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1. Introduction

Policy Background

1.1 The Waveney Local Development Framework (LDF) sets out the development and regeneration plans for the District. The Core Strategy (Adopted January 2009) forms the most important part of the Waveney Local Development Framework. It sets out the vision and strategic policies to guide the general direction of future development in Waveney. Importantly the Core Strategy identifies that over the period 2001 to 2025, 6,960 new homes will need to be delivered and to 2021, 5000 additional jobs generated. The Core Strategy focuses most new development in the District in the regeneration areas around Lake Lothing in central Lowestoft. The Core Strategy makes clear that this growth and regeneration will need to be supported by new and improved infrastructure.

1.2 Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy establishes a principle that developers should contribute towards infrastructure provision to support their developments. The policy states that such infrastructure may include:

- Affordable housing (including supported housing)
- Open Space (including play areas, sport and recreation)
- Community facilities (including youth activities and meeting venues)
- Cultural facilities (including libraries, public art and archaeology)
- Health and social care facilities
- Education (including early years provision and community education)
- Police/crime reduction measures
- Transport infrastructure (including footpaths, bridleways, cycleways, cycle parking facilities and roads)
- Public transport (including services and facilities)
- Surface water management and flood risk management
- Environmental improvements
- Waste recycling facilities
- Fire services
- Shopping facilities

1.3 The policy goes on to identify specific projects which will be required to support development and therefore require developer contributions. These include community centres and one-stop shops in all the market towns and Kessingland, drainage and flood alleviation in Kessingland, and health centres in south and north Lowestoft. Additionally the policy recognises the need for development to contribute to the infrastructure needed to support regeneration in the Lake Lothing area. The Policy also refers to a number of specific infrastructure projects identified in Policy CS14 and CS15 of the Core Strategy that contributions will be required for.

1.4 The emerging Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan (AAP) which aims to deliver the Core Strategy’s vision for regeneration in central Lowestoft further recognises the importance of new infrastructure provision to secure
regeneration. Policy HC3 of the AAP states that all new residential development should be supported by appropriate provision of social infrastructure. Policy IMP2 of the AAP sets out the likely strategic infrastructure requirements to support regeneration in the AAP that the public and private sectors will have to work together in delivering.

**Community Infrastructure Levy**

1.5 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a new standard charge which local authorities in England and Wales can charge on most types of new development in their area. CIL charges will be based on the size, type and location of the development proposed. The money raised will be used to pay for infrastructure required to support development in a District.

1.6 The Government believes that a CIL is a fair and transparent way in which new development can contribute to infrastructure provision. It is set locally, in a Charging Schedule by Charging Authorities (Local Planning Authorities, LPA) based upon local evidence of infrastructure need and viability and once adopted is a mandatory charge on all qualifying development except in exceptional circumstances.

1.7 Policy CS04 of the Core Strategy was drafted and adopted prior to Government introducing enabling legislation for the CIL. However, the supporting text to the policy anticipates the introduction of CIL, and states that a CIL could be used to supplement Section 106 agreements to help deliver wider infrastructure requirements. The emerging AAP also makes reference to the potential for CIL to be used to fund infrastructure.

1.8 The CIL Regulations introduced in April 2010 and amended in April 2011 contain measures to reduce the use of Section 106 agreements to fund infrastructure. The first measure (Regulation 122) which came into force on the 6th April 2010 requires Section 106 agreements to meet the following tests:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

1.9 A second measure introduced in the regulations restricts the use of planning obligations to require funding for pooled contributions towards infrastructure. The regulations only allow for a maximum of 5 planning obligations to contribute to a certain infrastructure project or type of infrastructure. For example, only five planning permissions for development will be able to have planning obligations that require financial contributions to off-site open space in a locality. After this no more pooled contributions towards off-site open space provision would be allowed in the District. This power will come into force in April 2014 or when a LPA’s charging schedule comes into force. Where a charging schedule is in place, a planning obligation cannot be used to require funding for a piece of infrastructure that is listed as being funded by CIL.

1.10 The above restrictions mean that it will not be possible for the Council to pool developer contributions towards infrastructure provision through the use of Section 106 contributions. Therefore the Council is planning to introduce a
Community Infrastructure Levy to help fund infrastructure delivery in Waveney.

Purpose of this Study

1.11 The purpose of this study is to provide evidence to justify the need for a Community Infrastructure Levy in Waveney. Regulation 14 of the CIL regulations states that Charging Authorities, when setting the rate of a CIL, need to aim to strike a balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure through CIL and the effects of the imposition of CIL on economic viability of development. Following from this, guidance set out by the Government in “Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance: Charge Setting and Charging Schedule Procedures” (March 2010) requires Charging Schedules to be justified by evidence of infrastructure need and economic viability.

1.12 The Adopted Core Strategy, and the emerging AAP demonstrate that new and improved infrastructure will be required in the District to support future development. However, the above documents do not adequately quantify this need in order to support the introduction of CIL. The above mentioned Government guidance states that evidence that outlines an aggregate funding gap for infrastructure provision is needed to support the introduction of a CIL. In identifying a funding gap, the evidence base should identify and cost infrastructure that is needed to support growth along with other existing and likely future sources of funding. The below equation summarises this.

\[
\text{Cost of Infrastructure required to support development} - \text{Existing sources of funding and potential future sources of funding} = \text{Aggregate funding gap for which CIL is required}
\]

1.13 This study therefore looks in detail at the likely infrastructure that is required to support the development planned in the Waveney LDF. It identifies the likely cost of provision and any existing or potential funding for infrastructure. Importantly it identifies a funding gap that CIL will be required to address.

1.14 It is important to note that the role of this study is not to provide absolute upfront assurances as to how the Council intend to spend future CIL funds, but rather to illustrate that the Council’s intended CIL target is justifiable given local infrastructure needs. Government guidance makes clear that in the interests of flexibility, Councils may spend their CIL revenues on different projects and types from those identified as indicative in infrastructure studies prepared for the purpose of introducing a CIL. The rationale behind this is that priorities of the Council and its partners may change over time. Clearly many of the projects identified in this study as needing CIL funding will likely be funded through CIL in order to ensure the planned development in the LDF is actually delivered. However, this study does not prioritise how funds will be spent and when. The development plan documents that make up the Waveney LDF all have sections on delivery and outline what infrastructure is needed and when to support development and this will act as a guide on how
CIL funds are spent. Additionally, the Council is working on a corporate infrastructure plan to establish how funds and resources are directed to infrastructure and other projects in the District.

1.15 In addition to this study, a further study which examines the economic viability of development in the District will be prepared to ascertain the level of CIL development can afford to pay. These two studies together will form the core of evidence base supporting the introduction of CIL in Waveney.

1.16 Please note this study does not cover the Broads Authority area. The Broads Authority is the Local Planning Authority for the Broads Authority area and as such would not be subject to any Community Infrastructure Levy that Waveney District Council introduces.
2. Growth Projections

2.1 The Waveney Local Development Framework sets out an agenda for growth and regeneration for the period between 2001 and 2021 (2025 for housing). It sets out targets and allocations for housing and economic development. It also sets out a planning policy framework for delivering sustainable development of all types across the District.

2.2 With this in mind, it is likely there will be a considerable level of development within the District over the period to 2025. All development will have an impact on infrastructure to some degree. The following section therefore outlines in detail the likely level of housing and economic development that will occur in the District over the period to 2025. However, it must be remembered that in addition to that which is planned for in the Local Development Framework there will be windfall developments (i.e. those not already identified) which will also impact upon infrastructure and therefore benefit from the infrastructure projects outlined in this plan.

2.1. Housing

2.1.1 The Waveney Core Strategy requires the delivery of at least 6960 dwellings between 2001 and 2025.

2.1.2 As of 1st April 2010, 3212 dwellings had been completed in the District. In addition, a further 1863 dwellings had planning permission or were under construction. It is likely that the infrastructure impacts of the majority of this completed and permitted development have been addressed through the planning process.

2.1.3 In addition to the above, the Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) allocates 528 homes over the period to 2025 and the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan DPD allocates a further 1,585 homes. The Core Strategy also includes a planned allowance for 250 windfall dwellings form 2017 onwards in the market towns. The Core Strategy’s planned allowance for 250 windfall dwellings from 2017 was informed by the 2007 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Since the 2007 SHLAA 216 new homes have been permitted on windfall sites. The emerging 2011 SHLAA will provide an update of the windfall potential of District. Preliminary results coming out of the SHLAA suggest there is potential for 202 additional windfall units across the entire District and a further 73 on identified larger sites.

2.1.4 Table 2.1.1 shows the total expected amount and distribution of new housing across the District to 2025 (excluding sites already with planning permission). In addition to the figures presented in the table there is a planning permission for 800 new homes on Woods Meadow, Oulton. This planning permission is subject to the imminent signing of a Section 106 agreement which will deal with the infrastructure requirements associated with the development. Therefore, these 800 homes have been left out of calculations throughout this study.
2.1.5 For calculating the impact of residential development on infrastructure it is assumed in this study that each new dwelling will have an average of 2.2 people living in it. This average comes from the 2001 Census.
## Table 2.1.1 – Forecasted Housing Development as of April 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Site Specific Allocations DPD (January 2011)</th>
<th>Emerging Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan (policy CS05 Core Strategy Adopted 2009)</th>
<th>Other identified deliverable sites in 2011 SHLAA (preliminary results)</th>
<th>Windfall potential (preliminary results from 2011 SHLAA)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowestoft + Carlton Colville + Oulton</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beccles + Worlingham</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungay</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halesworth</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwold + Reydon</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnby + North Cove</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blundeston</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kessingland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrentham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1.1 – Forecasted Housing Development as of April 2011
2.2. Economic Development

2.2.1 Policy CS07 of the Waveney Core Strategy sets a target of 5000 additional jobs over the period 2001 to 2021. To help deliver this target the Site Specific Allocations DPD allocates 47.3 hectares of land for industrial use. The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan allocates approximately 51.2 hectares (although some of this will be replacement provision where existing businesses relocate elsewhere in the District, most probably on sites allocated in the Site Specific Allocations DPD).

