



Babergh District Council
Local Development Framework
Draft Core Strategy (Preferred Options)

Sustainability Appraisal Report
Appendices Part I - Scoping Stage
September 2011

Babergh District Council Local Development Framework

Core Strategy

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices Part I - Scoping Stage

September 2010

Notice

This report was produced by Atkins for Babergh District Council for the specific purpose of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document Sustainability Appraisal.

This report may not be used by any person other than Babergh District Council without Babergh District Council's express permission. In any event, Atkins accepts no liability for any costs, liabilities or losses arising as a result of the use of or reliance upon the contents of this report by any person other than Babergh District Council.

Document History

JOB NUMBER: 5088144			DOCUMENT REF: Babergh Core Strategy SAR_V4.0 Appendices Part I.doc			
4	Final	OP	OP	CW	CW	30.09.11
3	Final	CS/OP/SM	OP	CW	CW	20.06.11
2	Final	CS/OP/SM	OP	CW	CW	01.06.10
1	Draft for Comment	CS/OP/SM	OP	AG		12.04.10
Revision	Purpose Description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date

Contents

Appendices Part I

Appendix A - Baseline Information and Identification of Sustainability Issues	4
A.1 Social baseline data	5
A.2 Environmental baseline data	34
A.3 Economic baseline data	67
Appendix B - List of documents produced by SSAG for use of Suffolk Authorities in producing their Scoping Reports for the Sustainability Appraisal of LDFs	82
Appendix C - Early indicators and objectives for the SA framework produced by SSAG	84
C.1 Defining Core SA Objectives for Suffolk	85
C.2 Draft Headline Objectives	91
Appendix D - Responses from early informal consultations regarding common framework for SEA for Suffolk	92
Appendix E - Responses to Consultation on SA Scoping Report	107

List of Tables

Table B.1 - Documents produced by SSAG	83
Table C.1 - Defining Core SA Objectives for Suffolk	85
Table E.1 - Babergh District Council, Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Response to Consultees Comments (February 2007)	108



Appendix A - Baseline Information and Identification of Sustainability Issues

A.1 Social baseline data

KEY: 😊 = Good progress/positive trend/on target. 😐 = Mixed progress/unable to determine trend. 😞 = Poor progress/negative trend/below target

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it improve access to high quality, health facilities?							
26/01/09	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (DfT accessibility indicators - define access, from SCC)	BDC	2005 data (DfT) Hospital: 57.4% of households are within 30 mins by public transport, and 97.1% within 60 mins GP: 87.3% households are within 15 mins by public transport and 99.3% are within 30mins.	2004 data 4 % of households are within 30 mins by public transport of a Hospital 87.7 % of households are within 60 mins by public transport of a Hospital 59.8 % of households are within 15 minutes of a GP by public Transport 86.9 % of households are within 30 minutes of a GP by public Transport	Situation improved between 2004 and 2005 according to DfT figures.	Delay between work and publication of data.	😊 Nearly 100% households are within 60 mins of a hospital and 30 mins of a GP by public transport. Improvement seen over the year 2004 to 2005.
26/01/09	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (DfT accessibility indicators - define access, from SCC)	Suffolk	2005 data: (DfT) Hospital 30 mins- 86.3% 60mins- 99.4% GP 15 mins- 88.0% 30 mins- 99.9%	30 % of households are within 30 mins by public transport of a Hospital 75.6 % of households are within 60 mins by public transport of a Hospital 73.6 % of households are within 15 minutes of a GP by public Transport 92.1 % of households are within 30 minutes of a GP by public Transport	Situation improved between 2004 and 2005 according to DfT figures.		😊 Nearly 100% households are within 60 mins of a hospital and 30 mins of a GP by public transport. Improvement seen over the year 2004 to 2005.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
26/01/09	Overall death rate by all causes (nchod.nhs and PCT) per 100,000 From www.nchod.nhs.uk Table 03C_073DR00++_07_V1_D	BDC	Directly Age Standardised: 2007: 513.4 2006: 505.6 2005: 523.8	2004: 568.7 standardised 2003: 546.6 2002: 556.4 2001: 571 Age 560.5 565.1 582.2	Death rate by all causes generally lower than early 2000s. Slight rise 2006-07.	Due to ageing population and Babergh being an attractive place for retiring to, some of the increase could be unavoidable.	😐 Previously decreasing, but has stabilised in recent years.
26/01/09	Overall death rate by all causes (nchod.nhs and PCT) Per 100,000	Suffolk	Directly Age Standardised: 2007: 519.3 2006: 510.8 2005: 548.22	2004: 570.26 standardised 2003: 597.91 609.6 2002: 595.91 608.7 Age	Similar to Babergh, was decreasing but slight increase between 2006 and 2007.	Due to ageing population and Babergh being an attractive place for retiring	😐 Previously decreasing, but has stabilised in recent years

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
				2001: 605.18 615.7		to, some of the increase could be unavoidable.	
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
26/01/09	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT) From www.nchod.nhs.uk Table 11B_075_DR0074_07_V1_D	BDC	2009- all cancers only available data Direct standardised rate: 2007: under 75: 97.4 all ages: 156.4 2005:144.3	2004: 158.6 2003: 147.4 2002: 135.4 104.2 2001: 141.7 111.0 Age standardised	Slightly different figures collected for 2007- covers ALL cancer types. 3 rd lowest in Suffolk	Difficult to draw accurate conclusions due it being unclear what figures have been used previously although as all cancer types are included it does show an improvement for under 75s. .	☺ Low rate for under 75. Significantly lower than previous years (if data is same)
26/01/09	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	Suffolk	2009- all cancers only available data Direct standardised rate: 2007: 101.27 2005: 138.9	2004: 140.9 standardised 2003: 147 114.7 2002: 139.2 110.4 2001: 138.4 112.7 Age			☹ Figure shows significant decrease for 2007. Unclear whether this will be a one off or a trend.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
26/01/09	Ischaemic Heart Disease deaths under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT) www.nchod.nhs.uk Table 09C_178DR00++_07_V1_D	BDC	Direct standardised rate 2007: all ages: 51.2 35-64 : 19.9	Crude mortality ratio: 2005: 49.4 2004: 55.9 standardised 2003: 61.3 43.8 2002: 57.8 44.0 2001: 63 46.9 Age	Lower than the Suffolk values	No longer 75 and under- data not published as that so have given available data.	☹ Unable to compare as age ranges are different in 2007 to previous. Suggests decrease.
26/01/09	Ischaemic Heart Disease deaths under 75 per	Suffolk	Direct standardised rate 2007: all ages: 54.2 35-64 : 23.0	Crude mortality ratio: 2005: 55.1 2004: 53.9 Age		No longer 75 and under- data not published as	☹ Unable to compare as age ranges are different in 2007 to previous. Suggests decrease.



