

RENDELSHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2014-2027

A Report to Suffolk Coastal District Council
of the Examination into the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan

by Independent Examiner, Nigel McGurk BSc(Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

Nigel McGurk

Erimax Land, Planning and Communities

erimaxltd.com

December 2014

Contents:

1. Introduction

2. Basic Conditions and Development Plan Status

3. Background Documents and Rendlesham Neighbourhood Area

4. Public Consultation

5. The Neighbourhood Plan - Introductory Section

- **Introductory and background chapters**

6. The Neighbourhood Plan – Policies & Objectives

- **The District Centre**
- **The Village Green**
- **Housing**
- **Environment**
- **Economic Development**
- **Traffic**

7. Summary

8. Referendum

1. Introduction

The Neighbourhood Plan

This Report provides the findings of the examination into the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan (referred to as the Neighbourhood Plan).

Neighbourhood planning provides communities with the power to establish their own policies to shape future development in and around where they live and work.

“Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they need.”
(Paragraph 183, National Planning Policy Framework)

Rendlesham Parish Council is the *qualifying body*¹ responsible for the production of this Neighbourhood Plan. This is in line with the aims and purposes of neighbourhood planning, as set out in the Localism Act (2011), the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Planning Practice Guidance (2014).

The Neighbourhood Plan is a “front runner” and as such, is one of the first tranche of neighbourhood plans to come forward in the country, and one of the first of such plans in Suffolk.

Rendlesham Parish Council established a Neighbourhood Plan Team (NPT) to lead on production of the Neighbourhood Plan. This comprised Parish Councillors, a District Councillor and volunteer residents and members of the business community.

This Examiner’s Report provides a recommendation as to whether or not the Neighbourhood Plan should go forward to a Referendum. Were it to go to Referendum and achieve more than 50% of votes in favour, then the Plan would be *made* by Suffolk Coastal District Council. The Neighbourhood Plan would then be used to determine planning applications and guide planning decisions in the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Area.

¹The qualifying body is responsible for the production of the Plan.

Role of the Independent Examiner

I was appointed by Suffolk Coastal District Council, with the consent of Rendlesham Parish Council, to conduct an examination and provide this Report as an Independent Examiner. I am independent of the qualifying body and the local authority. I do not have any interest in land that may be affected by the Neighbourhood Plan and I possess appropriate qualifications and experience. I am a chartered town planner and an experienced Independent Examiner of Neighbourhood Plans. I have extensive land, planning and development experience, gained across the public, private, partnership and community sectors.

As the Independent Examiner, I must make one of the following recommendations:

- a) that the Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it meets all legal requirements;
- b) that the Neighbourhood Plan, as modified, should proceed to Referendum;
- c) that the Neighbourhood Plan does not proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it does not meet the relevant legal requirements.

If recommending that the Neighbourhood Plan should go forward to Referendum, I must then consider whether or not the Referendum Area should extend beyond the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Area to which the Plan relates.

In examining the Plan, I am also required, under Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to check whether:

- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004;
- the Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the 2004 PCPA (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area);
- the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.

Subject to the contents of this Report, I am satisfied that all of the above points have been met.

Neighbourhood Plan Period

A neighbourhood plan must specify the period during which it is to have effect. The cover of the Neighbourhood Plan clearly states that it covers the period “2014-2027” and the Foreword states that the Neighbourhood Plan “will define how the community want to see the wider village developing from 2014-2027.”

The Basic Conditions Statement confirms that the Neighbourhood Plan covers the period from 2014 to 2027, “the same as the Core Strategy prepared by Suffolk Coastal District Council.” (Basic Conditions Statement, para 1.03)

Taking the above into account, I confirm that the Neighbourhood Plan satisfies the relevant requirement in this regard.

Public Hearing

According to the legislation, *when the Examiner considers it necessary* to ensure adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case, then a public hearing must be held.

However, the legislation establishes that it is a general rule that neighbourhood plan examinations should be held without a public hearing – by written representations only.

Further to consideration of the written representations submitted, I confirmed to Suffolk Coastal District Council that I was satisfied that the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan could be examined without the need for a Public Hearing.

2. Basic Conditions and Development Plan Status

Basic Conditions

It is the role of the Independent Examiner to consider whether a neighbourhood plan meets the “basic conditions.” These were *set out in law*² following the Localism Act 2011. In order to meet the basic conditions, the Plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
- be compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations.