2.2.2 In addition to the above allocated land, the Development Management Policies DPD (Adopted January 2011) safeguards a number of existing industrial areas across the District. Some of these industrial areas have vacant land within them which will likely be developed within the plan period. As of 1st April 2010 this vacant land equates to approximately 3.6 hectares.

2.2.3 This equates to a total of approximately 102 hectares. Using average ratios set out in the Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth Employment Land Evidence Base Report (2009) this would equate to approximately 408,000 sqm.

2.2.4 In addition to the above, 44 hectares of land currently has planning permission or is under development for industrial uses throughout the District.

2.2.5 There is also likely to be further retail development in the District over the plan period. Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy states that approximately 21,000sqm of new comparison (non-food) floorspace will be provided in Lowestoft as an extension to the town centre. The DTZ Retail Capacity Update (2010) estimates an updated need of between 17,550 and 20,200sqm. Policy SSP3 of the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan allocates a proportion of this floorspace to the Peto Square area. The remainder will be developed elsewhere within and adjacent to Lowestoft town centre. There is likely to be additional convenience (food) retail within the plan period. The long-term projection from the Great Yarmouth and Waveney Retail and Leisure Study (2006) indicated a capacity of between 2,300 and 4,700sqm. The DTZ Retail Capacity Update (2010) estimates an updated need of 1,450sqm. There is currently an outstanding planning permission for a 2,000sqm food store in Halesworth.

2.2.6 The Waveney Core Strategy and Development Management Policies give favourable consideration to economic development throughout the District including tourism. Therefore, it is also likely that within the plan period there will be a number of windfall developments of various commercial uses.

2.2.7 The level of economic development expected to occur within the plan period as described above will likely have an impact on existing infrastructure, particularly transport and utility infrastructure.
3. Transport

3.1 New development within Waveney will put additional stress on the District's transport infrastructure. Transport infrastructure includes roads, car parking, rail, buses, and pedestrian and cycle facilities. In order to achieve sustainable development it is necessary to promote a modal change from car-use to more sustainable modes of transport such as public transport and walking and cycling.

3.1. Road Overview

3.1.1 The A12 road that links Great Yarmouth to London runs south through Waveney District. Between Gorleston and Lowestoft the road is a dual-carriageway. South of Lowestoft, between Kessingland and Ipswich, few parts of the road are dualled which inhibits access to Lowestoft from London and the South East. The road goes through the built up area of Lowestoft through residential areas and close to the town centre and as such is used for a high number of local journeys. The A12 crosses Lake Lothing at the Bascule Bridge, one of two crossings in the town. Consequently at peak times the road can get congested and restricts north-south movements within the town. Short local trips within Lowestoft also cause problems to other routes within the town and future development could further increase these problems. Modelling studies have forecast that, by the time the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan proposals are implemented, traffic demand could exceed capacity at several places in the central area of Lowestoft and on routes leading to the river crossings. Therefore it appears likely that if existing travel patterns in Lowestoft continue in the future and in the new developments, there will be increased congestion and subsequent traffic delays at busy times on the road network, including junctions with the A12. Therefore town-wide traffic reductions measures will be needed.

3.1.2 A long term aspiration for Lowestoft has been the delivery of a third vehicular crossing over Lake Lothing. Core Strategy Policy CS15 states that “The District Council will continue to promote the creation of a third road crossing of Lake Lothing, as an integral part of dealing with transport problems and issues in Lowestoft and the sub-region.” The A12 Lowestoft Study Lake Lothing Third Crossing Feasibility Study (Highways Agency, 2009) estimated the cost of this bridge to be approximately £37,809,558. The cost of this bridge together with the lack of funding available means it is unlikely that this project will be delivered in the plan period. Additionally the crossing is not needed to support the planned development of the Lake Lothing area.

3.1.3 Other main roads through the district include the A146 which links Lowestoft to Beccles and Bungay, the A145 which links Beccles to the A12 south to Ipswich, and the A144 which links Bungay, Halesworth and the A143 and A146 to the A12 south to Ipswich. The A146 also provides a link from Beccles, Bungay and South Lowestoft to Norwich.

3.1.4 The A145 goes through the middle of Beccles and therefore Beccles town centre suffers from heavy traffic from Ellough Industrial Estate travelling to and from the A145 to Ipswich. The A144 goes through the middle of Bungay town centre where a one way system currently operates. As a result, like
Beccles, Bungay also suffers from heavy vehicles travelling through the town centre which is damaging the fabric of the town.

**Needs**

3.1.5 Policy CS15 of the Adopted Waveney Core Strategy, the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan and the emerging Suffolk Local Transport Plan 3 set out the improvements to road infrastructure required to support the sustainable development and regeneration of Lowestoft and the market towns.

3.1.6 The Core Strategy identifies the following road programmes needed to support development:

- Lowestoft Access Project which includes completion of the northern spine road to re-route the A12 through North Lowestoft away from residential areas, improvements to Denmark Road and new access road to development sites within Lake Lothing.
- Beccles Southern Relief Road to divert heavy traffic from the town centre.
- Measures to reduce traffic impact in Bungay town centre
- A146 Barnby to Carlton Colville Bypass

3.1.7 The Core Strategy also states that the District Council will continue to promote the creation of a third road crossing over Lake Lothing.

3.1.8 In addition to the access solutions to southern development sites, the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan also identifies the need to improve the Commercial Road/Station Square junction within the North Peto Square area of Lowestoft.

3.1.9 The Suffolk Local Transport Plan 3 (May 2011) identifies all of the above projects with the exception of the A146 Barnby to Carlton Colville Bypass which will now be a longer term proposal.

3.1.10 As The A146 Barnby to Carlton Colville Bypass is not identified in the Suffolk Local Transport Plan 3 as a priority now its delivery is unlikely to be achieved within this plan period and therefore will not require developer funding at present. Additionally, development proposed within the Council’s Local Development Framework will only generate a minor need for this project.

3.1.11 With the exception of the southern access to development sites on the south side of Lake Lothing and improvements to the Commercial Road/Station Square junction, none of the above projects are critical in terms of delivering the planned development. However, they will all ensure new development can be more sustainably accommodated within the District. For example, the planned expansion of Ellough Industrial Estate as allocated in the Site Specific Allocations DPD will further increase traffic pressure in Beccles town centre if the Beccles Southern Relief Road is not delivered.

**Costs**

3.1.12 Table 3.1.1 below summarises the likely costs of the above projects.
Table 3.1.1 – Road Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Lowestoft Spine Road</td>
<td>£4 million</td>
<td>SCC LTP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark Road Improvements</td>
<td>£6,163,505</td>
<td>A12 Lowestoft Study (Faber Maunsell on behalf of Highways Agency, Feb 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access road into development sites on south side of Lake Lothing</td>
<td>£500,000 to £8 million dependant on length and form</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beccles Southern Relief Road</td>
<td>£4 Million</td>
<td>SCC LTP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungay Town Centre Improvements</td>
<td>£450,000</td>
<td>SCC LTP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Road/Station Square Junction Improvements</td>
<td>£1,176,500</td>
<td>Regional Growth Fund bid, Suffolk County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£16,490,005 to £31,990,005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.13 With respect to the access roads needed for development sites on the south-side of Lake Lothing, the form of this road is yet to be determined. A signalised junction on the Jeld-Wen Playing Fields would cost in the region of £500,000. A single access road linking Waveney Drive at the Jeld-Wen Playing Fields frontage to the Brooke Peninsula and Sanyo sites could cost in the region of £2 million. A series of access roads throughout the site could cost in the region of £6 to 8 million.

Funding

3.1.14 The Suffolk Local Transport Plan 3 indicates that Suffolk County Council will invest capital funds to meet the full cost of delivering the Bungay Town Centre Improvements. The Suffolk Local Transport Plan also indicates that Suffolk County Council will either fund the full cost of delivering the North Lowestoft Spine Road or the Beccles Southern Relief Road.

3.1.15 For the Commercial Road/Station Square junction improvements, a bid was made to the Regional Growth Fund to cover the cost of the improvements, but unfortunately it was unsuccessful. However, Suffolk County Council indicate that they may be able to fund these improvements in the next five years.

3.1.16 The draft Suffolk Local Transport Plan indicates that Suffolk County Council will seek funding from the Department for Transport major scheme funds for the Denmark Road improvements.

3.1.17 The access road into the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood will be delivered as part of the development of that area. This may be through a section 106 agreement or other collaborative delivery mechanisms within the west part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood allocation in the Area Action Plan. It is likely this road will be built by developers and therefore CIL may not be the most appropriate mechanism for securing its delivery.

3.1.18 Considering the above there is likely to be a potential funding gap for either the Northern Spine Road or the Beccles Southern Relief Road, depending on
what project Suffolk County Council decide to fund in the short-term. Both of
these projects are not needed solely to mitigate the impacts of new
development, therefore it would be unreasonable to expect that a CIL should
fill the entire funding gap, however, CIL could be used to help address part of
any funding gap. At present it is not possible to accurately state the exact
figure required from development to address the funding gap. This will largely
be dependant on the project that Suffolk County Council choose to fund in the
short-term. It is hoped that this can be ascertained before publishing the
final version of this study.