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	100,000 population (PCT)			standardised 2003: 57.3 43.6 2002: 65.8 50.9 2001: 70.2 55.5		that so have given available data.	
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates							
SB/BG	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT)	BDC	No data for respiratory diseases as a group . Crude mortality ratio: 2005: 141.5 2004: 135.6	Crude mortality ratio Age standardised 2003: 125.6 59.9 2002: 113.6 53.2 2001: 112.5 7.0			
SB/BG	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT)	Suffolk		Crude mortality ratio 2005: 135 2004: 124.3 standardised 2003: 141.3 70.1 2002: 132.1 66.4 2001: 128.7 65.7			
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
26/01/09	Deaths from self harm and injury undetermined per 100,000 population (PCT) now Deaths from Suicide and Undetermined (per 100,000) www.nchod.nhs.uk	BDC	Directly Standardised Ratio: 2007: 6.97	Crude mortality ratio: 2005: 8.3 2004: 8.3 standardised 2003: 7.1 7.4 2002: 10.8 11.7 2001: 6 6.8	The rate fluctuates but seems to suggest a reduction in figures. Below the Suffolk average.		😊 Below average for Suffolk and lowest rate since 2001. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
26/01/09	now Deaths from Suicide and Undetermined (per 100,000) www.nchod.nhs.uk	Suffolk	Directly Standardised Ratio: 2007: 8.11	Crude mortality ratio: 2005: 8.5 2004: 7.9 standardised 2003: 8.8 8.7 2002: 8.8 8.9 2001: 9.3 8.7	Relatively stable over last 5 years, small fluctuation and possible slight reduction?		☺/☹ Has remained relatively stable since 2001. Figures for individual districts fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
01/2009	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (Suffolk) <i>Data from Matthew Frankland (Matthew.Frankland@et.suffolkcc.gov.uk)</i>	BDC	2007 (calendar year) 5 fatal, 41 serious injuries 53.1 per 100,000 2006: 48 Casualties 55.3 per 100,000 2005: 62 casualties 73.1 per 100,000	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005) 2004 RTA casualties: Fatal: 7 Serious: 47	Decrease in both fatal and serious casualties compared to 2006 and 2005 figures.	Rate is above that of Suffolk	☺/☹ Reductions shown over last few years and below target for Suffolk for 2007. Rate is above that of Suffolk as a whole.
01/2009	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (Suffolk)	Suffolk	2007 (calendar year) 39 fatal, 265 serious 42.8 per 100,000 2006: 359 casualties 51.1 per 100,000 2005: 380 casualties 55.6 per 100,000	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005) (304 for 2007) 2004 RTA casualties: Fatal: 42 Serious: 355 (Totals for county) The target for 2008 is 322	Greater decrease in rate (per 100,000) than in Babergh alone. Target was met.		☺ Target met and decrease in casualties seen.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
12/2008	Life expectancy (PCT) <i>From Neighbourhood Statistics (ONS)</i>	BDC	2004-2006 Male 78.7, Female 83.3 2002-2004 Male 78.6, Female 82.5	East of England Average: 2004-06 Male 78.3, Female 82.3 2002-04 Male 77.3 years, Female 81.4 years Longest life expectancy in Suffolk for	Life expectancy has increased each monitoring period since 1998-2000. 2001-2003: Male 78.7 years		☺ Life expectancy is good, and has increased each monitoring period recently.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
				both men and women.	Female 82.4 years		
12/2008	Life expectancy (PCT)	Suffolk	2000-2002 Male 77.4, Female 81.9	East of England Average: 2004-06: (m) 78.3, (f) 83.3 2002-04: (m) 77.6, (f) 81.6 England average: 2004-06: (m) 77.3, (f) 81.6 2002-04: (m) 76.5, (f) 80.8	For East of England and England life expectancy increasing.		No results for specific but ☺ for East of England
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Census/SSAG)	BDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.3% Babergh DC employees 2005: 18.24% 2006: 18.18 (LTP1) (no results broken down in SCC report but it is stated that there was no improvement)	No improvement made from 2006 to 2008 in the SCC report	No annual information available for the whole district but there is a survey of Babergh DC employees each year along with other employees in Suffolk. There appears to be little change		☹ Limited trend information but there appears to be little change in the use of sustainable means of transport which is against the County trend.
27/01/09	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Census/SSAG) SCC Travel to Work Report	Suffolk	SCC Travel Survey 2008: Walk/cycle: 2.9/8.3%= 11.2% Sustainable modes: 34.2% SCC Travel Survey of a sample of Suffolk employees: 2004: 25.24% 2005: 23.41% 2006: 26.19% (LTP1)	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. % sustainable 2001 Census: 21.2% Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2004: 28.0%	There may be a trend towards more sustainable modes across Suffolk but the survey is of a relatively few large employers.		☺/☹ Limited trend information. An increase has been recorded in use of sustainable modes by a sample of Suffolk employees but is this representative of the wider population?
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	How do children travel to school? (QOL/BVPI)	BDC	2005 survey 35.2% walk, 22.3% bus, 3.2% cycle, 39.3% car	2004 survey 36.7 walk, 25.6% bus, 2.5% cycle, 35.2% car 2003 survey 44.2 walk, 16.7% bus, 1.8% cycle, 37.3% car	The trend in Babergh seems to be slightly towards to more car use. This perhaps reflects the rural nature of the district.	To reduce the use of the car on the school run.	☹ Babergh appears to be going in the opposite direction to the County.
SB/BG	How do children travel to school?	Suffolk	2005 survey: 41% walk, 19% bus, 7.4% cycle, 32.4% car	Suffolk target of 23% by bus in 2004 2004 survey: Now target for car is	The split of transport uses varies slightly	To reduce further the use of	☺ There has been steady progress to reduce the use of

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	(QOL/BVPI)			31% 41% walk, 18% bus, 5.9% cycle, 35% car. 2003 Survey: 41.6% walk, 17.1% bus, 6% cycle, 35.3% car	year to year but the trend is towards more sustainable forms of transport. The county may have reached the limit for reducing car use because of it's rural nature and parental choice.	the car on the school run.	the car and encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	Obesity in the population (PCT) Synthetic Estimate for 2001 for people age 16 and over	BDC	24.9 ONS 2003 – 2005 Neighbourhood Statistics model based figures for 21% 2001	Second lowest in Suffolk			☹ Baseline data no trend yet but second lowest in Suffolk
SB/BG	Obesity in the population (PCT) Synthetic Estimate for 2001 for people age 16 and over	Suffolk	22.6% 2001				☹ Baseline data no trend yet
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (SSAG 5-year review)	BDC	This information is not currently available. Babergh District Council is working on a PPG17 compliant study to inform the LDF				No data available but surveys are due to be carried out.
SB/BG	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (SSAG 5-year review)	Suffolk	This information is not currently available. Babergh District Council is working on a PPG17 compliant study to inform the LDF				No data available but surveys are due to be carried out.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SB/BG	Change in existing provision of children's play space (SSAG 5-year review)	BDC	This information is not currently available. Babergh District Council is working on a PPG17 compliant study to inform the LDF				No data available but surveys are due to be carried out.
SB/BG	Change in existing provision of children's play space (SSAG 5-year review)	Suffolk	This information is not currently available. Babergh District Council is working on a PPG17 compliant study to inform the LDF				No data available but surveys are due to be carried out.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	Change in provision of open space (District open space assessments)	BDC	1 public open space area lost 1997 to 2001				☹ Baseline data no trend yet
SB/BG	Change in provision of open space (District open space assessments)	Suffolk	26 open spaces lost 1997 to 2001				☹ There appears to be a large number of open space areas lost but there may also be new ones created in housing development.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Suffolk BVPI)	BDC	N/A				
SB/BG	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Suffolk BVPI)	Suffolk	2005/6 survey 66%	Target for the county of 62% for 2004/5, 63% for 2005/6 and 63% for 2006/7.	2004/5 survey: 59% 2003/4: 60.5% 2002/3: 57.4% 2001/2: 48% Improving trend since 2001 but decreased slightly in 2004/5.	% of easy to use paths has increased substantially this year and target has been exceeded.	😊 % of easy to use paths has increased substantially this year and target has been exceeded.
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it increase access to natural green space?							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	BDC	Awaiting PPG17 work?				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	Suffolk	Awaiting PPG17 work?				
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?							
01/2009	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ C-A* grades at GCSE (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	BDC	2007: 67.7% 2006: 68.7% 2005: 66.1%	Target?	Trend shows regular increase from 64.1% in 2001. Slight decrease from 2006 to 2007 but still above Suffolk average	3 rd highest in Suffolk (previously highest)	☺ Good performance.
01/2009	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	Suffolk	2007: 64.4 2006: 62.8% 2004: 57.3%	Target?	Trend shows performance is improving each year. % for county has increased annually from 54.3% in 2001.		☺ Trend shows performance is improving each year. % for county has increased annually from 54.3% in 2001, although some districts perform better and/or have improved more than others.
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?							
01/2009	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	BDC	Average score 2008: 770.1 2007: 760.1 Average score 2006: 676.7 Average score 2005: 301	Target?	Can't compare 2006 with any data previous to that. Improvement seen in recent years		☺ Performance has improved
01/2009	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	Suffolk	Average score 2008: 712.7 2007: no data Average score 2006: 730.8 Average score 2004: 264.9	Target?	Performance worsened since 2006- but no data for 2007 so impossible to tell whether this is a trend or otherwise.		☹/☺ No data for 2007 but previous years have shown improvement

