



# Reydon Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement

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

## **1. Summary**

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

## **2. Background**

2.1 Reydon Parish Council, as the Qualifying Body, successfully applied for Reydon Parish and parts of Wangford with Henham Parish, to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area under The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The [Neighbourhood Area](#) was designated by (former) Waveney District Council on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2018.

2.2 The Reydon Neighbourhood Plan was published by Reydon Parish Council for pre-submission consultation (Regulation 14) between 25<sup>th</sup> April and 10<sup>th</sup> June 2019.

2.3 Following the submission of the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan ([submission version](#)) to East Suffolk Council the Plan was publicised and comments invited over a six week period commencing on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020, which was later extended to 10 weeks in light of Covid-19, closing on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2020.

2.4 East Suffolk Council, with the agreement of Reydon Parish Council, appointed an independent examiner, Andrew Ashcroft BA(Hons) M.A. DMS 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 7<sup>th</sup> July 2020 concluded that subject to modifications identified in the Report, the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions.

2.6 The Examiner recommends that subject to the modifications listed in the Report, the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum. He further recommends that the referendum area should be the same as the designated neighbourhood area, with there being no substantive evidence to demonstrate otherwise.



2.7 Following receipt of the Examiner's Report, legislation requires that East Suffolk Council consider each of the modifications recommended, the reasons for them, and decide what action to take. This is set out in the table below. Ahead of this consideration, the Examiner's Report and its findings have been subject to discussion between East Suffolk Council and Reydon Parish Council.

### **3. Decision and Reasons**

3.1 East Suffolk Council, under powers delegated to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, has considered each of the modifications recommended and concurs with the reasoning provided by the Examiner in his Report dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2020. With the Examiner's recommended modifications, East Suffolk Council has decided that the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, is compatible with the Convention rights and complies with provision made by or under Sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

3.2 As a consequence, the submission version of the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan will be modified as recommended for it then to proceed to referendum. It should be noted that under the Local Government and Police and Crime Commissioner (Coronavirus) (Postponement of Elections and Referendums) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020, the referendum will not be able to take place until at least 6<sup>th</sup> May 2021.

3.3 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 Reydon Neighbourhood Plan.

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

Philip Ridley BSc (Hons) MRTPI  
Head of Planning and Coastal Management

Dated: 07 August 2020



Examiner's recommended modification	Reason for change (summarised)	Action by ESC
<p><u>Policy RNP 1: Tenure Mix of Affordable Housing</u>            Reposition the second part of the policy to the end of paragraph 4.8 of the Plan.</p>	<p>The second part of the policy comments about process related matters rather than setting out policy.</p>	<p>Agree. Second paragraph of the policy repositioned as recommended.</p>
<p><u>Policy RNP 2: Development Next to Educational Establishments</u>            Replace the policy with: 'Proposals for the expansion and/or reconfiguration of the Reydon Primary School, Jermyns Road will be supported. Any development other than householder development adjacent to the School should not compromise its ability to expand to an appropriate size to cater for required educational provision and/or facilities within the Plan period. Any such development will only be supported where it is satisfactorily demonstrated that there is no need for the Primary School to expand on to the site concerned'</p>	<p>The evidence supporting the policy and purpose for the policy is in relation to Reydon Primary School.</p>	<p>Agree. Policy amended as recommended.</p>
<p><u>Policy RNP 2: Development Next to Educational Establishments</u>            In paragraph 4.17 replace 'the village's educational establishments' with 'Reydon Primary School' and add the following to the end of the paragraph 'Policy RNP2 provides a policy context for this approach. In relation to the second part of the policy the process of demonstrating the need or otherwise for the Primary School to expand on to the site concerned should include appropriate engagement with the Local Education Authority'</p>	<p>The evidence supporting the policy and purpose for the policy is in relation to Reydon Primary School.</p> <p>Elements of the second paragraph of the submitted policy provide process advice on how the policy would be applied.</p>	<p>Agree. Supporting text amended as recommended.</p>