3.2. Rail

Overview

3.2.1 Network Rail control the rail infrastructure in Waveney and the train service is
currently operated by the National Express East of England franchise. The
main train line through Waveney is the East Suffolk Line which connects
Lowestoft, Beccles and Halesworth to Ipswich and beyond to London.
Presently only a once every two hour service exists on this line. Lowestoft is
also connected to Norwich by rail where a more frequent hourly service
operates.

Needs

3.2.2 In order to encourage more sustainable methods of travel, there is a need to
increase the frequency of the train service between Lowestoft and Ipswich
and the market towns between them. Policy CS15 of the Adopted Waveney
Core Strategy identifies the need for the Beccles Rail Loop. This project is
also identified as a priority in the Suffolk Local Transport Plan 3. The loop
together with signalling improvements will mean that an hourly service can
operate between Lowestoft and Ipswich. National Express East Anglia has
made plans to introduce an hourly service once this project is complete,
which is expected to be late 2012.

3.2.3 At present facilities at Lowestoft Station are restricted with poor quality
passenger facilities and limited interchange with other transport modes. The
Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan promotes the improvement
of facilities at Lowestoft Station such as visual information systems, toilet
facilities, parking provision (both car and cycle), and canopies. The Area
Action Plan also promotes increased interchange facilities for taxis and
buses.

Costs

3.2.4 The Beccles Loop is forecasted to cost £4 million to deliver. The Lake
Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan forecasts that improvements to
Lowestoft Station, including interchange facilities will cost in the region of £2
million. The total cost of rail infrastructure for the plan period is therefore £6
million.
Funding

3.2.5 The Beccles Loop is being progressed by Network Rail with additional supporting funding from the county council to secure its delivery. The Local Transport Plan 3 states that Suffolk County Council will contribute £1 million to its delivery. Network Rail will fund the remaining £3 million.

3.2.6 A successful bid has been prepared by Suffolk County Council to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund for a package of measures to support sustainable transport in the town. This bid included the provision of the interchange at the Lowestoft Station. As such there is no funding gap for the station interchange.

3.3. Other public transport

Overview

3.3.1 There are no strategic infrastructure requirements for other types of public transport in the District such as buses. However, new development in the Lake Lothing Outer Harbour Area Action Plan Area will require new bus routes, particularly through the redevelopment areas on the south-side of Lake Lothing. Whether these services will require developer funding to help subsidise the running of new services is not yet known. The level of service provision will be determined through transport assessments and it is envisaged that a Section 106 obligation could be used to require developer contributions if needed.

3.3.2 New bus routes throughout Lowestoft and around the Lake Lothing area are included in a successful bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund prepared by Suffolk County Council. The £1.5 million package will deliver two new routes, one in North Lowestoft and one in South Lowestoft serving key employment and tourist locations.

3.3.3 The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action plan promotes the development of water-borne public transport such as water taxis. This will likely be a private sector initiative, however, it will be important that mooring stations are provided on the key development sites.

3.4. Pedestrian and Cycle Network

Overview

3.4.1 Key to reducing the transport impact of new development is the promotion of walking and cycling.

3.4.2 Part of the National Cycle Route goes through parts of Lowestoft, Beccles and Halesworth. There are proposed extensions to the National Cycle Route north of Lowestoft to link to Hopton. This route had planning permission but due to landowner constraints and lack of funding it has not been delivered to date and the planning permission has now expired. There are also other proposed extensions including a link between Lowestoft and Beccles and
through parts of Halesworth. In addition to the national route there are also regional cycle routes that link the main towns of Waveney.

**Needs**

3.4.3 In Lowestoft, 80% of the people who work in Lowestoft also live in Lowestoft which means cycling and walking are feasible forms of transport. However, the majority of journeys made by car in the town are relatively short and could be made by walking or cycling as an alternative. With the development proposed in the Area Action Plan, this will likely get worse unless cycling and walking are made more attractive.

3.4.4 The reliance on the car for short journeys within the town significantly contributes to peak time congestion, resulting in delays to journeys as people cross between the north and south of the town at the two bridge crossings at each end of Lake Lothing. The significant north-south movement is related to a large population living to the south of the river and a significant amount of employment being located to the north. Therefore, the Bascule Bridge at the east end of Lake Lothing suffers from heavy traffic. This together with the narrowness of the lanes and proximity of the footways to the carriageway makes it an unpleasant environment for non-motorised users. Due to the narrowness of the carriageway, and low height of the parapets, cycling is not permitted on the footway. This is ignored by some cyclists because of safety concerns about using the road and can result in conflict.

3.4.5 Key measures to address this and encourage walking and cycling include plans in the Area Action Plan to deliver two pedestrian and cycle crossings over Lake Lothing. One of these will be adjacent the Bascule Bridge and the other will link Brooke Peninsula to Normanston Park and the surrounding route network.

3.4.6 These two bridges will help improve the north south connectivity of the town and provide a safer, more pleasant route to cycle and walk between the two halves of the town.

3.4.7 The bridge provided adjacent to Bascule Bridge will help address some of the specific issue relating to pedestrian and cycle movement over the existing bridge. The bridge provided at Brooke Peninsula will provide a much needed crossing in the centre of Lake Lothing which will serve the large scale residential development proposed in the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood. The bridge will provide quick and easy access to Normanston Park, Oulton Broad North Station and the Oulton Broad shopping area for new and existing residents in central, south Lowestoft. It will also improve north-south connections within the town and should further reduce the need to travel by car.

3.4.8 In addition to the bridge across Lake Lothing, a new bridge across the railway is also ideally needed to improve cycle connections to Normanston Park. The existing bridge does not enable cyclists to remain on their cycles.

3.4.9 Policy TML2 of the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan outlines a number of other improvements to the pedestrian and cycle network to help reduce car travel. These include:
• Pedestrian and cycle route through the strategic sites on the southern shore of Lake Lothing.
• Pedestrian and cycle route from Bridge Road, through Oswalgs Boatyard to Normanston Park on the north shore of Lake Lothing.
• Improved footways on new and existing routes within strategic sites
• Cycles and pedestrian provision on south Denmark Road.

3.4.10 In addition to the above schemes, the Lowestoft Transport Strategy (Suffolk County Council. June 2011) identifies a package of improvements to the Lowestoft cycle network to help promote a modal shift. The cost and funding arrangements for these improvements are currently unclear. It is hoped through this consultation process that this information will be refined.

3.4.11 In Beccles, the Site Specific Allocations DPD allocates 14 hectares of land for industrial development at Ellough Airfield. As the site is slightly remote from the main residential areas of Beccles and Wollingham there is a need for improved cycle/pedestrian access to encourage more sustainable forms of transport. A cycle path between the Copland Way Roundabout and Cookes Corner will help link the industrial allocation to Regional Cycle Route 31 and enable people from Wollingham and Beccles to cycle to the industrial estate without having to cycle on roads with vehicular traffic. This will increase the attractiveness of cycling as a method of commuting and reduce the traffic impact of the allocation.

3.4.12 In Halesworth, for 90 new dwellings and 12.25 hectares of new industrial land. The National Cycle Network goes through Halesworth, however, there is a missing link on Norwich Road which means the network is diverted through Holton. This 0.7km missing link between the Sparrowhawk Road junction and the Harrisons Way junction forms the most direct means of travel between the proposed industrial land and the new housing land. Therefore the provision of this link will reduce the impact that these allocations will have on the local highway network and should encourage healthier lifestyles.

3.4.13 It is noted that there are many other required cycle and pedestrian improvements required across the District ranging from large projects such as the link between Lowestoft and Hopton and small projects that link existing cycle and pedestrian routes. The above projects specifically identified are the only projects that are needed to address the impacts of planned development in the Waveney Local Development Framework. There may be opportunities for neighbourhoods to use the proportion of CIL that is handed back to them to help deliver more localised improvements (See Section 11)

**Costs**

3.4.14 The cost of providing a new swing bridge over Lake Lothing, adjacent to the Bascule Bridge is estimated to cost £1.1 million.

3.4.15 A draft feasibility study into the pedestrian and cycle bridge across Lake Lothing at the Brooke Peninsula identified and costed three potential options for a crossing. Options 1 and 2 have a higher soffit level of 12m above ordnance datum to allow more craft to pass under the bridge without the need for opening. Options 1 and 2 would also involve the creation of a new bridge across the railway as described above. Option 3 has a lower soffit level of
3.5m above ordnance datum and does not necessarily require the railway crossing, although this will still be desirable. The height of this bridge would be consistent with the Bascule vehicular bridge across Lake Lothing on the A12.

- Option 1: Swing Bridge = £6,668,704
- Option 2: Bascule Bridge = £7,105,052
- Option 3: Bascule Bridge = £4,810,382

3.4.16 The railway crossing would cost an additional £931,480.

3.4.17 Therefore the likely cost of the pedestrian and cycle bridge across Lake Lothing at the Brooke Peninsula is between £4,810,382 and £8,036,532.

3.4.18 The cost of the other improvements identified in Policy TML2 as referred to above are unknown, however, these improvements will likely be delivered as part of the development of the strategic sites, as they are completely within the strategic sites. The exception is a proposed section of a improved cycle path between Oswalds Boatyard and the railway bridge to Normanston Park on the north side of Lake Lothing. Using costs outlined in Sustran’s “Connect2 Greenways Guide” it is estimated that this would cost approximately £70,000.

3.4.19 The cycle path between the Copland Way Roundabout and Cookes Corner in Ellough, Beccles is forecasted to cost £70,000 (Source: Suffolk County Council)

3.4.20 The cost of providing a new cycle path on Norwich Road in Halesworth is estimated to be in the region of £50,000 (Source: “Connect2 Greenways Guide”). This is assuming it would involve converting the existing path to a shared path.

3.4.21 In summary the total cost of providing the cycle and pedestrian infrastructure required to support development is between £6,100,382 and £9,326,532 depending upon what bridge option is selected at Brooke Peninsula.