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of adults?							
SB/BG 2009	Proportion of the population with no qualifications <i>Suffolk Data Observatory</i>	BDC	% of working age with no qualification 2006: 7.2% 2005: 13.2 % 2003-2004 : 16%	Lowest in Suffolk.	2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 27.8%	The time series data may be calculated in a different way- the figures from Nomis are higher (not used here)	☹ Proportion is relatively low and getting lower.
SB/BG 2009	Proportion of the population with no qualifications <i>Census/SDO</i>	Suffolk	2006: 12.2% 2005: 15.8 % of working age population 2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 27.8%	E of E average: 10.6% GB average: 9.00 %	Reducing, although Suffolk is 2 nd highest in E of England	Proportion of the population with no qualifications is relatively high.	☹ Proportion is relatively high for Suffolk compared to England average, though varies between Districts.
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of adults?							
SB/BG 2009	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher <i>Suffolk Observatory</i>	BDC	2006: 25.6% February 2005: 24.0%		Feb 2004: 24.1% Feb 2003: 22.2% Feb 2002: 22.2%		☺ Shows steady improvement.
SB/BG 2009	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher (Suffolk Observatory)	Suffolk	2006: 22.7% February 2005: 24.2%		Feb 2004: 22.9% Feb 2003: 19.8% Feb 2002: 21.6%		☹ Trend shows regular improvement in Suffolk since 2003, but a decline from 2005.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce actual levels of crime?							
SSAG 2009	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (SSAG) <i>Suffolk Data Observatory</i>	BDC	2007-08: 49.4 2006 - 2007 52.9 2005 55.4	Below average for county.	2001 46.8 2002 49.9 2003 51.6 2004 57.7		☺ The crime rate has decreased over the last few years. It remains relatively low for Suffolk
SSAG 2009	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (SSAG)	Suffolk	2007-08: 68.8 2006-07: 74.6 2005-06: 77.9 2004-05: 76.8 2004: 80.3	2 nd only to Norfolk (66.9) in E of E E of E average 74.9	2001 64.1 2002 ---- 2003 72.4 Substantially lower		☺ The crime rate has decreased over the last few years and is low for the region.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					baseline than the national figure (113 in 2004)		
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce actual levels of crime?							
SG 2009	Burglary Rate per 1000 population <i>Suffolk Data Observatory</i>	BDC	2007-08: 5.6 2006 – 2007: 5.3 2005: 8.8 2004: 7.1	2 nd lowest in County (Waveney 4.7)	No distinct trend although generally lower than a few years ago	Below Suffolk average	☺ This last year the rate has decreased, but burglary rates have increased annually in recent years, but is still relatively low.
SG 2009	Burglary Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	Suffolk	2007-08: 7.2 2006-07: 7.4 2005-06: 7.8 2004-05: 7.5 2004: 9.6 2003: 8.8	Suffolk second lowest county in E of E (Norfolk 6.6) E of E 8.9	Downwards trend	Burglary rates generally low	☹ Burglary rate has remained fairly low compared to the national average, and is particularly low in the more rural districts.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce actual levels of crime?							
SG 2009	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	BDC	2007-08: 7.9 2006-07: 9.6 2005-06: 8.5 2004-05: 8.8	2 nd lowest to Mid Suffolk (7.2).	Rate is at lowest level for previous 4 years and about half the county average		☺ ☺ Violent crime rate has decreased slightly and is low for Suffolk and for the region.
SG 2009	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	Suffolk	2007-08: 14.8 2006-07: 16.8 2005-06: 16.5 2004-05: 16.6 2003-04: 15.6	Suffolk is highest of Districts in E of E (with average over region of 13.2) but lowest that it has been in several years	The rate has reduced in the most recent figures but was steady for several year previously so difficult to draw a trend.	Suffolk has highest violent crime rate in the East, but is reducing	☹ Violent crime has decreased in Suffolk in recent years but is still relatively high (Ipswich and Forest Heath particularly)
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce the fear of crime							
SG	Fear of Crime (QOL, Suffolk Speaks, British Crime Survey)	BDC	94% of residents feel safe in the area where they live and only 5% unsafe according to the survey Suffolk Speaks 2005. 85% of residents from a 2005 Council survey said that Crime was a small or no problem. State of the District 2005.		N/A	Data could be considered out of date.	☺ Fear of crime is low compared to national average and other counties in the East of England, particularly for burglary and car crime. Perceived levels of local disorder also much lower than national average. The vast majority of residents feel safe

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
							in the area where they live.
SG	Fear of Crime (British Crime Survey)	Suffolk	<p>Suffolk police force area.</p> <p>Respondents very worried about: Burglary 6% Car crime 9% Violent crime 14%</p> <p>Respondents perceiving local levels of disorder as high: 8%</p> <p>87% of residents feel safe in the area where they live and 12% unsafe. According to the survey Suffolk Speaks 2005.</p> <p>2006/07- Suffolk 6th lowest crime rate in Britain (One Suffolk)</p>	<p>England and Wales average.</p> <p>Respondents very worried about: Burglary 13% Car crime 15% Violent crime 16%</p> <p>Respondents perceiving local levels of disorder as high: 17%</p>	No trend data available.	Data could be considered out of date.	<p>☺ Fear of crime is low compared to national average and other counties in the East of England, particularly for burglary and car crime. Perceived levels of local disorder also much lower than national average.</p>
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce noise and odour concerns?							
SG 2009	Number of domestic noise complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	BDC	<p>2007: 351 noise complaints</p> <p>2006: 305 noise complaints</p> <p>2005: 308</p>	<p>2004: 262</p> <p>2003: 224</p>	The figure seems to be increasing		☹ Number of noise complaints is higher than previously, and seems to keep rising.
SG	Number of domestic noise complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	Suffolk	2004: 2745 domestic complaints (total for county)		Decreased from 2,764 in 2002 to 2,530 in 2003, but increased again this year. There were slightly fewer complaints in 2004 than 2002.	The number of complaints has decreased since 2002 but need to monitor whether the increase recorded this year continues in the future.	☺ Number of noise complaints is lower than 2002 figure, but has increased this year.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce noise and odour concerns?							
2009	Number of odour complaints (Environmental Health Depts)	BDC	<p>2007: 37</p> <p>2006: 44</p> <p>2005 : 31</p>		Figures vary from year to year : - 2004: 25, 2003 :37,	There appears to be no particular trend and the number	☺ There appears to be no particular trend and the number of complaints can go up or down.