Examiner's recommended modification	Reason for change (summarised)	Action by ESC
<p><u>Policy RNP 3: Affordable Housing on the Boundary of the Settlement</u>            Replace the policy with:            'Proposals for affordable housing adjacent to the Settlement Boundary of Reydon as defined on the Settlement Boundary Policy Map (Map 2) will be supported subject to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no suitable and viable site is available for such development within the settlement;</li> <li>• the development would bring forward up to 25 dwellings;</li> <li>• the development would incorporate a range of dwelling types and mix of affordable rented and shared ownership accommodation appropriate to the identified need; and</li> <li>• the location, scale and design standard of the scheme would retain or enhance the character and setting of the village, and the natural beauty and special qualities of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'</li> </ul>	<p>The structure of the policy should be modified so that its various elements become detailed criteria.</p>	<p>Agree. Policy amended as recommended.</p>
<p><u>Policy RNP 3: Affordable Housing on the Boundary of the Settlement</u>            At the end of paragraph 4.19 add: 'Policy RNP3 needs to be read in association with Policy RNP5 (Maintaining Protection of the Countryside Around the Village). Whilst they address different issues proposals for affordable housing adjacent to the settlement boundary of Reydon will be in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The various criteria in Policy RNP3 have been designed to ensure that any such housing proposals will only be supported where no suitable and viable site is available for such development within Reydon. In addition,</p>	<p>The supporting text should comment about the relationship between this policy and Policy RNP5 (Maintaining Protection of the Countryside Around the Village). By definition, proposals for affordable housing adjacent to the settlement boundary of Reydon will be in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>	<p>Agree. Supporting text amended as recommended.</p>



Examiner's recommended modification	Reason for change (summarised)	Action by ESC
<p>the location, scale and design standard of any such scheme would need to retain or enhance the character and setting of the village in general, and the natural beauty and special character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in particular'</p>		
<p><u>Policy RNP 4: Principal Residency Requirement</u> Delete 'Due to.... (as second or holiday homes)'</p>	<p>The text proposed to be deleted operates as supporting text. The supporting text appropriately covers such matters and therefore the text should be deleted rather than repositioned into the supporting text.</p>	<p>Agree. Policy amended as recommended.</p>
<p><u>Policy RNP 5: Maintaining Protection of the Countryside Around the Village</u> Replace the policy with: 'Development outside the settlement boundary should protect and where possible enhance the natural beauty and special qualities of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in accordance with Policy WLP8.35 of the adopted Waveney Local Plan. The following areas (as shown on the Policy Map RNP Map 3) are identified as the most-valued parts of the countryside in the neighbourhood area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reydon Wood;</li> <li>• The Hen Reedbeds;</li> <li>• Pottersbridge Marshes;</li> </ul>	<p>The recommended modifications re-order the policy so that the general approach to the countryside precedes that for the most valued parts of the countryside. They also ensure a consistency of approach within the wider AONB to the appropriate policy in the adopted Local Plan.</p>	<p>Agree. Policy amended as recommended.</p>



Examiner’s recommended modification	Reason for change (summarised)	Action by ESC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reydon Smere;</li> <li>• Smere Marshes;</li> <li>• Reydon Common Marsh;</li> <li>• St Felix County Wildlife Site; and</li> <li>• Riverside Grazing Meadows and Marshes.</li> </ul> <p>Within the most-valued parts of the countryside identified above, proposals for development will not be supported unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the development is needed to preserve their character and integrity;</li> <li>• a demonstrable need for the development to take place in the location has been satisfactorily evidenced;</li> <li>• there are no suitable and available alternative sites outside of these areas; and</li> <li>• the impact on the landscape is mitigated through sensitive design and a detailed landscaping scheme’</li> </ul>		
<p><u>Policy RNP 5: Maintaining Protection of the Countryside Around the Village</u> Delete the final sentence of paragraph 5.1.</p>	The sentence does not reflect national, local or neighbourhood policies.	Agree. Supporting text amended as recommended.
<p><u>Policy RNP 5: Maintaining Protection of the Countryside Around the Village</u> In paragraph 5.3 replace ‘We, therefore.....its views’ with ‘As part of the plan-making process the Parish Council sought the community’s views’</p>	It is recommended that the supporting text better reflects the consultation responses.	Agree. Supporting text amended as recommended.