**Funding**

3.4.22 A successful bid has been prepared by Suffolk County Council to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund for a package of measures to support sustainable transport in the town. This bid included the provision of a pedestrian and cycle swing bridge over Lake Lothing by the Bascule Bridge.

3.4.23 There is no funding currently available for the second pedestrian and cycle crossing over Lake Lothing at Brooke Peninsula. There is also no funding for a formalised cycle path between Oswalds Boatyard and the railway bridge by Normanston Park.

3.4.24 Other improvements mentioned in Policy TML2 will be delivered as part of the development of the strategic sites in the Lake Lothing area.

3.4.25 There is no funding available for the cycle link between the Copland Way Roundabout and Cookes Corner in Ellough, Beccles
3.4.26 There is no funding allocated for extending the National Cycle Network between the Sparrowhawk Road junction and the Harrisons Way junction on Norwich Road in Halesworth.

3.4.27 In summary the likely funding gap for pedestrian and cycle infrastructure will be between £5,000,382 and £8,226,532.
4. Education

4.1 Improving educational achievement is a key objective of the Waveney Core Strategy (Objective 4). It is therefore important that educational provision across the District keeps up with development. Policy CS09 of the Core Strategy also recognises the importance of education in achieving sustainable development. Policy CS04 states that developer contributions will be sought for education facilities (including early years and community education).

4.2 Suffolk County Council are the Local Education Authority covering the Waveney District and therefore responsible for the provision of primary and secondary education throughout the District. For many years Suffolk County Council have requested developer contributions towards education provision from large developments to help off-set the impact of new development.

4.3 The education system in Waveney is currently a three-tier system comprising of first schools, middle schools and high schools. However, Suffolk County Council is currently undertaking a reorganisation of schools across Suffolk to move towards a two-tier system of primary and secondary schools. As of September 2011, Lowestoft will have a two-tier system.

4.1. Pre-School

Overview

4.1.1 The Childcare Act 2006 places a duty on Suffolk County Council to play a lead role in facilitating the provision of pre-school childcare within the broader framework of shaping children’s services in partnership with the private, voluntary and independent sectors.

4.1.2 Section 7 of the Childcare Act sets out a duty to secure free early years provision for pre-school children of a prescribed age. The current requirement is to ensure 15 hours per week of free provision over 38 weeks of the year for all 3 and 4 year-olds. This means pre-school provision is now not just a market provided facility.

Needs, Costs and Funding

4.1.3 The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan identifies a need for 2 year groups of pre-school provision to accommodate the 1,500 dwellings proposed. Ideally this would form part of the primary school required in the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood (Policy SSP3).

4.1.4 The Area Action Plan estimates that the cost of pump-priming this facility will require a developer contribution in the region of £612,000.
4.2. Primary

Overview

4.2.1 Primary education in Waveney is currently made up of first schools and middle schools. However, as explained above this is now starting to change as the education system moves towards a two-tier system. This means some schools closing and others merging. Despite this, as explained below, there will be a need for additional capacity to serve the increase in population arising from new development.

Needs

4.2.2 New development will increase demand for school places. In some locations there may not be capacity to accommodate this demand. In these cases improvements and extensions to schools will be needed to accommodate the additional pupils.

4.2.3 The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan allocates 1,585 new homes across the Area Action Plan area. The majority of these homes (1,505) are on the south side of Lake Lothing (Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood, Kirkley Rise and Western-end of Lake Lothing). The AECOM Social Infrastructure Assessment (2010) estimates that 1500 units will require at least 1.8 forms of primary school provision. This should be in the form of a new 2-form entry primary school as the existing schools in the area do not have the ability to expand. A 2-form entry primary school will also ensure that there is a level of surplus to facilitate parental preference and mid-year admissions, and for contingency planning.

4.2.4 Outside the Lake Lothing area, a new primary school will be developed to serve the Woods Meadow development which has planning permission subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement. This may be located on the development itself or on land allocated west of Millennium Way by Policy LOW1 of the Site Specific Allocations DPD.

4.2.5 There are no other new primary schools proposed in the District. However, development in some areas of the District may exceed the capacity of the local catchment school. In these circumstances improvements and/or extensions to existing primary schools will be required. Tables 4.2.1, 4.2.2. and 4.2.3 below look at each school and its forecasted surplus/deficit in capacity (Data provided by Suffolk County Council). The tables also show the likely level of development in each catchment and calculates the number of extra places needed to support development in that catchment. Suffolk County Council assume that for every 100 dwellings (2 bed and above) there are 25 new primary school children. For the purposes of this study it is assumed that all dwellings developed are 2 bedrooms or above.
### Table 4.2.1 – Education Capacity in Lowestoft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Average Spare Capacity 2011-2015</th>
<th>Number of Homes 2011-2025</th>
<th>Number of new pupils</th>
<th>New places needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oulton Broad Primary</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Loke Primary</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunton Primary</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplars Primary</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield St Nicholas Primary</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Margaret's Primary</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Hill Primary</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-84</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Colville Primary</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakefield Primary</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen Park Primary</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Primary</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell Primary</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.2.2 - Education Capacity in Beccles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Average Spare Capacity 2011-2015</th>
<th>Number of Homes 2011-2025</th>
<th>Number of new pupils</th>
<th>New places needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crowfoot Primary, Beccles</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Benets Catholic Primary, Beccles</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravensmere Infant, Beccles</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Pye Primary, Beccles</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.2.3 – Education Capacity Elsewhere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Average Spare Capacity 2011-2015</th>
<th>Number of Homes 2011-2025</th>
<th>Number of new pupils</th>
<th>New places needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bungay</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halesworth</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reydon</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.6 As can be seen from the tables above, there will only be a need for school improvements/expansions to accommodate development in Lowestoft. Elsewhere in the District the levels of development proposed will likely fit within existing capacity. The tables above do not include the forecasts of windfall that have been taken into account in other parts of this study. This is because these are forecasts and are not necessarily based on identified sites. As the location of these developments are uncertain it is not possible to analyse the impact of windfall development on local schools. It could be for example that most windfall development will happen where there is capacity in schools to absorb it. Should the 202 forecasted windfall homes be...
developed in areas where there is no or little school capacity than the number of primary places required would be approximately 51.

**Costs**

4.2.7 The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan estimates that the cost of providing a new 2 form entry primary school within the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood development to be **£8.5 million**. This figure takes into account the likely higher build costs associated with the previously developed nature of the site. The primary school will also require at least 2 hectares of land.

4.2.8 Suffolk County Council, using Department of Education cost per place figures which are regionally adjusted for Suffolk, estimate that a primary school place costs £11,644. Therefore the cost of improving schools in Lowestoft to take another 102 places as identified above will cost **£1,187,688**.

**Funding**

4.2.9 There is no funding currently available to build new schools and improve existing ones to address the impacts of new development. Therefore the funding gap for new primary school provision to support development is **£9,687,688**.

**4.3. Secondary and Sixth Form**

**Overview**

4.3.1 Currently there are three high schools in Lowestoft, one in Beccles, and one in Bungay. In September 2011 a new high school will open in Pakefield. A new Sixth Form College will be opening in Lowestoft in September 2011. There are also sixth forms in Sir John Leman High School in Beccles and in Bungay High School.

**Needs**

4.3.2 The recent re-organisation of secondary school provision in Lowestoft including the forthcoming opening of Pakefield High and the Sixth Form College means that there is capacity within the District’s secondary schools to accommodate the development proposed in the Waveney LDF.
5. Open Space and Green Infrastructure

5.1 Open space and green infrastructure perform a wide variety of important functions, including, providing space for formal and informal recreation, improving the appearance of towns and villages and providing areas for wildlife. Open space therefore provides a number of benefits, both socially, environmentally and economically, ranging from individual and community health benefits, enhanced property values, and increased biodiversity.

5.2 Pressure on existing open space and green infrastructure increases with population and housing growth. It is therefore important that adequate additional open space are provided as growth takes place. Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 together with local policies CS04 and CS14 of the Core Strategy, DM25 of the Development Management Policies and EHC1 of the emerging Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan set out the principle that new development should contribute to open space provision to meet additional demand. In some cases this provision will be made on the development site itself, in other cases this provision will be provided off-site, either in the form of new facilities or in improving existing facilities. The supporting text to Policy DM25 of the Development Management Policies states that sites of 20 dwellings or more should provide on-site open space.

5.3 The following sections detail the different types of open space that will likely be needed to support development across Waveney.

5.1. Play

Overview

5.1.1 Play is an important part of the development of young people by providing opportunities to interact and socialise with others, learn about risk taking and improvisation, as well as other aspects of growing up including generating self esteem and independence. It is important that public areas designated for play are accessible to the whole population. Play provision can take the form of equipped areas of open space and more informal unequipped areas.

5.1.2 The Fields in Trust (formerly the National Playing Fields Association) have established a national standard for play provision of 0.8 hectare per 1000 people. This is broken down into 0.25 hectares of equipped space and 0.55 hectares of non-equipped informal and amenity space.

5.1.3 New development will put increased pressure on existing facilities and will create new demand for additional and improved facilities, hence making the existing deficits more acute. It is important that new and improved play space is provided to support new development.

Needs

5.1.4 The need for the new and improved play space can be calculated by using the above standard of 0.8 hectares per 1000 people and applying it to the level of new development expected over the plan period.
5.1.5 The 0.8 hectares per 1000 people equates to 17.6m² of play space per dwelling assuming 2.2 people per house¹.

5.1.6 The housing growth figures indicated in section 2.1 indicate an additional 2,388 homes will be developed over the period to 2025. Therefore, over this period an additional 4.203 hectares of play space will be required.

