

# Examination into the Soundness of Waveney District Councils Development Management Policies and Site Specific Allocation Development Plan Documents

---

Ms D Reed  
Principal Planner (Planning Policy)  
Mariners Street  
Lowestoft  
Suffolk

Charlotte Read  
Programme Officer  
Examination Office  
Town Hall  
High Street  
Lowestoft  
Suffolk NR32 1HS  
Tel: 01502 523089  
[ldfprogrammeofficer@waveney.gov.uk](mailto:ldfprogrammeofficer@waveney.gov.uk)

Date : 25.08.10

Dear Ms Reed

Thank you for your letter dated 12<sup>th</sup> August 2010 in response to the Inspector's initial concerns. The Inspector is most grateful for the comprehensive reply. While some of these matters will be addressed further at the hearings, there are a few points arising from your letter as follows:

- 1.) **Minor changes** – The Inspector can only recommend changes necessary for the plan to be sound. Any minor changes for updating (eg in respect of the revocation of the RSS), corrections etc should therefore be promoted by the Council as part of its schedules of suggested changes.
- 2.) **Revocation of RSS** - You have indicated that the revocation of the RSS means that it reduces the number of gypsy and traveller pitches that need to be identified during the plan period. However, the figures in the RSS were derived following public examination and, no doubt, the 2007 Suffolk Cross-Boundary Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment was taken into account. The Inspector recognises that there is no longer a policy requirement to comply with regional figures. In addition, the Council is reviewing its position on whether to produce a separate site allocations DPD on this matter and the DPDs that he is examining make only brief references to this document. Nonetheless, it would be helpful if you could explain the basis on which the revocation of the RSS of itself results in a smaller pitch requirement.
- 3.) **Housing trajectory** – it would be of assistance if the Council could produce a revised Core Strategy housing trajectory table incorporating the updated figures referred to in the letter. The Inspector notes that the Council has regarded the Lake Lothing 1,500 homes as a 'given' and reduced the requirement for allocations elsewhere. He would appreciate an indication of the reasons for this approach.
- 4.) **Planning obligations** – the Inspector notes the Council's view that the open space assessment indicates that all areas of the District are deficient in some form of open space. However, there are different types of open space and he asks whether that is a justification for seeking a contribution towards all forms in every case. For example, if there was adequate children's play space in a locality would there be a justification (in terms of Circular 05/2005 or the CIL Regulations) for seeking that element of an open space contribution intended to remedy a deficiency in that regard? In this context, the Inspector would like some further explanation as to how Policy DM25 would be applied in practice in terms of the national statutory and policy tests.

Yours sincerely

*Charlotte Read*  
Programme Officer