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	Districts)				2002 :22, 2001 : 33	of complaints can go up or down.	
2009	Number of odour complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	Suffolk	Each District/Borough to do.				
Headline Objective: To reduce poverty and social exclusion							
Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?							
SB/BG No 2009- 2007 most recent	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Suffolk)	BDC	IMD 2007 Most deprived 10% = 0% population Most deprived 25% = 0% population IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 0% population Most deprived 25% = 0% population			No update since 2007	Low levels of deprivation.
SBBG 2007 most recent	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Suffolk)	Suffolk	IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 2% popn Most deprived 25% = 9% popn	Much lower than national average		Areas in some Suffolk towns experience relatively high levels of deprivation (particularly Ipswich and Lowestoft and to a lesser extent Saxmundham), but levels are low for county as a whole.	County as a whole has relatively low proportion of population in the most deprived areas. However deprivation is relatively high in towns of Ipswich, Lowestoft and to a lesser extent Saxmundham.
Headline Objective: To reduce poverty and social exclusion							
Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?							
SB/BG	Housing benefit recipients (LAs)	BDC	2008: Council tax benefit: 5298 2006: 3619 2005: 3627	No target identified.	Slight decline in numbers from 2005 to 2006	The figures appear relatively static but we will need a longer time series. Affects just over 10% of households.	☹ Figures are lower than some parts of Suffolk and static but a longer time series is needed.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SB/BG	Housing benefit recipients (LAs)	Suffolk	Awaiting data from districts.				
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to key local services?							
26/01/09	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG) <i>Work on village services & facilities 2008</i>	BDC	Total Rural Population (all except Sudbury, Hadleigh and Pinewood): 61,660 (2005 MYE) Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 43,290 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 70%	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services This was the highest % in Suffolk, but many facilities have been lost. 2004/05: 13926/45557 = 29.2%	% of rural population with access to all five listed facilities has halved - 64% recorded in 2002/3 (no data for 2001/2). 2003/4 the figure was 41.5% with a total rural population of 45,561	No record of what parishes were used/where data came from so difficult to compare.	☹ Despite concerns over loss of rural facilities it seems that in Babergh many of the villages are well provided. This needs to be monitored consistently to provide results.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	Suffolk	Unknown for 2007/08	Total Rural Population 217,776 Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 71,883 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 33.0% 2004/5 Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2003/4: 42% 2002/3: 43.2% 2001/2: 41.0% Appears to have been a slight decrease in provision of rural services over the past year. However this does not include FHDC, which had lowest % last year, so actual decrease may in fact be greater.		☹ The source of population data has changed and so figures are not directly comparable. Not all districts returned data for each year, therefore not accurate to compare.
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to key local services							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG)	BDC	% of rural households 2005/6: 35.6%	To achieve a one-third increase in % of households in rural areas within about 10 minutes walk of hourly or better bus service by 2010 (Transport Ten Year Plan, 2000).	2003/4: 33.0% 2002/3: 25.2% 2001/2: 30% After decrease in 2002/3, indicator is now higher than it has been in last 3 years.		☺ New indicator in 2001/2, and results have varied since but there appears to be a slight trend towards improvement in access to public transport.
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG)	Suffolk	% of rural households 2005/6: 37.2%	To achieve a one-third increase in % of households in rural areas within about 10 minutes walk of hourly or better bus service by 2010 (Transport Ten Year Plan, 2000).	2003/4: 26.0% 2002/3: 22.7% 2001/2: 23% Levels of coverage have previously remained stable, but have increased recently and target may have been met.		☺ A substantial increase has been recorded this year for the county as a whole, but this is not reflected in all districts. However, the level of increase is on track to meet the target. New indicator in 2001/2.
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to key local services?							
2007	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators)	BDC	2007: (by public transport) GP: 15mins: 87.3%, 30mins: 99.3% Prim Sc'l: 15 min: 94.7%, 30min: 99.8% 2 nd ry sc'l: 20 min: 77.8%, 40min: 94.9% Superm'ket: 15 min: 82.3%, 30: 96.5%	2004 86.9% of households are with 30 min of a GP by public transport 98.1% of households are within 30 min of a primary school by public transport 88.7% of households are within 30 min of a shop by public transport	Accessibility is increasing for all services and facilities		☺ Accessibility improving across the board
2007	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators) - define access	Suffolk	2007: (by public transport) GP: 15mins: 88.0%, 30mins: 99.9% Prim Sc'l: 15 min: 93.0%, 30min: 99.6% 2 nd ry sc'l: NO INFO Superm'ket: 15 min: 91.4%, 30: 99.4%	2004 92.1% of households are with 30 min of a GP by public transport 98.1% of households are within 30 min of a primary school by public transport 92.3% of households are within 30 min of a shop by public transport	Accessibility is increasing for all services and facilities		☺ Accessibility improving across the board
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Will it improve accessibility to shopping facilities?							
2008	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (SSAG – additional indicator?)	BDC	2007/08: 76 sq m gross, 32 net (COI BD4, AMR) 2006/07: 0 sq m (COI 4b) 2005/06: 0 sq m 2004/05: 1060 sq m	This figure reflects the completion of the extension to the COOP in Hadleigh.	The trend may well be that there is limited development in town centres.		☹ Baseline data no trend yet
2007	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (SSAG – additional indicator?)	Suffolk	2006/07- poor returns for RAMR so no data. 2005/06: 2004/05: 1060 sq m	There was incomplete information but there were also very few completions over 1000 sq m in town centres, taken from EERA annual monitoring report.			☹ Baseline data no trend yet
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to shopping facilities?							
2007	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators) - define access	BDC	2007 (DfT) Access to supermarket by public transport: 15 mins: 82.3%, 30 mins: 96.5%	2004 64.5% of Households are within 15 min by public transport of a shop selling food 88.7% of Households are within 30 min by public transport of a shop selling food 64.1% of Households are within 15 min cycle ride of a shop selling food 87.5% of Households are within 30 min cycle ride of a shop selling food	Access is improving No data in the 2007 published figures about cycle access.	Due to current economic climate, some local shops are closing- this will need to be monitored closely as this could affect the accessibility to local services	☺ Currently improving
2007	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators) - define access	Suffolk	2007 (DfT) Supermarket by public transport: 15 min: 91.4%, 30: 99.4%	2004 76.4% of Households are within 15 min by public transport of a shop selling food 92.3% of Households are within 30 min by public transport of a shop selling food 78.1% of Households are within 15 min cycle ride of a shop selling food 92.9% of Households are within 30 min cycle ride of a shop selling food	Access is improving No data in the 2007 published figures about cycle access		☺ Currently improving
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve access to childcare?							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5	BDC	44 per 1000 children aged 0 - 4	This is the first year that information has been available in this form, but the provision seems good. The position Countywide has improved considerably in the last 3 to 4 years. No national target in 2006			☺ Baseline data no trend yet, but the provision in 2006 is good and it has improved in recent years, although statistical information is not available to back this up.
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5	Suffolk	279 per 1000 children aged 0 - 4	This is the first year that information has been available in this form. The position Countywide has improved considerably in the last 3 to 4 years.			☺ Baseline data no trend yet.
Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment							
Will it reduce unemployment overall?							
2008	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR) <i>Suffolk Data Observatory</i>	BDC	Unemployed as percentage of all people of working age Nov 2008: 1.7% Nov 2007: 1.1% Nov 2006: 1.3% Nov 2005: 1.1% Dec 2007 1.1 % May 2006 1.4 %	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England <u>East of England:</u> Nov 2008: 2.2% Nov 2007: 1.6% Nov 2006: 1.9% Nov 2005: 1.7% <u>Great Britain:</u> Nov 2008: 2.8% Nov 2007: 2.1% Nov 2006: 2.4% Nov 2005: 2.3%	Babergh has below Suffolk level unemployment. This has increased in 2008 but so has unemployment in all Districts without exception		☺ Consistent very low unemployment. Still lower than Suffolk as a whole but has increased (by the same amount as in Suffolk/East). Target met.
2008	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR)	Suffolk	Nov 2008: 2.2% Nov 2007: 1.6% Nov 2006: 2.0% Nov 2005: 1.7% April 2003 2.0 July 2003 2.0 October 2003 1.9 January 2004 2.1	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England <u>East of England:</u> Nov 2008: 2.2% Nov 2007: 1.6% Nov 2006: 1.9% Nov 2005: 1.7% <u>Great Britain:</u> Nov 2008: 2.8% Nov 2007: 2.1% Nov 2006: 2.4% Nov 2005: 2.3%	Suffolk level is very similar to East of England but remains consistently below the GB levels. Unemployment has risen by a similar rate at all geographical levels.		☺ Overall unemployment rates are similar East of England totals, and have increased at a similar rate
Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA																																																		
Will it reduce long-term unemployment?																																																									
26/01/09	Census, labour market trends Long term unemployed % of workforce and % of the unemployed.	BDC	Time in unemployment as a <u>percentage of all unemployed</u> : <table><tr><td>Months unem- ployed</td><td>Nov 2005</td><td>Nov 2006</td><td>Nov 2007</td><td>Nov 2008</td></tr><tr><td><6</td><td>73.0</td><td>69.9</td><td>72.1</td><td>78.9</td></tr><tr><td>6-12</td><td>13.5</td><td>15.8</td><td>15.3</td><td>14.0</td></tr><tr><td>12-24</td><td>9.0</td><td>10.5</td><td>8.1</td><td>5.3</td></tr><tr><td>>24</td><td>4.5</td><td>3.8</td><td>4.5</td><td>1.2</td></tr></table> Length of unemployment as <u>percentage of workforce</u> <table><tr><td>Monthunem- played</td><td>Nov 05</td><td>Nov 06</td><td>Nov 07</td><td>Nov 08</td></tr><tr><td><6</td><td>0.80</td><td>0.90</td><td>0.79</td><td>1.3</td></tr><tr><td>6-12</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.24</td></tr><tr><td>12-24</td><td>0.099</td><td>0.14</td><td>0.095</td><td>0.089</td></tr><tr><td>>24</td><td>0.049</td><td>0.049</td><td>0.050</td><td>0.020</td></tr></table>	Months unem- ployed	Nov 2005	Nov 2006	Nov 2007	Nov 2008	<6	73.0	69.9	72.1	78.9	6-12	13.5	15.8	15.3	14.0	12-24	9.0	10.5	8.1	5.3	>24	4.5	3.8	4.5	1.2	Monthunem- played	Nov 05	Nov 06	Nov 07	Nov 08	<6	0.80	0.90	0.79	1.3	6-12	0.15	0.20	0.17	0.24	12-24	0.099	0.14	0.095	0.089	>24	0.049	0.049	0.050	0.020	March 2006: 0.17% / 12% April 2004: 0.2% / 18.8% April 1999: 0.5% / 25.1% Unemployment 12 month duration [from Nomis on 15 February 2005]	Proportion of people unemployed for the longest times are coming down and greater proportion of people unemployed for less than 6 months		☺ Consistent very low unemployment and shortening periods of unemployment
Months unem- ployed	Nov 2005	Nov 2006	Nov 2007	Nov 2008																																																					
<6	73.0	69.9	72.1	78.9																																																					
6-12	13.5	15.8	15.3	14.0																																																					
12-24	9.0	10.5	8.1	5.3																																																					
>24	4.5	3.8	4.5	1.2																																																					
Monthunem- played	Nov 05	Nov 06	Nov 07	Nov 08																																																					
<6	0.80	0.90	0.79	1.3																																																					
6-12	0.15	0.20	0.17	0.24																																																					
12-24	0.099	0.14	0.095	0.089																																																					
>24	0.049	0.049	0.050	0.020																																																					
26/01/09	Census, labour market trends	Suffolk	Time in unemployment as <u>percentage of all unemployed</u>	April 2004: 0.3% / 17.1% April 1999: 0.7% / 25.6% Unemployment 12 month duration [from Nomis on 15 February 2005]	Proportion of people unemployed for the longest times are coming down and greater proportion of people unemployed for less than 6 months																																																				