5.1.7 Some of this need will be addressed by developers providing play space within the development site. Policy DM25 encourages developments of 20 dwellings or more to provide open space on-site. In the majority of cases this will include play space. The standards applied for onsite provision are based on the Fields in Trust standard of 2.4 hectares per 1000 people.

5.1.8 It is possible to calculate the likely amount of on-site provision over the period by analysing the size of sites identified in the emerging 2011 SHLAA. There may also be instances where, with sites of 20 or more dwellings it may be more beneficial to have off-site provision. Considering the above, it is estimated that out of the above need, 3.135 hectares will be provided directly by developers on development sites.

5.1.9 Therefore the residual need for off-site provision which will need to be funded through a Community Infrastructure Levy is 1.068 hectares.

**Costs**

5.1.10 The average cost of providing a play area in Waveney is £83.26 per m². This has been calculated by taking the cost of providing local examples of equipped play space (£115 per m²) and local examples of unequipped open space (£69 per m²)². These figures do not include the cost to purchase land which is estimated to be £4.75 per m² (Source: District Valuer, 2011). Therefore the cost of providing 1.068 hectares of play space is £939,947.

5.1.11 New play space will require ongoing maintenance in order for it to continue to be a useful and valuable resource for the community. Maintenance has a considerable cost implication. The emerging Localism Bill includes amendments to the Community Infrastructure Levy legislation to allow CIL to be spent on revenue projects. The Council currently requests developer contributions towards the cost of maintaining new open space for a period of 10 years. The Open Space Implementation Note (2004, updated 2011) estimates that the annual cost of basic maintenance of open space is approximately £0.29 per m². Therefore the revenue cost of maintaining the 4.203 hectares of new play space for 10 years will be approximately £147,755 (including 3% annual inflation).

**Funding**

5.1.12 Whilst there has been public and lottery funding in the past for play space, this has been to deal with existing deficits of provision. No funding is available to address new demand arising from new development. Therefore

¹ 0.8 hectares per 1000 people = 8m² per person. 8m² x 2.2 people per dwelling = 17.6m² per dwelling

² According to Fields in Trust (FIT) standard for every 1m² of children’s play space 0.69m² will be unequipped and 0.31m² will be equipped. (0.69 x £69) + (0.31 x £115) = £83.26. The source of these costs is Waveney Norse
the cost of providing new and improved off-site play space will have to be
covered by developer contributions through the Community Infrastructure
Levy. Therefore, the capital funding gap which CIL will be required to
address is £939,947.

5.2. Outdoor Sport

Overview

5.2.1 Outdoor sport provision consists of publically accessible, outdoor areas set
aside for formal and informal sports. These include sports pitches such as
football rugby and cricket as well as informal playing fields with pitches for
sport. Other outdoor sports facilities include bowling greens and tennis
courts. Informal and formal outdoor sports facilities have a range of
community benefits including encouraging healthy lifestyles.

5.2.2 The Fields in Trust (formerly the National Playing Fields Association) have
established a national standard for outdoor sports provision of 1.6 hectare per
1000 people. This is broken down to 1.2 hectares per 1000 people for
playing pitches and 0.4 hectares per 1000 people for other outdoor sports
such as tennis, bowls and athletics. The Waveney Playing Pitch Assessment
(2002) identified a quantitative deficiency against this standard of 54 hectares
for the whole District. This deficit was mainly constrained to Lowestoft.
However, deficits were also identified in Bungay, Halesworth and Beccles.
The assessment also included a refined assessment based on actual demand
for facilities. Under this assessment a deficiency of 15.7 hectares for the
entire District was identified. The assessment identified a need for an artificial
hockey pitch, more cricket provision in Lowestoft and Bungay, and 12 to 14
additional junior football pitches across the District.

Needs

5.2.3 Applying the above Fields in Trust standard of 1.6 hectares per 1000 people,
a need for an additional 8.406 hectares of outdoor sport will be needed to
support the development of 2,388 homes over the period to 2025\(^3\).

5.2.4 To address this need and existing deficits, the Council has identified and is
planning to deliver a number of outdoor sport projects.

5.2.5 In Carlton Colville, 32.3 hectares of land has been allocated for outdoor
sports and leisure uses at Oakes Farm (Policy LOW11 of the Site Specific
Allocations DPD). This will likely include new football pitches, cricket,
athletics provision and possibly rugby. The allocation of this site will help
address existing deficits and address new demand arising from development
across the District.

5.2.6 In Halesworth the Council has allocated the existing playing fields in the town
for housing in order to secure the delivery of a larger and improved playing
field elsewhere in the town (Policy HAL3 of the Site Specific Allocations
DPD).

\(^3\) This is calculated as follows: 1.6 hectares per 1000 people = 16m\(^2\) per person. 2.2 people
per dwelling x 16m\(^2\) = 35.2m\(^2\) per dwelling. 35.2m\(^2\) per dwelling x 2,388 homes = 8.406
hectares
5.2.7 In Kessingland the Council has allocated 2.76 hectares of land for a new playing field (Policy LOW10 of the Site Specific Allocations DPD).

5.2.8 It should be noted that the projects in Kessingland and Halesworth identified above deal mainly with existing deficits rather than dealing with deficits arising from future development.

5.2.9 It is unlikely that any development will provide sport facilities on-site as part of their on-site requirement under Policy DM25, given the large size of these facilities. Therefore it is likely that most outdoor sport provision to accommodate new development will be off-site using contributions pooled by CIL.

**Costs**

5.2.10 It is currently uncertain what form future sports provision will take. Therefore using averages from local examples, a grass sports pitch costs £8.29 per m$^2$ to set up and lay out. There is no local evidence for the cost of non-pitch sports. Sport England provide average sports facilities costs on their website ([http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/planning_tools_and_guidance/planning_kitbag/facilities_costs_-_2nd_quarter.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/planning_tools_and_guidance/planning_kitbag/facilities_costs_-_2nd_quarter.aspx)). Using Sport England figures the non pitch average cost is £81.27 per square metre (Quarter 2 2011 Sport England estimates based on Tennis, Bowls and Athletics). The above figures exclude the cost of purchasing open space land which is locally estimated to be £4.75 sqm (Source: District Valuer, 2011).

Assuming that of the 8.406 hectares of outdoor sport space required, 6.305 hectares is to be for pitch based sports and 2.101 is to be for non-pitch sports the cost of providing the outdoor sport requirement is £2,629,452

5.2.11 New outdoor sport facilities will require ongoing maintenance in order for them to continue to be a useful and valuable resource for the community. Maintenance has a considerable cost implication. The emerging Localism Bill includes amendments to the Community Infrastructure Levy legislation to allow CIL to be spent on revenue projects. The Council currently requests developer contributions towards the cost of maintaining new open space for a period of 10 years. The Open Space Implementation Note (2004, updated 2011) estimates that the annual cost of basic maintenance of open space is approximately £0.29 per m$^2$. Therefore the revenue cost of maintaining the 8.406 hectares of new outdoor sport facilities for 10 years will be approximately £295,470 (including 3% annual inflation).

**Funding**

5.2.12 The cost of providing the 8.406 hectares of outdoor sport to support the development of 2,388 new homes across the District will need to be funded by development through the CIL. The remaining hectares of the Council’s proposed outdoor sports facilities will need to be funded by other sources. Some of the proposals such as the Halesworth replacement playing fields will be funded through enabling development. The proposed new Kessingland playing field already has enough Section 106 funding secured for it. Some of the Oakes Farm development may be commercially led therefore not requiring public funding.

---

4 Based on the FIT standards of 1.2 ha per 1000 people for pitch sports and 0.4 ha per 1000 people for non-pitch sports.
5.2.13 To summarise to provide enough open space for outdoor sport to accommodate the proposed levels of development, £2,629,452 will be required through CIL.

5.3. Parks

Overview

5.3.1 Parks are areas of land normally enclosed, designed and constructed for public use. They are intended to provide accessible, high quality opportunities for informal recreation and community events. There are currently 12 parks in Waveney, 7 of which are in Lowestoft. Together these parks total some 28 hectares. The Waveney Open Space Strategy (2007) reports that the level of provision of parks in Beccles, Bungay and Southwold do not meet the expectations of the local community. However, the overall quality of parks across the District is rated highly with 60% of local people rating local parks as good or excellent.

5.3.2 The Core Strategy and Open Space Strategy make a commitment to identify opportunities for the development of new parks as well as improving the quality of existing parks.

Needs

5.3.3 The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan includes proposals to create a new contemporary park to be known as the East of England Park. The park will be adjacent the North Lowestoft seafront to celebrate the most eastern point of Britain. The park will support the development of the Lake Lothing Area and will be of benefit to people working in the new PowerPark allocation as well as people living in the new residential developments proposed in the area. This 7.8 hectare, destination park, will also be of benefit to local people across the District and visitors from outside the area. The park will consist of space for informal recreation and cultural events as well as equipped play spaces.

Costs

5.3.4 Although the Area Action Plan includes information on some of the features the park will have, the exact specification for the park is yet to be determined and therefore the costs of delivery can only be estimates. Waveney Norse estimate that the cost of delivering a new park is approximately £15.32 per m². Therefore the potential cost of delivering the East of England Park will be £1,194,960.

5.3.5 The East of England Park will require ongoing maintenance in order for it to continue to be a useful and valuable resource for the community. Maintenance has a considerable cost implication. The emerging Localism Bill includes amendments to the Community Infrastructure Levy legislation to allow CIL to be spent on revenue projects. The Council currently requests developer contributions towards the cost of maintaining new open space for a period of 10 years. The Open Space Implementation Note (2004, updated 2011) estimates that the annual cost of basic maintenance of open space is
approximately £0.29 per m\(^2\). Therefore the revenue cost of maintaining the East of England Park for 10 years will be approximately **£274,170** (including 3% annual inflation).

