



**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- d.) In most instances site-specific transport issues will continue to be covered by a combination of S106, S278 and S38. There may be (rare) instances where on-site early years and/or education provision is required (land and build costs) due to the scale of individual and/or co-located development proposals and this should continue to be covered by S106. Where site-specific S106 costs cause individual site viability problems then affordable housing requirements may be reduced to ensure that the site remains financially viable when taking into account other development costs (Source: paragraph 2.17 of the Viability Study by BNP Paribas Real Estate).
- e.) It is noted in paragraph 2.17 of the Viability Study by BNP Paribas Real Estate that affordable housing requirements may be reduced to ensure the site remains financially viable when taking into account other development costs.

**3.) Does the evidence demonstrate that the proposed charge rates would not threaten the delivery of the relevant Plan as a whole?**

- c.) There must be full collaboration and consultation with the County Council concerning variation of the existing county-wide S106 guidance as set out in the adopted '*Section 106 Developers Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk*'. This will ensure clarity and transparency for all parties interested in the development management process including developers and landowners.
- d.) There may be some instances where phased development or co-located sites may sensibly require the continued pooling of S106 contributions e.g. local transport mitigation measures which could cover such matters as junction improvements or improvements to a cycleway etc. These matters will be identified when individual and/or co-located sites are promoted. The County Council will clearly be mindful of the limit on pooling S106 contributions as specified by the CIL Regulations.

Whilst the County Council has confirmed that it does not wish to be heard by the Examiner and will rely on written representations, I can also confirm that I am available if the Examiner requires that.

I would be grateful if you could confirm whether or not a hearing will take place on 22 March 2013.

Yours sincerely,

**Neil McManus**  
Planning Obligations Manager

cc Sam Hubbard, Waveney District Council

**From:** Neil McManus  
**To:** "annette.feeney@waveney.gov.uk" <annette.feeney@waveney.gov.uk>  
**CC:** Sam Hubbard <Sam.Hubbard@waveney.gov.uk>, "planningpolicy@waveney.gov.u...  
**Date:** 07/03/2013 15:13  
**Subject:** Waveney Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Examination  
**Attachments:** Waveney CIL consultation response 07 March 2013.pdf

Dear Annette,

Please see attached the County Council's response to your letter dated 07 February 2013 which requested any comments by 5pm on Thursday 07 March 2013.

Kind regards, Neil.

Neil McManus BSc (Hons) MRICS  
Planning Obligations Manager  
Economy, Skills & Environment Directorate  
Suffolk County Council

Phone:            or  
mailto:  
Website: [www.suffolk.gov.uk](http://www.suffolk.gov.uk)

Emails sent to and from this organisation will be monitored in accordance with the law to ensure compliance with policies and to minimise any security risks.

The information contained in this email or any of its attachments may be privileged or confidential and is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee. Any unauthorised use may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake, please advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your email software.