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA																																																		
			<table><tr><td>Months unem-played</td><td>Nov 2005</td><td>Nov 2006</td><td>Nov 2007</td><td>Nov 2008</td></tr><tr><td><6</td><td>68.1</td><td>67.1</td><td>67.2</td><td>77.9</td></tr><tr><td>6-12</td><td>17.1</td><td>17.6</td><td>15.4</td><td>13.1</td></tr><tr><td>12-24</td><td>9.7</td><td>10.7</td><td>12.0</td><td>6.7</td></tr><tr><td>>24</td><td>5.0</td><td>4.6</td><td>5.4</td><td>2.3</td></tr></table> <table><tr><td>Months unem-played</td><td>Nov 05</td><td>Nov 06</td><td>Nov 07</td><td>Nov 08</td></tr><tr><td><6</td><td>1.2</td><td>1.3</td><td>1.1</td><td>1.7</td></tr><tr><td>6-12</td><td>0.29</td><td>0.35</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.29</td></tr><tr><td>12-24</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.21</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.15</td></tr><tr><td>>24</td><td>0.085</td><td>0.092</td><td>0.087</td><td>0.051</td></tr></table> <p>Time in unemployment as <u>percentage of workforce</u>:</p>	Months unem-played	Nov 2005	Nov 2006	Nov 2007	Nov 2008	<6	68.1	67.1	67.2	77.9	6-12	17.1	17.6	15.4	13.1	12-24	9.7	10.7	12.0	6.7	>24	5.0	4.6	5.4	2.3	Months unem-played	Nov 05	Nov 06	Nov 07	Nov 08	<6	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.7	6-12	0.29	0.35	0.25	0.29	12-24	0.16	0.21	0.19	0.15	>24	0.085	0.092	0.087	0.051				
Months unem-played	Nov 2005	Nov 2006	Nov 2007	Nov 2008																																																					
<6	68.1	67.1	67.2	77.9																																																					
6-12	17.1	17.6	15.4	13.1																																																					
12-24	9.7	10.7	12.0	6.7																																																					
>24	5.0	4.6	5.4	2.3																																																					
Months unem-played	Nov 05	Nov 06	Nov 07	Nov 08																																																					
<6	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.7																																																					
6-12	0.29	0.35	0.25	0.29																																																					
12-24	0.16	0.21	0.19	0.15																																																					
>24	0.085	0.092	0.087	0.051																																																					
Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment Will it provide job opportunities for those most in need of employment?																																																									
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Census)	BDC	2004: Long term ill – 35.8% Lone parent – 64.4%																																																						
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Census)	Suffolk																																																							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment Will it help to improve earnings?							
2008	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR)	BDC	ASHE: Residents' full time gross annual income (mean) 2008: £32,576 2007: £28,775 2006: £26,954	April 2004: £24,554 April 2002: £26,339 [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]		Methodology changed prior to 2006 so unable to compare Using just mean value of residents full time workers (potentially slightly different results for workplace and/or part time workers)	☺ Income has been increasing in the District steadily over the past few years.
2008	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR)	Suffolk	ASHE: Residents' full time gross annual income (mean) 2008: £unreliable 2007: £28,626 2007: £28973	April 2004: £24,940 April 2002: £23,194 [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]		Methodology changed prior to 2006 so unable to compare Using just mean value of residents full time workers (potentially slightly different results for workplace and/or part time workers)	☹ Income remained fairly constant over 2006-07. The data was unreliable for 2008 so it is difficult to comment
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community Will it reduce homelessness?							
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations) Awaiting feedback from Karen Carter (housing BDC)	BDC	2005/06 108		2000/01 272 2001/02 275 2002/03 282 2003/04 285 2004/05 266 Upward trend until 2004 then declines with a rapid decline		☺ Decline in recent years in part due to the new approach. New BVPI for 05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homeless cases prevented, so numbers expected to decrease.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					in 2006.		
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations)	Suffolk	2003/04 3080		2001/02 2470 2002/03 2841 Upward trend		⊕ upward trend (see note for St.Eds) New BVPI for 05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homelessness cases prevented, so numbers expected to decrease.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it provide enough housing?							
2008	Housing Stock (SSAG)	BDC	Stock 31/03/08: 37,838 Stock 31/03/07: 37,582 Housing stock 31/03/06: 37,307 Housing stock 31/03/05: 37,120 Total change since 2001: 1871 Annual rate: 267	Overall RSS requirement 2001-2021: 5,600. Dwellings completed to 31/03/08: 1,871. Therefore annual rate required of 287 dwellings p.a to 2021.	Annual rate has fluctuated. Current economic climate forecasts predict a future drop in build rates.	Additional housing stock is required. Trend shows that rate of increase has fallen below that required to meet RSS requirements in recent years.	⊕ Additional housing development is required at increased rate.
2007	Housing Stock (SSAG)	Suffolk	Stock 31/03/08: 314,241 (4,203 net) Stock 31/03/06: 310,038 (3,368 net) Housing stock 31/03/05: 306,670 Total change since 2001: 17,720 Annual rate: 3141	To 31/03/07: 17,720 dwellings completed in Suffolk 2001-07. Overall target 2001-21: 61,700. Therefore annual rate required of 3,141 p.a.	Overall, the completion rate in Suffolk has been above the rate required by the RSS.	Although the rates are currently above the required minimum, with the current economic climate this may change.	⊕ Completion rates are above those minimum annual required rate for Suffolk.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it provide enough housing?							
26/01/09	Housing Land Availability (SSAG) AMR/RAMR	BDC	Total commitments end 2007/08: 3051 (10.6 years) Commitments end 2006/07: 1336 Total commitments end 2005/6: 3,623 Years supply: 9 years	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 4,540 Shortfall of 1,233 below the 2016 target.	Years supply has fluctuated in recent years. No clear trend. 2004/5: 3,307 which equated to 7.7 years supply.		⊕ Housing land supply will fluctuate depending on stage of development of Local Authority's Local Plan. Obvious that there is a plentiful supply for coming few years.