**Funding**

5.3.6 There is currently no funding to deliver the East of England Park. Therefore the capital funding gap for this project that a CIL will need to address is **£1,194,960**.

**5.4. Cemeteries**

**Overview**

5.4.1 Cemeteries consist of land set aside for the burial of the deceased. They also are important for wildlife and provide space for quiet contemplation. By their nature, existing cemeteries are a finite resource and additional provision will be needed as the capacity of existing cemeteries is met. New development and the associated increase in population will also increase the need for burial land.

**Needs**

5.4.2 The Council has to make provision of burial land to serve the District. Most parts of the District have adequate land to last many years into the future. However, the Open Space Strategy states that within 15 years it will be necessary to deliver more burial land in Lowestoft and Bungay to meet predicted need.

5.4.3 In response to this the Council has allocated 0.33 hectares of land as an extension to Bungay cemetery in the site Specific Allocations DPD (Policy BUN6).

5.4.4 Land has not been identified in Lowestoft in the Site Specific Allocations DPD. It is expected that there is capacity for another 10 years in the town, so land will be identified in a review of the DPD. The Open Space Strategy (2007) identified that a site of 2 hectares would be required in Lowestoft. This would also include a crematorium as there is currently no provision of such a facility in the District.

**Costs**

5.4.5 Until land is identified and proposals worked up, it is not certain what the cost of cemetery and crematorium provision in Lowestoft will be. It is unlikely that the allocated site for burial land in Bungay would have a significant cost implication as it forms a small extension to an existing cemetery. Therefore set up costs should be minimal.
Funding

5.4.6 The extension to Bungay Cemetery will be funded by the Council and its partners and will therefore not need contributions from development.

5.4.7 It is not currently possible to say presently as to who will fund any future provision of cemeteries as any new provision will be at the very end of the plan period. There may be scope for developer contributions through CIL to help fund part of this, but the scale of developer contributions would need to be reviewed at a later date when further detail is known.

5.5. Allotments

Overview

5.5.1 Allotments have been an integral part of the urban landscape in the UK for over a century. Their main use is for growing vegetables and other crops, but they also provide recreational and wildlife benefits. Recently there has been an upsurge in interest in allotments given growing concern about good quality, locally produced food and sustainability. Current trends show an increase in demand regionally and locally. This demand will likely increase with new development.

5.5.2 There is currently 32.48 hectares of allotments across the District with highest provision per 1000 people in Southwold (1.08) and the lowest in South Lowestoft (0.13) (The Waveney Allotments, Cemeteries and Church Yards Needs Assessment (2007)). Under Section 8 of the Small Holdings and Allotments Act 1908, Local Authorities have a statutory duty to provide a sufficient number of allotments where they consider there is demand.

Needs

5.5.3 The Waveney Allotments, Cemeteries and Church Yards Needs Assessment (2007) reports a general need for more allotments in the District. The assessment recommends a standard of 0.3 hectares per 1000 people.

5.5.4 Using the above standard, an additional 1.576 hectares of allotments will be required to support the development of 2,388 homes over the period to 2025.\(^5\)

5.5.5 To address this need and existing deficits, the Council's Site Specific Allocations DPD has allocated four pieces of land for allotments, these are:

- 0.35 hectares off Monckton Avenue in North Lowestoft (Part of the Policy LOW9 allocation)
- 0.77 hectares south of Nicholson Drive in Beccles (Policy BEC4 allocation)
- 1.02 hectares off Wingfield Street in Bungay (Policy BUN5)
- 0.5 hectares at Dairy Hill, Halesworth (Part of the Policy HAL3 allocation)

\(^5\) This is calculated as follows: 0.3 hectares per 1000 people = 3m² per person. 2.2 people per dwelling x 3m² = 6.6m² per dwelling. 6.6m² per dwelling x 2,388 homes = 1.576 hectares
- 0.15 hectares at Cucumber Lane, Beccles (Part of the BEC3 allocation)

5.5.6 No land was allocated in South Lowestoft where the greatest shortfall of Allotment provision is. However, there may be potential to provide some allotments as part of the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood proposal in the Area Action Plan (Policy SSP3). The proposed 0.35 hectares off Monckton Avenue, 0.5 hectares on Dairy Hill and 0.15 hectares at Cucumber Lane will be delivered as part of the development of these sites.

Costs

5.5.7 Local estimates provided by Waveney Norse suggest that the set up cost for allotments is £27.07 per m$^2$. The cost of land for allotment use is approximately £4.75 per m$^2$ (Source: District Valuer, 2011). Therefore the estimated cost of providing the remaining 1.79 hectares of allotment land allocated in the Site Specific Allocations DPD is £569,578. However, the need for allotment land emanating from 2,388 new dwellings is only 1.567 hectares costing £498,619.

5.5.8 It is assumed that the cost of maintaining allotments will covered by the individual allotment holders.

Funding

5.5.9 There are no current funding sources for the delivery of allotment land. Therefore the funding gap that can be legitimately filled by CIL is £498,619.

5.6. Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace

Overview

5.6.1 Natural and semi-natural greenspaces are areas of undeveloped or previously developed land that contain natural habitats or which have been planted or colonised by vegetation and wildlife including woodland and wetland areas. They are an important resource for wildlife but also have recreational and educational benefits.

Needs

5.6.2 With the exception of a new country park which is being provided as part of the Woods Meadow development, there are no strategic proposals for natural and semi-natural greenspaces. However, development across the District may put pressure on existing natural greenspaces. It is not possible to quantify the likely need for this type of open space but it may be necessary to use future CIL funds on improving or maintaining natural greenspaces in certain localities where development may increase impact. Alternatively it may be possible to address local issues through the use of Section 106. The Government is making provision through the Localism Bill to require Councils to allocate a meaningful proportion of CIL revenues back to the communities in which the development occurred. There may be circumstances where the community wish to allocate some of their ‘local’ CIL funds to improving local natural and semi-natural greenspace.
6. Community and Cultural Facilities

6.1 Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy gives a strong commitment to protecting and promoting cultural and community facilities. Cultural and community facilities such as leisure, community centres, libraries, museums and heritage all improve the quality of lives of new and existing residents as well as supporting tourism.

6.2 Policy CS04 of the Core Strategy states that contributions from developers may be required to help deliver cultural and community facilities. New development will increase demand for such facilities and therefore put pressure on existing facilities. Therefore it is considered justified that development should contribute towards the provision of this type of infrastructure through CIL.

6.1. Leisure and Sport Centres

Overview

6.1.1 Leisure centres and indoor sport facilities are an important recreational resource that complements outdoor sport provision. In Waveney, there are currently leisure centres in Lowestoft, which is currently undergoing refurbishment, and Bungay. Both of these facilities are now managed by the Sentinel Leisure Trust which was established in April 2011. There is also dual use of school leisure centres across the District.

Needs

6.1.2 The Council and its partners are planning a number of projects to improve the leisure offer within the District. Whilst these projects are about addressing existing need, it is likely that to some degree, they will help accommodate new development as well.

6.1.3 These projects include:

- In Halesworth, the Council is currently exploring options to deliver a new leisure centre, including a swimming pool, gym, sports hall and astro surface on the Middle School site. This will be linked to the replacement playing fields associated with the Dairy Hill (Policy HAL3) allocation in the Site Specific Allocations DPD.
- In Bungay, the Council is hoping to extend the existing leisure centre to create a new Spa and a refurbished gym.
- In Beccles, the Council is working with Beccles Town Council and Sir John Leman School to develop their existing sports centre into a new leisure centre plus astro facilities. The Council and its partners are seeking to further develop and open up the facility to the community whilst also developing the schools sports activities and facilities.
**Costs**

6.1.4 The Halesworth leisure centre proposal is currently estimated to cost £5.5 million based on the above specification. However, the final specification will ultimately be dependant on the amount of funds available for delivery.

6.1.5 The extensions and improvements to Bungay leisure centre are currently estimated to cost £2.5 million.

6.1.6 The Beccles project is currently forecasted to cost £6 million.

**Funding**

6.1.7 The main source of funding for the Halesworth leisure centre proposal will be from the sale of the existing playing fields for housing development in accordance with Policy HAL3 of the Site Specific Allocations DPD. However, there is still likely to be a funding gap to meet the full costs of the above specification of approximately £2.5 million.

6.1.8 For the Bungay proposal there is currently a funding gap of approximately £1.5 million.

6.1.9 The Beccles project also currently has a funding gap. This is approximately £2 million.

6.1.10 As shown above the three main leisure projects the Council are working on all have sizeable funding gaps at present and therefore will need to seek other sources of funding for timely delivery. In some cases the plugging of these gaps may need to be by scaling down the proposals. The above projects are not just to meet the needs of new development, therefore the extent to which the Community Infrastructure Levy can contribute to them is limited. However, it is considered that as development will have an impact on the capacity of existing leisure facilities, future CIL receipts could potentially be used to help address a portion of these funding gaps. In terms of working out a reasonable contribution the Sport England Sports Facility Calculator can be used to give a likely idea of the demand and associated cost arising from new development. Table 6.1.1 below shows the reasonable contribution development can make to addressing these funding gaps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure Centre Proposal</th>
<th>Number of new homes planned in the locality</th>
<th>Reasonable Developer Contribution to Funding Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halesworth</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>£61,533 (based on need for swimming pool, halls and synthetic pitches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungay</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>£34,806 (based on need for swimming pool, halls and synthetic pitches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beccles</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>£32,942 (based on need for swimming pool, halls and synthetic pitches)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.11 As can be seen from Table 6.1.1 a reasonable contribution from development through CIL to addressing the funding gap for leisure centres is £129,281.

