read “....development proposals <i>should</i> meet the following criteria:”</p> <p>Add the following at the beginning of the justification, before paragraph 7.29: “<i>Martlesham Heath Retail Park and Business</i></p>	<p>The first part of the policy and paragraph 7.31 refer to the need for planning applications to be accompanied by an assessment of the ration of parking spaces to floorspace at existing stores and to demonstrate how well this accommodates the parking need. The reasons for this requirement are unclear. In any case the parking requirements for different types of stores will vary and cannot be used to predict the needs of new stores. The County Council notes that new developments cannot be required to remedy existing infrastructure deficits. It is therefore recommended this requirement is deleted.</p>	<p>Agreed. Discussions on this point were held between the Qualifying Body and the Council.</p> <p>Policy MAR17 and paragraph wordings amended as per recommendation.</p> <p>Key to the Policies Map amended.</p> <p>In addition, the policy title has been amended to refer to Parking Provision – a consistency point with R19.</p>

<p><i>Park together form the Martlesham Heath General Employment Area. The extent of the Martlesham Heath Retail Park is as described in the Core Strategy and the Retail and Commercial Leisure Town Centre Study 2017, or as defined in a subsequent strategic policy. The remainder of the General Employment Area constitutes the Business Park. The General Employment Area is shown on the Policies Map.</i></p> <p>Revise the key to the Policies Map so that the General Employment Area includes Policy MAR17.</p> <p>Revise paragraph 7.29 to refer to Policy MAR15.</p> <p>Delete “Policy MAR15 recognises that” from paragraph 7.30.</p>	<p>The policy uses the word “must” throughout. In view of the importance of providing for vehicular parking and HGV manoeuvring within these areas, I am making no recommendation concerning its use in this policy. The second part of the policy refers to proposals being expected to meet the criteria. To improve clarity it is recommended that this be revised to “should meet”.</p> <p>At this stage the boundary of the Retail Park cannot be defined on a map. To provide clarity for plan users, it is recommended that additional text is added at the beginning of this section to describe the extent of the Retail Park and Business Park. The key to the Policies Map should be revised so that the General Employment Area relates to Policy MAR17 as well as Policy MAR19.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.29 incorrectly refers to Policy MAR14.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.30 as currently written is inaccurate.</p>	
<p><u>R21: Martlesham Heath Retail Park</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR18 as follows:</p>	<p>The policy supports the provision of retail uses at the Martlesham Heath Retail Park with the provision that it is of a nature and scale that cannot be supported in a Retail or</p>	<p>Agree. Policy MAR18 has been amended as per the recommendation.</p> <p>Additional wording has been added to the</p>

<p>Revise the first bullet point to read: “it has been demonstrated that there are no sites that are suitable or available in or on the edge of a Retail Centre.....Policy SP9; and”</p> <p>Revise the second bullet point to read: “would not have a significant adverse impact on”</p> <p>Add the following at the end of paragraph 8.9: “Impact assessments will be required for retail developments over 2,500 sq m.”</p> <p>Add the following after paragraph 8.5: “The extent of the Martlesham Heath Retail Park is defined in paragraph 7.XX in the section on the Martlesham Heath Retail Park and Business Park.”</p>	<p>District Centre. Secondly, that the proposal demonstrate the principal type of retail use proposed would not impact on the vitality and viability of the Martlesham Heath District Centre.</p> <p>NPPF paragraphs 26 & 27 advises local planning authorities to require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate locally set threshold. Where no thresholds are set, the default threshold is 2,500 sqm. It would be helpful to plan users to include a statement in the justification to the policy that an impact assessment will be required for developments over 2,500sqm. The boundary of the Retail Park has not been defined for reasons given earlier. It would be helpful to plan users to include a reference to the justification to Policy MAR18.</p> <p>In response to representations made, additional wording could be added to the first bullet point to provide a degree of flexibility to consider the suitability of other site in edge of centre locations close to these centres. Also to support proposals where it has been demonstrated that there are not sites that are suitable or available in a centre.</p> <p>In respect of the second bullet point it should state that applications should demonstrate that there would not be a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability or the</p>	<p>end of paragraph 8.9.</p> <p>An additional paragraph has been added after paragraph 8.5.</p>
--	---	---