Examiner's recommended modification	Reason for change (summarised)	Action by ESC
<p><u>Policy RNP 5: Maintaining Protection of the Countryside Around the Village</u>            In the first sentence of paragraph 5.4 delete 'on which development should never be permitted'. Thereafter insert the following additional sentence between the penultimate and final sentences of the paragraph: 'These designations will continue to operate in their own right throughout the Plan period'</p>	<p>It is recommended that the supporting text highlights that the designations that identified areas are subject to and that these areas will continue to operate in their own right throughout the Plan period.</p>	<p>Agree. Supporting text amended as recommended.</p>
<p><u>Policy RNP 5: Maintaining Protection of the Countryside Around the Village</u>            In paragraph 5.5 replace 'they agreed strongly' with 'the community commented' At the end of paragraph 5.6 add: 'Within this context Policy RNP3 (Affordable Housing on the Boundary of the Settlement) identifies circumstances where such development will be supported on the edge of the settlement boundary, and therefore within the countryside'</p>	<p>It is recommended that the supporting text comments about the relationship between this policy and Policy RNP3 (Affordable Housing on the Boundary of the Settlement). By definition, proposals for affordable housing adjacent to the settlement boundary of Reydon will be in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Policy RNP3 identifies circumstances where affordable housing would be supported on the edge of the settlement boundary.</p>	<p>Agree. Supporting text amended as recommended.</p>
<p><u>Policy RNP 6: Improving Public Rights of Way and access to the Countryside from new Developments</u>            In the second sentence replace 'must' with 'should'</p>	<p>It is recommended that the policy uses appropriate language.</p>	<p>Agree. Policy amended as recommended.</p>



Examiner's recommended modification	Reason for change (summarised)	Action by ESC
<p><u>Policy RNP 7: Local Green Spaces</u> Delete proposed LGSs 5 (Reydon Woods), 6 (Hen Reedbeds) and 8 (Common Marshes) from the policy.</p> <p>Remove LGSs 5 Reydon Wood, 6 Hen Reedbeds and 8 Common Marshes from RNP Map 4.</p>	<p>To reflect the importance of other designations and the incompatibility of an LGS designation with a working farm.</p>	<p>Agree. Policy and Map 4 amended as recommended.</p>
<p><u>Policy RNP 7: Local Green Spaces</u> Insert the following as a separate paragraph at the end of the policy: 'Proposals for development within the designated local green spaces will only be supported in very special circumstances'</p> <p>At the end of paragraph 6.5 add: 'Policy RNP7 sets out a policy basis to safeguard the local green spaces throughout the Plan period. It follows the approach as set out in paragraph 101 of the NPPF where development will only be supported in very special circumstances'</p>	<p>To provide clarity that decision making should apply a very special circumstances test to development within LGS, as is consistent with national policy as regards the Green Belt (see paragraph 101 of 2019 NPPF).</p>	<p>Agree. Policy and supporting text amended as recommended.</p>
<p><u>Policy RNP 8: Safe Access to and from New Developments</u> Replace the policy with: 'New developments should demonstrate the way in which they can be safely accommodated within the capacity of the local highways network. Where necessary new developments should incorporate more than one point of access. Developments that would cause an unacceptable impact on the capacity and/or the safety of the local highway network will not be supported'</p>	<p>To ensure the policy responds to the consultation responses that raised highway safety as a key concern.</p>	<p>Agree. Policy amended as recommended.</p>