6.2. Community Centres and Customer Service Centres

Overview

6.2.1 Community centres provide valuable space for community uses such as meeting space, childcare, indoor sports and other recreational uses. They can be co-located with other services such as medical services and community safety. New community buildings also provide an opportunity to include other local service provision such as local authority customer services. Co-location of services and community space provides financial efficiencies and can be more customer friendly as all services are in one accessible location.

Needs

6.2.2 The Waveney Prospectus (2007) highlights a widespread need for community buildings that provide community space and accommodate a range of local service providers. This is reflected in the Customer Access Strategy (2009) which states the Council will explore options to provide new customer service centres combined with other service providers where opportunities arise.

6.2.3 Policy CS04 of the Core Strategy states that developer contributions will be sought for community centres or multi-agency one-stop shops in the market towns and Kessingland. A one-stop shop has already been provided in Kessingland. There is potential that community space/customer service space will be provided within the Policy SOU2 housing allocation in the Site Specific Allocations DPD which now has planning permission.

6.2.4 In Beccles, housing allocation Policy BEC2 on Gresham Road of the Site Specific Allocations DPD requires a customer access centre to be provided on the ground floors of two of the residential dwellings.

6.2.5 In Bungay, Policy BUN3 on Upper Olland Street of the Site Specific Allocations DPD allocates the existing community centre, which is in a state of disrepair, for housing. This should help secure the delivery of new community facilities and a customer access centre on land allocated by Policy BUN4 on Old Grammar Lane.

6.2.6 In Halesworth, Policy HAL4 on Dairy Farm allocates part of the site (0.4 hectares) for a community centre and customer access centre.

6.2.7 The need for multi-agency or one-stop shop side of these facilities is currently being reviewed. However, the need for generic community facilities remains.

6.2.8 The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan sets out an indicative need for 228sqm of community space. This need was established through the AECOM Social Infrastructure Assessment (2010) which applied Swindon standards of 70sqm per 1000 people. It is likely that this need could be addressed through the provision of the primary school by allowing space
within the primary school to be used by the wider community out of school hours.

**Costs**

6.2.9 The Sites Viability Study that informed the Site Specific Allocations (Feb, 2010) estimated that the cost of providing a 65sqm one-stop shop on the BEC2 allocation would be £76,375.

6.2.10 The proposed community centre on allocation BUN4 is estimated to cost £2.4 million (based on 2,050 sqm building using estimates provided in the Sites Viability Study (Feb 2010)) .

6.2.11 As the type and function of new community space in Halesworth is not yet determined it is not possible to quantify a cost. The Town Council have recently acquired the Rifle Hall for community uses and this, together with the new leisure centre proposal may address need. If only a one-stop shop is needed on the site, similar to that proposed for the BEC2 allocation, this will likely cost the same as estimated for that allocation (£76,375).

6.2.12 The provision of small one-stop shops on allocations BEC2 and HAL4 will be delivered as part of the development and will therefore not need external funding.

6.2.13 The total cost of community centre provision will therefore be between **£2.4 million**. This figure could rise should there be a need for new community space on HAL4.

6.2.14 The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan assumed that the provision of 228sqm of community space and 98sqm of library space would cost £700,000. The community space part of this would cost in the region of **£489,570**. However, if the community space need is addressed through the primary school, this cost will be removed.

**Funding**

6.2.15 The new community centre proposed on allocation BUN4 in Bungay will be partly funded by the receipts from developing site BUN3. The Sites Viability Study (Feb, 2010) estimates that the development of BUN3 will create a residual land value of £123,813 which would be used to help fund the community centre. This leaves a funding gap of £2,276,187 for delivery of this project. Bungay Town Council and Waveney District Council are currently exploring other possible funding streams to help deliver this project. The above project is not just to meet the needs of new development, therefore the extent to which the Community Infrastructure Levy can contribute to it is somewhat limited. The estimated population of Bungay as of 2009 was 5,126. The proposed community centre will therefore provide 0.4 sqm of community space per person across the town. The 51 new units proposed in Bungay equates to 112 new residents. Therefore the 51 new units creates a need for 20m² of floorspace of the new community centre which equates to a contribution of **£23,400**.

6.2.16 There is no funding to address the community space needs arising from housing development in the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan. Therefore if the community space need cannot be met within the
primary school the funding gap which CIL will need to address for this will be £489,570.

6.2.17 Therefore the total funding gap for community space which CIL will be required to address is between £23,400 and £512,970.

6.3. Libraries and Archives

**Overview**

6.3.1 Public Libraries are an important part of social infrastructure and are often at the heart of local communities. They provide free access to books and information services such as the internet and provide opportunities for learning and leisure. Libraries are therefore often perceived as a valuable local facility.

6.3.2 The provision of public libraries is a statutory requirement under the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964. Suffolk County Council currently provides library services in Waveney. Table 6.3.1 below sets out the existing provision within Waveney.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
<td>Lowestoft Library, Clapham Road South, Lowestoft, NR32 1DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oulton Broad Library, Council Offices, 92 Bridge Road, Oulton Broad, NR32 3LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beccles</td>
<td>Beccles Library, Blyburgate, Beccles, NR34 9TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungay</td>
<td>Bungay Library, Wharton Street, Bungay, NR35 1EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halesworth</td>
<td>Halesworth Library, Bridge Street, Halesworth, IP19 8AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwold</td>
<td>Southwold Library, North Green, Southwold, IP18 6AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kessingland</td>
<td>Kessingland Library, Marram Green, Hall Road, Kessingland, NR33 7AH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.3 The Suffolk Record Office is inspected and approved by The National Archives under the Public Records Act 1958 as a place for local records to be deposited with proper security and environmental measures to preserve them. They come from a wide range of sources from councils and churches to schools, hospitals, businesses, estates and individuals dating back from the 12th century. The material all relates to the history of Suffolk and can be in any format from maps and plans to newspapers, parchment or microfilm. It is all made available to anyone who needs to see it in the public search rooms. The collections continue to grow each year as new items are added, with new development increasing pressure on space.
**Needs**

6.3.4 New development increases pressure on local libraries and the Suffolk Record Office. Therefore, to support the new development planned in Waveney, improvements and extensions to existing library provision and the Suffolk Records Office will be required.

6.3.5 The Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the DCMS which promotes best practice in museums, libraries and archives, to inspire innovative, integrated and sustainable services for all. The MLA recommends that a floorspace standard for library provision of 30 square metres per 1,000 population is adopted by local authorities. This follows a survey of space standards used by library authorities. The MLA also recommends that 6 square metres of archive floorspace per 1,000 population is provided, based on a survey of recent and current archive facilities.

6.3.6 Suffolk County Council uses the standards recommended by the MLA, with the exception that the floorspace standard for archive accommodation, at 5 square metres per 1,000 population is smaller than recommended.

6.3.7 Using the above Suffolk County Council standards it is possible to work out the need for library and archive provision to support development in Waveney.

6.3.8 On this basis an additional 2,388 dwellings within Waveney, assuming a population of 2.2 people per house, will generate a need for an additional:

- 158m² of library space
- 26m² of archive space

**Costs**

6.3.9 From the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Building Cost Information Service data, the MLA recommends a benchmark figure for construction and initial fit out of £3,000 per square metre for libraries and £3,600 per square metre for archive accommodation.

6.3.10 Therefore the cost of providing the library and archive space to meet the needs of new development in Waveney is:

- £474,000 for library space
- £93,600 for archive space

**Funding**

6.3.11 There is no current funding available to improve and expand libraries and archives to meet the needs of new development in Waveney. Therefore, the funding gap for library and archive provision for which CIL will be required to address is **£567,600**
7. Health Care

Overview and Needs

7.1 NHS Great Yarmouth and Waveney PCT commission health care services for the population of Waveney District. Planning has its roots in public health law from the 19th Century and recently health issues are again becoming an increasingly important material planning consideration. A healthy population is also a key factor of sustainable development. It is therefore important that new developments promote and enable healthy lifestyles and do not put undue pressure on existing health care services.

7.2 The Core Strategy identifies a need for new health centres in North and South Lowestoft. The new health centre in North Lowestoft will be provided as part of the residential development at Woods Meadow, Oulton. The proposed health centre for South Lowestoft now has planning permission on the Kirkley Rise allocation in the emerging Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan.

7.3 Using the Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU) model, the AECOM Social Infrastructure Assessment (2010), that informed the Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan, identifies a need for 299sqm of additional primary health care floorspace and 65sqm of dental surgery floorspace to accommodate one dentist to support development in the area. Whether this requirement is delivered within the main development sites on the south-side of Lake Lothing or off-site as part of an expansion of existing provision still needs to be determined. As this need figure is theoretical and does not take into account local circumstances further engagement with the Primary Care Trust is needed to refine the likely need arising from development.

Costs and Funding

7.4 The Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan estimates that the provision of the above need of 299sqm of additional primary health care floorspace and 65sqm of dental surgery floorspace will cost £700,000.

7.5 As the above need is generated entirely by new development there will be no funding from the Primary Care Trust to meet this need, except that which comes from development. Therefore the current funding gap for health infrastructure to meet the needs of development is £700,000. As stated previously this is an indicative figure and will need to be refined in discussions with the Primary Care Trust.
8. Police

Overview

8.1 The Suffolk Police Authority oversees provision of the police service in Suffolk. In Waveney there are currently police stations in Lowestoft, Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth and Southwold. There are no known strategic police infrastructure requirements to support development in Waveney. The Suffolk Police Authority Three Year Plan (2011) outlines how the police will be based in fewer buildings in the future and how they will look to share facilities with other public authorities. The provision of one-stop shops where opportunities occur as described in Section 4.2 may help deliver this.
9. Coastal Protection and Flooding

Overview

9.1 The Waveney coast suffers from some of the most dramatic losses of land in the country through coastal erosion. This has serious implications for local communities, tourism, business and the natural environment.