I have examined the Neighbourhood Plan against all of the basic conditions above.

EU and ECHR Obligations

The Basic Conditions Statement submitted with the Neighbourhood Plan confirms that it does not breach, and is compatible with, all European obligations.

I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan has regard to fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the ECHR and complies with the Human Rights Act 1998 and there is no substantive evidence to the contrary.

Planning Practice Guidance establishes that *the local planning authority must decide whether the draft neighbourhood plan is compatible with EU regulations*. Suffolk Coastal District Council has undertaken a screening report to test whether the Neighbourhood Plan requires a full Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The screening report concluded that the Neighbourhood Plan will not have any significant environmental impacts and that an SEA is not required.

In determining the need, or otherwise, for an SEA, Suffolk Coastal District Council consulted Natural England, the Environment Agency and English Heritage. Each of these bodies supported Suffolk Coastal District Council’s conclusion that an SEA is not required.

The Neighbourhood Plan does not include any housing or employment land allocations. Thus, whilst the Neighbourhood Area includes part of the Sandlings Forest Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is part of the Sandlings Special Protection Area (SPA) – designated for its nightjar populations – the Basic Conditions

² Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Statement establishes that “no European sites will be significantly affected” by the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan and a Habitats Regulation Assessment is not required. With specific regard to the SSSI, I note that Natural England considers that the “scale and nature of development being proposed through the Plan appears unlikely to have a significant effect on this site.”

Whilst not a legislative requirement, I note that a Sustainability Review of the Neighbourhood Plan has been undertaken. This is a substantial document that demonstrates how the Neighbourhood Plan will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The Sustainability Review follows relevant guidance set out in Planning Practice Guidance and concludes that the Neighbourhood Plan has been “sustainably prepared.”

Taking all of the above into account, I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan is compatible with EU obligations and that it does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with the ECHR.

3. Background Documents and Rendlesham Neighbourhood Area

Background Documents

In undertaking this examination, I have considered a number of documents in addition to the examination Version of the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan. These include:

- National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) (2012)
- Planning Practice Guidance (2014)
- Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
- The Localism Act (2011)
- The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012)
- Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan - Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (Adopted 2013)
(Referred to in this Report as the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan)
- Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan Saved Policies (Saved 2013)
- Basic Conditions Statement
- Consultation Statement
- Sustainability Review

Also:

- Representations received during the publicity period

In addition, I spent an unaccompanied day visiting the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Area.

Rendlesham Neighbourhood Area

The Rendlesham Neighbourhood Area coincides with that of the Parish of Rendlesham. There is a plan showing the Neighbourhood Area (and Parish Boundary) on page 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Further to an application made by the Parish Council, Suffolk Coastal District Council approved the designation of Rendlesham as a Neighbourhood Area on 29 October 2013. This satisfied a requirement in line with the purposes of preparing a Neighbourhood Development Plan under section 61G (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

4. Public Consultation

Introduction

As land use plans, the policies of neighbourhood plans will become the basis for planning and development control decisions. Legislation requires the production of neighbourhood plans to be supported by public consultation.

A comprehensive and robust approach to public consultation can ensure that a neighbourhood plan reflects the needs, views and priorities of the local community. It can create a sense of public ownership, help achieve consensus and provide the foundations for a successful 'Yes' vote at Referendum.

Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

Rendlesham Parish Council has submitted a Consultation Statement to Suffolk Coastal District Council. This sets out who was consulted and how, together with the outcome of the consultation. As such, the Consultation Statement meets the requirements of the neighbourhood planning *regulations*³.

From the evidence provided – parts of which, I summarise below – I am satisfied that the production of the Neighbourhood Plan was supported by significant, comprehensive and well-organised public consultation. It is clear to me that the views of the wider community were sought on a sustained and pro-active basis and that these views have been fundamental to the production of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Consultation commenced with an event attended by around 240 people in September 2011. This event focused on the use of the Sports Centre and Angel Theatre. A further event, with a similar focus and held in February 2012, was attended by around 165 people. These events were followed by walking tours, a housing needs survey, consultations with surrounding Parish Councils, Drop-In consultation, a public meeting, and consultations with young people, stakeholders, the Over-60s Club and Rendlesham Care Centre, amongst other things.

