

RENDLESHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Summary of comments submitted to the independent Examiner.

(Full copies of comments received are available for viewing via the following link

<http://www.suffolkcoastal.gov.uk/yourdistrict/planning/review/community/consultation/rnp/>)

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENT SUBMITTED
Anglian Water	No comments to add to those previously made. (Note earlier comments related to possible housing sites. Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan submitted for examination does not include new housing provision)
Boyer Planning (on behalf of Walnut Tree Property Ltd)	<p>Objects to the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan (RNP) as it is “unsound”.</p> <p>As a starting principle the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan must be in conformance with national and local policy.</p> <p>There still remain many areas of the RNP that contain inaccurate and misleading information and do not conform with national and local policy.</p> <p>There appears to be a strong desire to protect the District Centre, however the policies put in place for this area contrary to both national and local policy.</p> <p>By stating that Rendlesham’s facilities “<i>would serve a much wider area, potentially with a 10-15 mile radius at a minimum</i>”, this appears to be much wider than would be expected in a village of Rendlesham’s size, as well as the fact that there are numerous sports facilities within the District. It also brings into question whether the village would be able to cope with an increase in traffic and car parking when the facilities would potentially be in use. It is considered that an area considerably less than the “10-15 mile radius” catchment stated in the RNP would be more suitable and realistic.</p> <p>It is thought that the methods suggested to protect the District Centre above everything else, is flawed and does not promote “sustainable development” or a “sustainable neighbourhood”. The approach put forward by the Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan is therefore “unsound”.</p> <p>In order for this document to become adopted policy it must be supported by evidence and justified. Therefore, the policies to protect the retention of redundant buildings in the district centre for community and sports use are not supported by any substantive evidence and thus not justified.</p> <p>By amending the points mentioned in the above document it should help to ensure the Neighbourhood Plan is a more robust document for Rendlesham to submit to the Planning Inspector.</p>
Natural England	<p>The Rendlesham Neighbourhood Plan (RNP) area includes part of the Sandlings Forest SSSI, a component of the Sandlings SPA which has been designated for its Nightjar populations. The scale and nature of development being proposed through the Plan appears unlikely to have a significant effect on this site.</p> <p>For clarity the Plan could make reference to green infrastructure and biodiversity policies within the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan</p>

	<p>and/or paragraph 118 of the NPPF which seeks to prevent harm to biodiversity and geological interests through the planning process. In the absence of a specific policy within the RNP to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity the Plan could make reference to the requirements of Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan policy DM27.</p> <p>The Plan area incorporates part of the nationally important Suffolk Coasts and Heaths AONB. We note that the RNP contains no policies that would be in conflict with the AONB Management Plan and that the Bentwaters Master Plan deals with any issues arising regarding the SSSI on their site.</p> <p>Natural England welcomes requirements and opportunities provided through the plan to enhance the local landscape and the green infrastructure network, including improved connectivity for walking and cycling.</p>
Suffolk County Council (SCC)	<p>Confirms no objection to the Plan as drafted in respect of the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>Welcomes recognition given to school and early years provision</p> <p>Confirms SCC has no plans or funding for increasing Children's Centre physical capacity. Confirms there is an effective relationship between the Centre and the School which enables sharing of facilities. Welcomes Parish Council commitment to consider funding additional provision through its share of any CIL receipts which may be forthcoming.</p> <p>Libraries. Notes information in paragraph 9.12 and Appendix G is based on earlier iteration of the Plan when policies for new housing were being proposed. Any consideration of new provision will therefore be based upon the level of housing growth brought forward in future planning documents.</p> <p>Welcomes the reference to countywide parking standards. Seeks an amendment to paragraph 11.22 and reference to "shared space". Shared space has a particular meaning in highway design terms and in the context of this paragraph it is assumed that "shared space" is actually what is meant.</p> <p>Objectives 6 and 6a both refer to an objective of minimisation of traffic. The Parish Council should be aware that it is not possible to minimise traffic impacts. The Local Planning Authority and the Highways Authority will only be able to require the prioritisation of sustainable modes and will not be able to refuse permission for development unless impacts are "severe".</p> <p>Paragraph 14.05 makes reference to hazards in the highway network. Highway safety is a priority in assessing the highway implications of development.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.09 is unclear as regards what is meant by "positive traffic flow". It is recommended that this paragraph is deleted.</p>
Valerie Edwards	<p>Supports neighbourhood plan and would like to see it accepted so community can flourish.</p> <p>Moved to Rendlesham 8 years ago with expectation that Sports Centre and Angel Theatre would endure. Opposite has happened and village in danger of becoming dormitory settlement with no heart of sense of community if current application for residential</p>

	<p>development is successful.</p> <p>Community is fortunate to have pro-active Parish Council who has pledged to keep centre of village for community use incorporating all the facilities a diverse community needs to gel and develop.</p> <p>Knows of several groups who struggle to find suitable places to meet.</p> <p>Notes sports centre could become hub for health for all abilities not just for village but for wider east Suffolk.</p> <p>Supports provision of allotments.</p> <p>Supports development of footpath network outside of village which is fenced in on three sides.</p>
Susan Johnson	<p>Considers development of Angel Theatre as proposed by Parish Council to be unviable and would also pose threat to quiet residential nature of village & unsuitable narrow roads.</p> <p>Would prefer residential development as proposed by owners of Angel Theatre site.</p> <p>Considers additional retail provision better located on Bentwaters Park or Rendlesham Mews. Would also benefit from passing trade.</p> <p>Viability also potential issue given current difficulties apparently experienced by Costcutters.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plan good at identifying advantages. More needs to be done to raise awareness of disadvantages, in particular, increase in traffic, traffic noise and nuisance driving.</p> <p>Could be argued the community building falls short of what might be expected. Use of Sports Centre with expanded facilities and more space for school might be viable.</p> <p>Considers Rendlesham residents live in area with easily accessible leisure facilities 7 – 15 minutes drive. Suggests for village better to focus on development of small scale facilities particularly for teenagers.</p> <p>Sense of community also best nurtured by encouragement of local clubs and societies. Village already well served with meeting places.</p>
Richard Kevern	<p>Thinks most residents would agree the need for more community assets given the extensive residential development over the past 10 -12 years. Does not think it realistic to assume Sports Centre and Angel Theatre could be retained for community benefit in a way which would be financially viable in the medium to long term.</p> <p>Suggests preferable alternative would be for agreement between Parish Council, developer and local planning authority which reduced amount of new homes in centre of Rendlesham but allowed developers to fund small multipurpose structures for community use.</p>