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Housing Land Availability (SSAG)	Suffolk	Total commitments at end of 2004/5: 29,342 Years supply: 10.0	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 32,830 Shortfall of 3,488 below the 2016 target.	Years supply recorded in mid 1997, 1999 and 2000 had showed a trend of decreasing supply, falling from 8.9 years in 1997 to 7.3 years in 2000, but this is now reversed. The 2003 figure matched the previous maximum supply for the county of 8.9 years, and this was exceeded in 2004 and 2005.	Large supply available, and increasing.	Supply has increased in the last 2 years, reversing a previously decreasing trend. However housing land supply will fluctuate depending on stage of development of Local Authority's Local Plan so long-term trends are difficult to identify.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
27/01/09	Affordable Housing (SSAG)	BDC	2007/08 net completions: 43 2006/07 net completions: 73 Net affordable completions 56 In 2005/6 (30 % of net completions)	(i) in settlements below 3,000 pop - 1 in every 3 new dw on sites of 0.1 ha or which propose 3 or more dw. (ii) in settlements above 3,000 pop - on allocated sites and others of 0.5 ha or more in size, capable of accommodating at least 15 dw, up to 35% of new dw (depending on local circumstances). Highest % of affordable completions in Suffolk 2003/4, and 2004/5	22.7% of net completions were affordable in 2001/2. Number of affordable approvals has fluctuated since 1997-8, ranging from 0 (2001/2) to 88 (2000/1) (where triggered). 2004/5 = 71 (= 38 % of total completions)	IN 2006/07 and 2005/06, the 2 nd highest % affordable completions seen in Suffolk.	☹ Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends, but recently Babergh has achieved high numbers and % completions compared with other districts. Monitoring issues in 2007/08 meant a lower number- to be corrected for 2008-09
27/01/09	Affordable Housing (SSAG)	Suffolk	2006/07: 663 2005/06: 613 Total net affordable completions 2004/5: 301 (= 12.7% of total completions)	<i>No target for county as a whole</i>	9.4% of net completions were affordable in 2001/2. This years figure has changed little from the 11.3% recorded in 2002/3. 2004/5: 311 or 11.2%		☺ There has been a steady increase over time recently.



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns)	BDC	No clear information on this.		This indicator is difficult to monitor with a variety of agencies involved.		
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns)	Suffolk	Each District/Borough to do.				
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG)	BDC	<p>2004/5 Houses/Bungalows: Private sector 1 bed: 46 Private sector 2 bed: 47 Private sector 3 bed: 62 Private sector 4+ bed: 32 RSL: 67</p> <p>2004/5 Flats/Maisonettes: Private sector 1 bed: 3 Private sector 2 bed: 0 Private sector 3 bed: 0 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL: 38</p>	No target.	<p>2003/4 Houses/Bungalows: Private sector 1 bed: 0 Private sector 2 bed: 25 Private sector 3 bed: 37 Private sector 4+ bed: 21 RSL: None</p> <p>2003/4 Flats/Maisonettes: Private sector 1 bed: 3 Private sector 2 bed: 0 Private sector 3 bed: 0 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL: None</p> <p>2002/3 Houses/Bungalows: Not recorded.</p> <p>2002/3</p>		☹ New indicator, no data prior to 2001/2. Limited data.



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					Flats/Maisonettes: Private sector 1 bed: 3 Private sector 2 bed: 0 Private sector 3 bed: 1 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL : Not recorded 2001/2: Not recorded.		
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG)	Suffolk	2004/5 Houses/Bungalows (where recorded): Private sector 1 bed: 62 (11%) Private sector 2 bed: 117 (20%) Private sector 3 bed: 222 (39%) Private sector 4+ bed: 173 (30%) Not Known: 908 RSL ; 115	No target.	2003/4 Houses/Bungalows (where recorded): Private sector 1 bed: 0.8% Private sector 2 bed: 13.5% Private sector 3 bed: 41.2% Private sector 4+ bed: 40.8% RSL 1 bed: 0 RSL 2 bed: 2.5% RSL 3 bed: 1.0% RSL 4+ bed: 0 2003/4 Flats/Maisonettes (where recorded): Private sector 1 bed: 31.2% Private sector 2 bed: 37.0% Private sector 3 bed: 1.0% Private sector 4+ bed: 2.1% RSL 1 bed: 26.5% RSL 2 bed: 2.1% RSL 3 bed: 0 RSL 4+ bed: 0 2002/3 (2001/2) Houses/Bungalows		☹ County figures are incomplete, so care should be taken interpreting trends. New indicator, no data prior to 2001/2. It is not possible to identify any long-term trends. Data available shows little difference in house sizes since last year but % of 1 and 2 bed dwellings (especially private sector) has increased. Correspondingly there has been a reduction in the number of 4 bed dwellings. This may not be a trend yet.