	District Centre. I agree.	
<p><u>R22: General Employment Areas</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR 19 as follows:</p> <p>Revise the first paragraph to read: “...on the Martlesham Heath General Employment Area shown on the Policies Map, the development of B1 (<i>business</i>), B2 (<i>general industrial</i>) and B8 (<i>storage or distribution</i>) uses will be supported.</p> <p>Revise the second paragraph to read: “...retail uses (Classes A1 to A5) will be resisted. Such changes of use will only be permitted if it has been satisfactorily demonstrated to the LPA that the location has been effectively marketed over a reasonable period of time in accordance with the Suffolk Coastal Commercial Property Marketing Guide dated 12th August 2016 (or subsequent updates).”</p> <p>Delete the bullet points.</p> <p>Include further information on the Supplementary Planning Guidance and marketing requirements in the justification.</p> <p>Revise the first sentence of paragraph 8.4 to read “... Martlesham. The Martlesham Heath</p>	<p>Wording “planning permission will normally be granted” is not acceptable for reasons cited earlier. First part of policy should be re-phrased as “the development of B1, B2 and B8 uses will be supported”. The description of the use classes should be amended to be consistent with the wording used in the Use Classes Order.</p> <p>MAR19 is clearly worded to state that it relates to the whole of the General Employment Area. However paragraph 8.4 refers to the policy applying to the Business Park. Paragraph 8.5 refers to the industrial park. The justification should be revised to clarify the policy applies to the whole General Employment Area which includes both the Retail Park and the Business Park.</p> <p>The policy title and first paragraph refer to Areas but only one area is shown on the Policies Map.</p> <p>The Key to the Policies Map should refer to the correct policy number.</p> <p>As the boundary of the Retail Park cannot be mapped at this stage it is recommended that the Business Park is defined in the justification as that part of Martlesham Heath General Employment Area outside the Retail Park.</p> <p>References in the second part of the policy</p>	<p>Agree. Recommended modifications aid clarity.</p> <p>Policy MAR 19 amended as per recommendation.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.4 amended as per recommendation.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.5 reference to Business Park included.</p> <p>References amended to refer to General Employment Area.</p> <p>Policies Map Key updated.</p>

<p><i>General Employment Area is retained and the wording of the saved policy has been updated to promote the area for business use, to resist changes of use to retailing and to set out the circumstances when retail uses will be acceptable.”</i></p> <p>Revise the second sentence of paragraph 8.5 to read “<i>Business Park</i>”.</p> <p>Revise the title of Policy MAR19 to “<i>Martlesham Heath General Employment Area</i>”.</p> <p>Correct the key to the Policies Map.</p>	<p>should be updated to reflect current use classes and their descriptions.</p>	
<p><u>R23: Sandy Lane Martlesham</u></p> <p>Revise Policy MAR 20 as follows: <i>“Planning permission will be granted for employment development, including re-development or refurbishment of existing buildings on land at Sandy Lane, Martlesham as identified on the Policies Map, provided that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • <i>The use is restricted to activities falling within Use Classes B1 and B2 or extensions and alterations to established premises and businesses on the site for the continuation of existing activities;</i> • • <i>It does not harm the AONB setting</i> 	<p>I have a number of concerns about the clarity of the wording of this policy and its application and deliverability. I have asked the Qualifying Body and the Council to review it. They have proposed revisions which I am recommending to ensure that the policy is clear and unambiguous in order to provide clear guidance for decision makers and plan users.</p>	<p>Agreed. The modification recommended has been the subject of discussion between the Qualifying Body and the Council.</p> <p>Policy MAR20 amended as per recommendation.</p>

<p><i>and any designated heritage assets. New buildings, conversions and external works (including re-cladding) shall be of a high standard and should not detract from the character of the AONB;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It does not increase the number of access routes in and out onto Sandy Lane;</i> • <i>A transport assessment can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority that the scale and type of traffic generated is acceptable in terms of impact on the local road network;</i> • <i>Where possible, it improves pedestrian and cycling conditions on Sandy Lane; and</i> • <i>It supports the provision of suitable premises for small businesses.”</i> 		
<p><u>R24: Non Policy Actions</u></p> <p>Revise Table 9.1 first point to read: “<i>Work with the Local Planning Authority to ensure that a wide range of housing is provided in the parish outside the Neighbourhood Plan area to include....”</i></p>	<p>This section highlights other matters that have arisen during the consultations. A revision to this section is advised to make it clear that this will be met through developments outside the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>First point in Table 9.1 amended as per recommendation.</p>
<p>Other Changes not required to meet Basic Conditions</p>	<p>Reason for change</p>	<p>Action by SCDC</p>
<p>Introductory Sections Paragraph 1.1 Update paragraph to refer to adopted plans</p>	<p>Noted by Examiner in paragraph 3.15 of Report, but not specified within modifications</p>	<p>New sentence added to end of paragraph 1.1 to read “ <i>Suffolk Coastal District Council is</i></p>

and the commencement of the review of the Local Plan.	listed in Recommendation 2.	<i>currently working on a Local Plan Review which, at March 2018 is at an early stage."</i>
Introduction Section Fig 2.1.	The purpose of this plan is to provide a general overview of the Martlesham area and the environmental designations which add context. Title currently incorrectly references the neighbourhood plan area as the information contained extends beyond the neighbourhood area boundary. Lines which do not denote environmental designations removed but notations retained so information is presented in a consistent manner.	Fig 2.1 Re-titled to correctly reflect information shown. Lines which do not show environmental designations removed.