9.2 Decisions on how the coastline is managed are strongly influenced by Shoreline Management Plans (SMP). There are two SMPs covering the Waveney coastline. SMP Sub cell 3b covers the northern part of the Waveney coast from Lowestoft Ness to the border with Great Yarmouth Borough Council. SMP Sub cell 3c covers the area from Lowestoft Ness south to the border with Suffolk Coastal District Council at Southwold Harbour. The purpose of an SMP is to determine appropriate, strategic policies for coastal management that balance the many and often competing aspirations of stakeholders with proper regard for economic and environmental sustainability. The primary output is an 'intent for management' over a 100 year timeframe. This overarching vision is converted to policy statements for discrete lengths of coast with shared attributes broken down into short, medium and long-term time bands. Revisions to both SMP’s under the supervision of the Environment Agency and in partnership with Waveney, Suffolk Coastal and North Norfolk District Council’s and Great Yarmouth Borough Council are due to be completed and adopted by the end of 2011.

9.3 The SMPs have proposals to ‘Hold the Line’ for the 100 year period for the towns of Lowestoft and Southwold and the village of Kessingland. In between the towns there are various policy approaches including ‘No Active Intervention’ and ‘Managed Realignment’. Important to note is that the policy for Corton, which contains a number of tourist and residential properties near the cliff edge, in the 25 -50 year epoch is for managed realignment.

9.4 The emerging Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan proposes to allocate a significant amount of development on land that is at risk from tidal flooding. New flood defences and/or land raising will be required in this area to ensure development remains safe. These measures will be delivered by developers as part of the development sites.

Needs, Costs and Funding

9.5 In order not to increase the number of properties at risk from erosion, development is restricted in an area defined as the Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA) in the Waveney Local Development Framework. The CCMA equates to the areas at risk from erosion within 100 years as predicted in the SMP. Areas with a ‘Hold the Line’ policy do not have a CCMA as the SMP policy if implemented as planned will ensure the area remains safe from erosion. As such some development has been allocated in the Waveney Local Development Framework in areas close to the sea where a ‘Hold the Line’ policy exists. These are the PowerPark allocation in North Lowestoft (Policy SSP1 of the emerging Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan) and the CEFAS site in South Lowestoft (Policy LOW8 of the Site Specific Allocations DPD). These allocations will only remain safe...
from erosion/flooding if the SMP policy is implemented as planned. Implementation of these policies requires new capital works in the next 10 years which require funding.

9.6 Funding for coastal protection schemes is changing to a scheme where funding is based on number of residences that benefit. Commercial and other land uses are given less value under the new scheme. This could mean that for coastal protection schemes for frontages such as those in North Lowestoft around the PowerPark and in South Lowestoft near the LOW8 allocation, central Government funding for capital works could be severely limited and therefore funding from other sources such as CIL will likely be required. The exact likely funding shortfalls are currently uncertain and will be refined before the publication of the final version of this study.
10. Utilities

Overview

10.1 There are no known strategic utility infrastructure requirements to support development across Waveney. There may be site-specific issues, but these will need to be dealt with by the individual developer concerned.

10.2 A Water Cycle Study Scoping Report covering Waveney and Great Yarmouth was completed in March 2009. The study looked at the capacity of water infrastructure to accommodate the growth proposed in the Waveney Local Development Framework. The study concluded that there was capacity in wastewater treatment works at Lowestoft, Bungay, and Halesworth. It identified that there was limited capacity at Beccles and Southwold. Further work with the Environment Agency and Anglian Water as part of the Site Specific Allocations DPD work has confirmed that there is likely to be capacity at Beccles and Southwold to accommodate the proposed level of development. To accommodate the level of development proposed in South Lowestoft there may be a need for a new sewer crossing Lake Lothing or a new Waste Water Treatment Works in South Lowestoft. Further consultation will be needed with Anglian Water as part of the development brief for the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood (Policy SSP3 of the emerging Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan).

10.3 The Water Cycle Study also identified limited capacity in the sewer network in all towns with the exception of Halesworth. However, recent localised events suggest there may be issues in parts of Halesworth as well. These network capacity issues are very site-specific and therefore will need to be dealt with by individual developments.
11. Neighbourhood Infrastructure

11.1 The Government announced in November 2010 that it planned to reform the Community Infrastructure Levy to require Charging Authorities to pass back a ‘meaningful proportion’ of the levy secured in a particular neighbourhood back to that neighbourhood for spending on local infrastructure of their choice. The Government sees this as a way to help incentivise local communities to welcome development in their areas and to ensure the benefits of development are shared with local communities.

11.2 Little additional information has been provided to date on the definition of a ‘meaningful proportion’ and ‘neighbourhood’. The Government should be consulting on the detail of these proposals over the summer.

11.3 However, the guidance to date suggests that local authorities should work closely with neighbourhoods to help define their infrastructure requirements. It also suggests that local authorities will have to balance neighbourhood funding with wider strategic infrastructure funding. The chapters above mainly detail with the strategic infrastructure needed to support allocated development in the Waveney Local Development Framework. However, there may be some smaller infrastructure requirements that specific communities have.

11.4 With this in mind the Council would welcome, as part of this consultation, input from Parish and Town Councils and other community groups identifying local, small-scale infrastructure requirements (such as village hall improvements, cycle path improvements etc.) which could be funded through the Community Infrastructure Levy. This should not just be limited to those areas where the Local Development Framework allocates development as all areas could see some ‘windfall’ development and the new neighbourhood planning regime will allow communities to opt for more growth.
12. Summary of Key Findings

12.1 Table 12.1 below summarises all the strategic capital infrastructure requirements needed across the District to support the development allocated in the Waveney Local Development Framework. It identifies the cost of providing that infrastructure and the current total funding gaps to deliver all the projects identified in this study and the funding gap that a Community Infrastructure Levy will need to address.

12.2 In addition to the capital infrastructure identified in Table 12.1, the emerging Localism Bill includes amendments to the Community Infrastructure Levy legislation to allow CIL to be spent on revenue projects. This study identifies that the likely revenue funding issues will be limited to the maintenance of open space required to support development. The likely total cost for funding the maintenance of new open spaces for a period of 10 years will be £717,395.
Table 12.1 – Summary of Infrastructure Funding Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Type</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Current Funding</th>
<th>Funding Gap</th>
<th>Funding Gap of which CIL is required to address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Northern Spine Road</td>
<td>£4,000,000</td>
<td>Uncertain - Potentially SCC</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beccles Southern Relief Road</td>
<td>£4,000,000</td>
<td>Uncertain - Likely requirements for some developer funding</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denmark Road Improvements</td>
<td>£6,163,505</td>
<td>Uncertain - SCC to explore the Department for Transport major scheme funds</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access road into development sites on south side of Lake Lothing</td>
<td>£500,000 to £8,000,000</td>
<td>Developer delivered</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bungay Town Centre Improvements</td>
<td>£450,000</td>
<td>£450,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Road Junction</td>
<td>£1,176,500</td>
<td>£1,176,500</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>Beccles Rail Loop</td>
<td>£4,000,000</td>
<td>£4,000,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station Interchange</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Cycle Network</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge by Bascule Bridge</td>
<td>£1,100,000</td>
<td>£1,100,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge by Brooke Peninsula</td>
<td>£4,810,382 - £8,036,532</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£4,810,382 - £8,036,532</td>
<td>£4,810,382 - £8,036,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Cycle Path Normanston Park to Oswalds Boatyard</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Cycle Path Ellough, Beccles</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
<td>£70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Cycle Path Halesworth</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-School</td>
<td>Lake Lothing Area improvements</td>
<td>£612,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£612,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood School</td>
<td>£8,500,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other School Improvements</td>
<td>£1,187,688</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£1,187,688</td>
<td>£1,187,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Type</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Current Funding</td>
<td>Funding Gap</td>
<td>Funding Gap of which CIL is required to address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>£939,947</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£939,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor Sport</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>£2,629,452</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£2,629,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>East of England Park</td>
<td>£1,194,960</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£1,194,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>£498,619</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£498,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>Sport and Leisure</td>
<td>New Leisure Centre in Halesworth</td>
<td>£5,500,000</td>
<td>£3,000,000</td>
<td>£2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension to Leisure Centre in Bungay</td>
<td>£2,500,000</td>
<td>£1,000,000</td>
<td>£1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved public sports facilities at Sir John Leman High School</td>
<td>£6,000,000</td>
<td>£4,000,000</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres</td>
<td>Bungay Community Centre</td>
<td>£2,400,000</td>
<td>£123,813</td>
<td>£2,276,187</td>
<td>£23,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Lothing Community Space Need</td>
<td>£0 - £489,570</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0 - £489,570</td>
<td>£0 - £489,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>£474,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£474,000</td>
<td>£474,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>£93,600</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£93,600</td>
<td>£93,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>Lake Lothing Area improvements</td>
<td>£700,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£700,000</td>
<td>£700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Protection and Flood Defence</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£61,620,653 to £72,836,373</td>
<td>£16,850,313 plus other potential funding for road schemes</td>
<td>£30,106,835 to £33,822,555</td>
<td>£21,983,329 to £25,699,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.3 As can be seen from Table 12.1 the total funding gap for capital projects that a Community Infrastructure Levy will have to address is between £21,983,329 and £25,699,049. This together with the revenue funding requirements clearly justifies the need for the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy.

12.4 From the information in this study it is not possible to work out a likely rate of CIL. A viability study needs to be conducted to work out how much different types of development can afford to contribute. It may be that development across the District cannot afford to generate enough CIL funds to cover the funding gap identified above. If so, this evidence will help the Council look elsewhere for funding sources to help deliver the infrastructure required. Therefore this study together with the viability study will inform the rate of Community Infrastructure Levy.