All of the above was supported and/or publicised via flyers, the parish newsletter, posters on notice boards and/or information on the Parish Council website. Furthermore, video blogs were produced, email invitations sent and social media utilised.

Questionnaires were sent to all households and businesses in the Parish and responses were received from over 700 individuals. The Consultation Statement

³Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

notes that 93% of people responding to the designation of the District Centre supported the allocation of the land for retail, leisure and community use.

The Draft Plan underwent 6 weeks consultation in April and May 2014. Consultation was publicised by banners, posters, notices in the Parish's ENews and by newsletter, delivered to every household and business in the Parish. Two consultation events, one of which was for young people, were held.

Further to revision, the Draft Plan underwent a second 6 week consultation period in June and July 2014. This was similarly publicised and included a consultation event in July 2014.

All of the above enabled plan-makers to develop key themes and objectives. I note that the final vision, objectives and content of the Neighbourhood Plan has been generally endorsed by feedback provided through consultation.

The Consultation Statement clearly sets out how the Neighbourhood Plan has evolved through substantial and sustained public consultation. From consideration of the evidence presented, it is clear that public consultation has been integral to the development of the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan.

There is an audit trail to demonstrate that consultation was ongoing, extensive and comprehensive, and that it was transparent and widely promoted. There were plentiful opportunities for comment and comments were duly considered. I am satisfied that people and organisations were provided with a fair chance to have their say.

The consultation undertaken is reflective of the major efforts made by all those involved to go well beyond any statutory requirements. Public consultation was central to the production of the Neighbourhood Plan and as such, is reflected in its content.

I am satisfied that the consultation process was significant and robust.

5. The Neighbourhood Plan – Introductory Section

Where modifications are recommended, they are presented as bullet points and highlighted in bold print, with any proposed new wording in italics.

The policies of the Neighbourhood Plan are considered against the basic conditions in Section 6 of this Examiner’s Report. I have also considered the introductory chapters of the Neighbourhood Plan and make recommendations below. These are aimed at making the Neighbourhood Plan a clear and user-friendly document.

Introductory and background chapters

The striking thing about the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan is that it does not adopt a standard format, but still effectively builds from relevant background information into Objectives and Policies. Processes, legislation and relevant background are clearly explained, in plain English, throughout the Neighbourhood Plan. Plentiful photographs and plans add significant interest.

In the above way, I find that the background Chapters, whilst comprising around half of the Neighbourhood Plan, are relevant and informative. They relate directly to the Neighbourhood Plan’s Objectives and Policies.

It is easy for the introductory chapters of neighbourhood plans to become too wide ranging and to go into too much detail on less relevant matters. This can lead to neighbourhood plans becoming imbalanced. It is not unusual for examiners to recommend the deletion of significant parts of introductory text at the examination stage.

It is a difficult task to ensure that background information remains both informative, interesting and importantly, relevant to the Policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan has largely managed to achieve this and the positive outcome is a Neighbourhood Plan that is entirely distinctive to Rendlesham.

As a consequence of this, whilst the background Chapters of the plan are substantial, I recommend only minimal modifications to them.

The final paragraph of the Foreword relates to matters relevant to pre-examination but which would add little to the final version of the Neighbourhood Plan.

- **Page 4, delete final paragraph**

Similarly, the diagram about neighbourhood planning on page 5 is a guide on how to produce a neighbourhood plan and is not relevant at this stage.

- **Delete Figure 1 on page 5**

I note that the Neighbourhood Plan contains many Appendices. With the exception of the Village Assets Map, these simply 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.

- **Remove Appendices (except Village Assets Map) to a separate document**
- **Delete page 6**

The Contents, Glossary and Map of Rendlesham are useful and their inclusion enhances the Neighbourhood Plan.

- **Para 2.07, the Framework was not published in March 2014, move this date reference to follow “National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)”**
- **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.**
- **Paras 2.11 to 2.13 relate to conformity matters. They are unnecessary. Delete these paragraphs.**

The History and Rendlesham Today chapters provide interesting and relevant background information, as does the SWOT analysis. 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.