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					<p>(where recorded): Private sector 1 bed: 1.1% (0.1%) Private sector 2 bed: 13.0% (13.1%) Private sector 3 bed: 39.7% (40.2%) Private sector 4+ bed: 38.6% (36.5%) RSL 1 bed: 0.7% (0) RSL 2 bed: 3.1% (4.9%) RSL 3 bed: 2.6% (4.8%) RSL 4+ bed: 1.2% (0.4%)</p> <p>2001/2 Flats/Maisonettes (where recorded): Private sector 1 bed: 13.8% (8.0%) Private sector 2 bed: 49.1% (50.0%) Private sector 3 bed: 3.6% (0) Private sector 4+ bed: 0 (0) RSL 1 bed: 25.8% (15.2%) RSL 2 bed: 8.6% (19.6%) RSL 3 bed: 0 (3.6%) RSL 4+ bed: 0 (3.6%)</p>		
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
2007	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG)	BDC	2006/07 (averaged): 47 Dwellings per hectare 2005/6: 46 3004/05: 42	<p>"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare.</p> <p>2nd highest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.</p>	<p>Dwellings per hectare 2004/5: 42.2</p> <p>Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 34.96</p>	No longer part of RAMR process - need to do.	☺ Relatively high for Suffolk - remained fairly constant in recent years. Rural district so will not achieve highest densities.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					Not recorded for 2001/2 or 2002/3. No data for comparison.		
2007	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG)	Suffolk	2006/07: 38 Dwellings per hectare 2004/5: 33	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. Excluding BDC: Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 30.39	Combined density in Suffolk meets the recommended guideline. County totals do not include all districts in previous years so trends are difficult to discern.		☺ Housing meets the recommended guideline and is increasing slowly for the county as a whole. Varies between districts and data for previous years are incomplete.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
SSAG 2007	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG)	BDC	Using average house price (all types) : mean residents income (both full and part time average) 2007: 251623:22303 = 11.3 2006: 240028:21756 = 11.0	No target.	Ratio 2003 /4: 6.7 Ratio 2002 /3: 7.9 Apparent decrease in ratio but it still remains very high and indicates major housing affordability problems.	Depends on what figures are used (e.g. if only full time figures used the ratios would be lower)	⊗ Income figures based on either small or variable sample and should be treated with caution, but there is a clear trend to increasing housing affordability problems and the figures are very high.
SSAG 2007	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG)	Suffolk	Using average house price (all types) : mean residents income (both full and part time average) 2007: 213896:23233 = 9.2 2006: 198724:23168 = 8.6	No target.	Ratio 2003 /4: 6.6 Ratio 2002 /3: 6.0 With most districts showing an increase in their ratios an increase in the county average was likely and the figures do bear this out. Serious housing affordability problems evident across all of the county.	Depends on what figures are used (e.g. if only full time figures used the ratios would be lower)	⊗ Still high ratio and worsening
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
26/01/09	Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings (QOL/Districts?) (decent homes standard for LA/housing stock - private?)	BDC	BVPI 184a Proportion of LA homes which were non-decent – 15% - 2006 BVPI 2006/07: 12%	22% - 2005 44% - 2004 Target for BVPI 184a: 2006/07: 15%, 2007/08: 8%, 2008/09: 4%, 2009/10: 0%.	Trend is now down, but dwellings are assessed each year and they may fail, so at the beginning of the year there may be additional dwellings with repairs needed. Repairs are carried out when needed.		☺ Trend is now downward but it may vary from year to year as different dwellings fail the standard.
HH	Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings (QOL/Districts?) (decent homes standard for LA/housing stock - private?)	Suffolk	N/A				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve the satisfaction of people with their neighbourhood as a place to live?							
ME	% of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood as a place to live (Suffolk Speaks/ODPM QOL surveys)	BDC	Satisfied 89% Dissatisfied 2% (Suffolk Speaks, April 2005)	Very Satisfied – 40% Fairly Satisfied – 47% Neither satisfied or dissatisfied – 5% Fairly dissatisfied – 6% Very dissatisfied – 1% Don't Know/not stated - 0 (Suffolk Speaks, April 2004)	Slightly higher satisfaction rating, the rating is already high with very few dissatisfied.	The question is not reviewed on a regular basis; SSAG will need to request the Suffolk Speaks Panel to mail this question again, annually?	☺ Trend is now slightly up but the rating is already high.
ME	% of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood as a place to live (Suffolk Speaks/ODPM QOL surveys)	Suffolk	Very Satisfied – 34% Fairly Satisfied – 52% Neither satisfied or dissatisfied – 6% Fairly dissatisfied – 6% Very dissatisfied - 2% Don't Know/not stated – 1% (Suffolk Speaks, April 2005)	Very Satisfied – 33% Fairly Satisfied – 50% Neither satisfied or dissatisfied – 9% Fairly dissatisfied – 5% Very dissatisfied - 2% Don't Know/not stated – 1% (Suffolk Speaks, April 2004)	Slightly higher satisfaction rating	The question is not reviewed on a regular basis; SSAG will need to request the Suffolk Speaks Panel to mail this question again, annually?	☺ Trend is now slightly up but the rating is already high.
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it increase access to natural green space?							
	Area of land	BDC	Awaiting outcomes of PPG17 Assessment				Awaiting response or contact

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	managed in whole or part for its ecological interest and with public access over and above public rights of way (Suffolk)						from SCC
	Area of land managed in whole or part for its ecological interest and with public access over and above public rights of way (Suffolk)	Suffolk	Awaiting data from Suffolk County Council				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it increase access to natural green space?							
	Areas of deficiency in terms of natural green space (Suffolk)	BDC	Outcomes of PPG17 work will provide data for this.				
	Areas of deficiency in terms of natural green space (Suffolk)	Suffolk	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it increase access to natural green space?							
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	BDC	No of sites 156, Area 904.47 Ha No of parishes deficient Standard 1: 66 No of parishes deficient Standard 2: 12 (SBRC 2006)	Standard 1 = Parish must have more than 50% total area within 500m of accessible natural greenspace of at least 2ha Standard 2 = Parish must have more than 50% total area within 4km of accessible natural greenspace of at least 20ha	First year information available.		☹ Baseline data
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	Suffolk	No of sites 692, Area 22108.16 Ha No of parishes deficient Standard 1: 373 No of parishes deficient Standard 2: 139 (SBRC 2006)	Standard 1 = Parish must have more than 50% total area within 500m of accessible natural greenspace of at least 2ha Standard 2 = Parish must have more than 50% total area within 4km of accessible natural greenspace of at least 20ha	First year information available.		☹ Baseline data

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it encourage engagement in decision making?							
2007	Electoral turnout in local authority elections	BDC	BDC election 2007: Turnout 24.8% to 56.4%-total over District 38.3% Babergh DC Elections 2003 Turnout 18% to 53% South Suffolk Constituency May 05 Election Turnout 69.65%	Babergh DC Elections 1999 Turnout 23% to 53% South Suffolk Constituency June 01 Election Turnout 66.56%	There appears a trend towards a reduction in turnout for local elections but possibly an increase in turnout for General Elections.		☹ Baseline data but there does not appear to be a clear trend.
	Electoral turnout in local authority elections	Suffolk	The SCC poll was on the same day as the General Election in 05 so it may give a false picture.	Turnout varied from 58% to 73% for the 7 th June 2001 elections to SCC			☹ Baseline data but there does not appear to be a clear trend.
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it encourage engagement in decision making?							
2008	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Suffolk Acre)	BDC	2008: 20 2007: 17 2004: 11	This is now 22% in 2007. In 2004 the figure was 14.5% of parishes have a village plan. This is the second highest figure in Suffolk.	The figure is likely to increase slowly in the future.		😊 There has been a steady increase in the number of village plans over the years
ME	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Suffolk Acre)	Suffolk	2008: no data 2007: 136 2004: 60	This is now 27% of parishes in the county in 2007. In 2004:12.5% of parishes has a village plan.	The figure is likely to increase slowly in the future		😊 There has been a steady increase in the number of village plans over the years
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it increase the number of people involved in volunteer activities?							
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Suffolk/ CVS)	BDC		Difficult indicator to quantify.			
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Suffolk/ CVS)	Suffolk	47,542 2006 survey carried out for the SDA, is based on volunteers who work for 2hrs per week or 100 hours per year.	Difficult indicator to quantify.			☹ Baseline data.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve ethnic relations?							
ME 2008	Number / rate of racist incidents (Racial Harassment Initiative)	BDC	2007/08: 52 (10% of the County total) 2006/07: 20 (4.5% of County total) 2005/06: 31 (7% of County total)	2004/05: 27 (6% of County total) 2003/04: 27 (5% of County total)	The number of racial incidents increased slightly up to 2006/07 when it decreased substantially, but we may need a longer time series to get a better picture. The percentage figure is increasing.		⊗ Although there is no discernible trend yet, the numbers are high for 2007/08.
ME 2008	Number / rate of racist incidents (Racial Harassment Initiative)	Suffolk	2007/08: 512 2006/07: 445 2005/06: 439	2004/05: 418 2003/04: 496	There was a downwards trend but this seems to have reversed		⊗ Although there is no definite trend, the numbers are high for 2007/08.
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve access to cultural facilities?							
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (BV170a)	BDC	Not Applicable.		No museums are funded or part funded by the District Council.		
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (BV170a)	Suffolk	No data				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve access to cultural facilities?							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (BV170b)	BDC	Not Applicable.				
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (BV170b)	Suffolk	No data				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve access to cultural facilities?							
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (BV170c)	BDC	2003/4: 1413	2002/3: 1789.	Difficult to discern a trend as the returns are voluntary, but this can act as a baseline.		☹ Difficult to discern a trend as the returns are voluntary, but this can act as a baseline.
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (BV170c)	Suffolk	2003/4: 40,042	2002/3: 37,845	Difficult to discern a trend as the returns are voluntary, but this can act as a baseline.		☹ Difficult to discern a trend as the returns are voluntary, but this can act as a baseline.