Examiner's recommended modification	Reason for change (summarised)	Action by ESC
<u>Policy RNP 9: Safe Walking and Cycling Routes</u> Replace 'feasible' with 'practicable'	To acknowledge that the approach may not necessarily be practicable in all circumstances.	Agree. Policy amended as recommended.
<u>Policy RNP 9: Safe Walking and Cycling Routes</u> After 'developments' add 'other than householder proposals'	It would be inappropriate for minor and householder development to be caught by the policy.	Agree. Policy amended as recommended.
<u>Policy RNP 10: Reydon Neighbourhood Design Principles</u> Replace the opening part of the policy with: 'New development should take account of the following design principles as appropriate to their scale and use:'	To require that developments comply with the criteria where they are directly relevant to the development proposed.	Agree. Policy amended as recommended.
<u>Policy RNP 10: Reydon Neighbourhood Design Principles</u> In a) replace 'must' with 'should'	To reflect the 'should' in the opening sentence of the policy.	Agree. Policy amended as recommended.
<u>Policy RNP 10: Reydon Neighbourhood Design Principles</u> In b) replace 'local' with 'Local Plan'	To clarify that reference is made to the Waveney Local Plan.	Agree. Policy amended as recommended.
<u>Policy RNP 10: Reydon Neighbourhood Design Principles</u> In the penultimate sentence of e) replace 'still' with 'be designed to'	To clarify that a design response may be needed of new development in this regard.	Agree. Policy amended as recommended.
Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies.	To achieve consistency with the modified policies.	Agree. Plan to be amended as recommended.
Throughout the Plan (as necessary) replace 'East Suffolk District Council' with 'East Suffolk Council'	To appropriately reference East Suffolk Council.	Agree. Plan to be amended as recommended.



Examiner's recommended modification	Reason for change (summarised)	Action by ESC
In the Glossary NPPF Section replace the second sentence with: 'As its name suggests it provides national planning policy'	To accurately set out the purpose of the NPPF.	Agree. Glossary to be amended as recommended.

### Council's further modifications

Under section 12(6)(a) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Council considers that the following modifications are also needed in order that the Plan meets the basic conditions or for the correction of errors.

Policy/Supporting text	Reason for change	Action by ESC
Front cover and contents page	To ensure the Neighbourhood Plan is updated to reflect examiner's modifications and status of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Replace "Submission Draft, February" with "Referendum Draft, August".
Within the final sentence of paragraph 4.1	To provide clarity and enable the Neighbourhood Plan evidence base to be accessible to the reader.	Replace "Appendix 10" with "Background Document 5 in the List of Appendices at page 23".
Within the second bullet point after paragraph 4.4	To accurately reflect Policy WLP8.2.	Replace "proposes" with "requires".
At the end of paragraph 4.7 and within the second sentence of paragraph 4.8	To provide clarity.	Addition of "Section 3.2".
Within the second sentence of paragraph 4.8	Grammatical error	Add "to"
Beginning of paragraph 4.10	To provide clarity	Remove "But"
Second sentence of paragraph 4.11	To provide clarity	Remove "In essence,"



Within the first sentence of RPC Action 1	To ensure the accurate use of terminology.	After “RPs” insert “, CLTs and Community Led Housing Groups”
Below paragraph 4.25	To ensure the document is suitably formatted.	Remove the image of affordable housing in Mount Pleasant
Paragraph 5.3	To reflect Examiner’s recommended modification.	Remove “which should have the strongest possible protection”
Paragraph 5.6	To provide clarity and accurately reflect consultation comments.	Remove “in the years”, “to”, “the environment of” and “absolute”
At the end of the second sentence of Policy RNP 7: Local Green Spaces	To ensure the Local Green Spaces can be easily identified.	Add “and Maps RNP 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e”
Page 21 and 22	To ensure the Local Green Spaces can be easily identified.	Replace RNP Map 4 with updated map and insert Maps 4a-4e.
Page 23	To provide clarity and enable the Neighbourhood Plan evidence base to be accessible to the reader.	After “List of appendices (available separately in four pdf files” insert “available from the Reydon Village website: <a href="http://reydon.onesuffolk.net">reydon.onesuffolk.net</a> ”