- **Delete para 6.02**

Chapter 7 is the only Chapter in the introduction/background section that fails to add to the content of the Neighbourhood Plan. It simply regurgitates a very long quotation from the Localism Act and goes on to repeat information already set out in earlier chapters. It even repeats the plan showing the Neighbourhood Area. Its inclusion detracts from the earlier chapters and adds unnecessary “wool” between the introduction and the Policies.

- **Delete Chapter 7 and plan. Retain the two photographs.**

The Neighbourhood Plan Vision is clearly set out and sets the scene for the ensuing Objectives and Policies.

6. The Neighbourhood Plan – Neighbourhood Plan Policies

The Policy section of the Neighbourhood Plan provides a clear distinction between the Neighbourhood Plan’s land use planning Policies, Objectives and supporting text.

However, the supporting text includes long excerpts from the Framework and Policies from the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan. Neighbourhood plans should set out their own Policies, not those already contained in other documents. I address this matter in further detail below.

District Centre

This Chapter sets out numerous objectives relating to the District Centre. It only contains one Policy, RNPP1.

Paragraphs 9.03.02 to 9.03.03 simply repeat policy from the Framework and the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan. It is unnecessary to include this information. It detracts from the content of the Neighbourhood Plan.

- **Delete paras 9.03.02 to 9.03.03 inclusive.**

Whilst the figures and plans on pages 46 and 47 are relevant and informative, the page titles are inappropriate and make little sense.

- **Change titles on pages 46 and 47 to “*Change of land-use in the centre of the village to housing*”**

RNPP1

Policy RNPP1 defines Rendlesham District Centre and effectively protects the retail, leisure, education and community uses within it.

This approach has regard to national policy, in particular paragraph 28, which states that neighbourhood plans should

“promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.”

It also has regard to paragraph 23 of the Framework, which recognises town centres as being the heart of communities. This paragraph of the Framework states that policies should support their viability and vitality and should make it clear which uses will be permitted within them.

National planning policy recognises the important role that the planning system has to play in the creation of healthy, inclusive communities (Framework, para 69). In the light of this, the Framework identifies social, recreational and cultural facilities and services as being necessary community requirements. It states that planning policies and decisions should:

“Plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities...and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments.” (para 70)

In seeking to safeguard retail, leisure, education and community uses, Policy RNPP1 has regard to this.

The Policy is also in general conformity with Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan Policy SP9, which recognises Sycamore Drive, Rendlesham as a District Centre where the emphasis will be on maintaining viability and vitality.

Taking all of the above into account, I find that, in seeking to support a strong, vibrant and healthy community, Policy RNPP1 will perform a significant social role. It clearly aims to support the health, social and cultural well-being of the community. Consequently, it contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.

Furthermore, robust consultation has demonstrated that the Policy not only reflects the community’s needs but that it reflects the priorities of local people. The Framework is explicit in stating that

“Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they need” (para 183)

I find that Policy RNPP1 provides an example of local people utilising neighbourhood planning to get the right type of development for the community. Taking this and all of the above into account, subject to the recommendations with regards the wording of the Policy, set out below, I find that Policy RNPP1 meets the basic conditions.

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. I recommend:

- **Policy RNPP1, change to maintain/ing “or” enhance/ing, in the first, third and fourth paras**

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. I recommend the following changes:

- **Policy RNPP1, second para third line, change to “...key facilities *will be supported, provided that the redevelopment...*”**
- **Policy RNPP1, third para third line, change to “employment development *will be supported, provided that they maintain or enhance...*”**

The Angel Centre and the Sports Centre, both within the District Centre, are currently closed and, together with the Village Green, are in private ownership. Notably, both the Angel Centre and the Sports Centre are protected as Assets of Community Value.

The owner of the buildings objects to Policy RNPP1 and has applied for the redevelopment of the site. This application is the subject of an appeal – which comprises a separate matter to this examination.

The objection to Policy RNPP1 refers, amongst other things, to Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan Policy DM30. This Policy seeks to protect Key Facilities wherever possible and reflects the Council’s aim of preventing community facilities from being lost without evidence of detailed local consideration. I find that Policy RNPP1 is in general conformity with Policy DM30, which seeks to provide local communities with the opportunity to take over the operation of community facilities.

Policy RNPP1 supports redevelopment that at least maintains existing employment, leisure, education, retail or community uses. I consider that the Policy is reflective of well-evidenced local opinion, further to robust consultation. It has regard to national policy. I note that being in “general conformity” is different to “being the same as” and that Policy RNPP1 is not the same as DM30.

The objection considers that the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan is “unsound.” However, soundness is not the appropriate test for neighbourhood plans. I have found above that Policy RNPP1 meets the basic conditions. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that this is not the case.

The Village Green

This Chapter provides detail behind the Objective of protecting and realising the potential of the Village Green as part of the District Centre.

Policy RNPP2

Policy RNPP2 designates the Village Green as a Local Green Space.

The Framework enables local communities to identify, for special protection, green areas of particular importance to them. It states that

“By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances.” (Para 76)

Local Green Space is a restrictive and significant policy designation. The Framework requires the managing of development within Local Green Space to be consistent with policy for Green Belts. Effectively, Local Green Spaces, once designated, provide protection that is comparable to that for Green Belt land.

Taking this into account, it is essential that, when allocating Local Green Space, it can be demonstrated that the requirements for its designation are met in full. These requirements are that the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; it is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance; and it is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

The Village Green meets the above requirements and thus, its designation has regard to national policy.

However, the detailed wording of Policy RNPP2 fails to have regard to the Framework. The Policy states that the Village Green “will not be built on” whereas the Framework explicitly refers to “very special circumstances” and to Green Belt policy, which does not preclude development. Furthermore, the Policy itself does not need to repeat the reasons for the designation. I recommend the following modification:

- **Policy RNPP2, change wording to “...page 63) will not be built on, other than in very special circumstances. This protected area...support this.”**

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. This fails to have regard to paragraph 154 of the Framework, which requires policies to provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal. I recommend:

- **Policy RNPP2, change last sentence to “*The Local Green Space will be retained as a community open space.*”**

Subject to the above, Policy RNPP2 has regard to national policy. In safeguarding demonstrably important green space it contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. It meets the basic conditions.

Housing

The Housing Chapter sets out a number of Objectives with regards the provision of housing in the Neighbourhood Area.

The Housing Chapter does not contain any Policies.

Environment

This Chapter recognises a strong local desire for access to places to grow food.

Policy RNPP3

Policy RNPP3 requires provision to be made towards meeting “the identified local need” for allotments. The first sentence of the Policy states that there are no allotments in Rendlesham. This is background information and repeats supporting text. I recommend:

- **Policy RNPP3, delete the first sentence**

The supporting text refers to a variety of ways space is used for growing food and no specific sites for allotments are identified. Taking this into account, 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.” I recommend:

- **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.*”**

Subject to the above, Policy RNPP3 has regard to the Framework, which establishes that a principle of planning is to:

“support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all..” (para 17) and that planning policies should:

“plan positively for the provision and use of...community facilities...to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments” (para 70).

As such, Policy RNPP3 contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.

Policy RNPP3 meets the basic conditions.

Economic Development

The Economic Development Chapter sets out the Objective of supporting the growth and regeneration of the local economy. It does not contain any Policies.

Traffic

The Traffic Chapter provides detail behind Objectives to minimise the impacts of traffic. The Chapter does not contain any Policies.

I note that 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. I therefore recommend:

- **Para 11.22 change “shared space” to “*shared use*”**
- **Delete Para 14.09**

8. Summary

The Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan is the result of a significant, sustained community effort over a number of years. It demonstrates the passion that local people have for turning a vision for Rendlesham into a Neighbourhood Plan capable of delivering the sustainable development that the community needs.

Further to consideration of its Policies against the basic conditions, I have recommended a number of modifications to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Subject to these modifications, the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan

- 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 of the development plan for the area;
- does not breach, and is compatible with European Union obligations and the European Convention of Human Rights.

Taking the above into account, I find that the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions. I have already noted above that the Plan meets paragraph 8(1) requirements.

9. Referendum

I recommend to Suffolk Coastal District Council that, subject to the modifications proposed, the **Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to a Referendum.**

Referendum Area

Neighbourhood Plan Area - I am required to consider whether the Referendum Area should be extended beyond the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Area. I consider the Neighbourhood Area to be appropriate and there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that this is not the case.

I recommend that the Plan should proceed to a Referendum based on the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Area as approved by Suffolk Coastal District Council on 29 October 2013.

Nigel McGurk, December 2014
Erimax – Land, Planning and Communities

www.erimaxltd.com