A.2 Environmental baseline data

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA			
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality										
Will it improve the quality of inland waters?										
AN	Water quality in rivers (EA) www.defra.gov.uk/	BDC	<u>Water quality (EA) 2007:</u>		<u>Water quality (EA) 2006:</u>		<u>Water quality (EA) 2004:</u>	Not obvious yet but close to target and slightly below in one place.	☹ Chemical water at very good (A and B) has increased proportionally with the lowest	
			Chemical	Biological	Chemical	Biological	Chemical			
			Grade A:	16.5%	45.3%	Grade A:	11%			47%
			Grade B:	42.7%	44.8%	Grade B:	41%			42%
					Biological					



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA																																										
	environment/statistics/inlwater/iwriverquality.htm		Grade C: 39.6% 3.5% Grade D: 0% 6.4% Grade E: 1.2% 0% Grade F: 0% 0%	Grade C: 47% 4% Grade D: 0% 5% Grade E: 0.55% 0% Grade F: 0% 0% <u>Water quality (EA) 2005:</u> <table><tr><th></th><th>Chemical</th><th>Biological</th></tr><tr><td>Grade A:</td><td>18.2%</td><td>50.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade B:</td><td>45%</td><td>43.5%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade C:</td><td>35.6%</td><td>6.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade D:</td><td>1.2%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade E:</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade F:</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td></tr></table>		Chemical	Biological	Grade A:	18.2%	50.1%	Grade B:	45%	43.5%	Grade C:	35.6%	6.4%	Grade D:	1.2%	0%	Grade E:	0%	0%	Grade F:	0%	0%	Grade A: 3% 57.5% Grade B: 42% 33.3% Grade C: 451% 9.2% Grade D: 4% 0% Grade E: 0% 0% Grade F: 0% 0% <u>Water quality (EA) 2003:</u> <table><tr><th></th><th>Chemical</th><th>Biological</th></tr><tr><td>Grade A:</td><td>7.6%</td><td>55.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade B:</td><td>37.2%</td><td>34.2%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade C:</td><td>45.2%</td><td>10.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade D:</td><td>10% 0%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade E:</td><td>0% 0%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Grade F:</td><td>0% 0%</td><td>0%</td></tr></table>		Chemical	Biological	Grade A:	7.6%	55.4%	Grade B:	37.2%	34.2%	Grade C:	45.2%	10.4%	Grade D:	10% 0%	0%	Grade E:	0% 0%	0%	Grade F:	0% 0%	0%		levels remaining fairly constant Biological water quality has remained fairly constant
	Chemical	Biological																																															
Grade A:	18.2%	50.1%																																															
Grade B:	45%	43.5%																																															
Grade C:	35.6%	6.4%																																															
Grade D:	1.2%	0%																																															
Grade E:	0%	0%																																															
Grade F:	0%	0%																																															
	Chemical	Biological																																															
Grade A:	7.6%	55.4%																																															
Grade B:	37.2%	34.2%																																															
Grade C:	45.2%	10.4%																																															
Grade D:	10% 0%	0%																																															
Grade E:	0% 0%	0%																																															
Grade F:	0% 0%	0%																																															
AN	Water quality in rivers (EA)	Suffolk	<u>Chemical water quality 2006:</u> Grade A: 5% Grade B: 33% Grade C: 36% Grade D: 15% Grade E: 11% Grade F: 0.8% <u>Biological water quality 2006:</u> Grade A: 30% Grade B: 38% Grade C: 26% Grade D: 6% Grade E: 0% Grade F: 0%	None specifically for chemical/biological water quality in Suffolk as a whole. However, River Quality Targets have been set for individual river reaches <u>Chemical water quality 2003:</u> Grade A: 2.6% Grade B: 26.1% Grade C: 37.8% Grade D: 21.2% Grade E: 11.6% Grade F: 0.8% <u>Biological water quality 2003:</u> Grade A: 32.7% Grade B: 46.9% Grade C: 17.4%	<u>Chemical water quality 2000:</u> Grade A: 4.3% Grade B: 34.5% Grade C: 32.7% Grade D: 15.8% Grade E: 12.1% Grade F: 0.5% Deterioration since 2000 – only 28.7% rated as 'very good' (A) or 'good' (B) cf 38.8% in 2003 <u>Biological water quality 2000:</u>		⊕ Biological water quality seems to be declining but chemical water quality seems to remain about the same in the county as a whole. But the situation will vary considerably from river reach to river reach																																										



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)				Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
							Grade D: 2.3% Grade E: 0.7% Grade F: 0%	Grade A: 24.9% Grade B: 48.9% Grade C: 14.8% Grade D: 5.7% Grade E: 0.6% Grade F: 0% Grade O (unclassified): 5.0% Improvement since 2000 –77.6% grade A or B cf 73.8%		
Water Cycle Study June 2011 River Basin Management Plan Watercourse Status Summary	Watercourse	Code	Ammonia	Phosphorous	Dissolved Oxygen	Overall Ecological Status	Ecological Status Objective			
	Stour Estuary	R45	Moderate	Not Classified	Not Classified	Moderate	Good by 2027			
	Holbrook	R 35	High	Good	Moderate	Moderate	Good by 2027			
	River Brett	R39	High	Poor	Good	Moderate	Good by 2027			
	Stutton Brook	R113	High	Good	Moderate	Moderate	Good by 2027			
	Lower Stour	R114	High	Poor	Good	Moderate	Good by 2027			
	River Gipping	R3	High	Moderate	Good	Poor	Good by 2027			
	River Orwell (tidal)	R15 + R16	Moderate	Not Classified	Not Classified	Good	Good by 2015			
	Belstead Brook	R20	High	Moderate	High	Poor	Good by 2027			
	Lavenham Brook	R96	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Good by 2027			
	River Box	R38	High	Poor	Good	Moderate	Good by 2027			
	Bildeston Brook	R27	High	Good	High	Poor	Good by 2027			
	Alton Water Reservoir	L3	High	Good	Not Classified	Moderate	Good by 2027			
Some water quality issues have been identified within the District. Phosphorous levels are high and most watercourses classified as having 'moderate' ecological status. Ammonia levels are very low and should be maintained through implementation of the appropriate WwTW discharge limits, which should also seek to improve the ecological status of the watercourses to 'good' by 2027, as specified under the WFD.										
Two environmentally designated sites - Cattawade Marshes and Cornard Mere - have been identified as currently being in unfavourable condition due to water cycle processes. Partnership working has been identified as being required to assist improvement.										
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality										



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Will it improve the quality of inland waters?							
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS)	BDC	Uncertain if information is available				
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS)	Suffolk	Uncertain if information is available				
Water Cycle Study June 2011 River Basin Management Plan Groundwater Status Summary	Watercourse		Code	Quantitative Status	Overall Status	Status Objective	
	Waveney and East Suffolk Chalk & Crag		G8	Good	Poor	Quantitative: Good by 2015	
	North Essex Chalk		G5	Poor	Poor	Quantitative: Good by 2027	
	Both groundwater sources have also been assigned an overall status of 'poor'						
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?							
AN	Water quality in estuaries (EA)	BDC	Estuarine water quality 2006: Orwell: 17.5km Grade A and 4km Grade B Stour: 27km all Grade A and 2km Grade B				☺ Almost all estuarine water in the county is top quality, and Orwell and Stour have remained constant for 6 years
AN	Water quality in estuaries (EA)	Suffolk		No target. Estuarine water quality 2000: Waveney: 15km all Grade A Blyth: 7km all Grade A Alde: 26.5km all Grade A Butley: 9km all Grade A Deben: 16km all Grade A Orwell: 21.5km Grade A and 4km	Estuarine water quality 1995: Waveney: 15km all Grade A Blyth: 7km all Grade A Alde: 26.5km all Grade A		☺ 5 yearly indicator. Almost all estuarine water in the county is top quality, and Orwell and Stour have shown improvement in last 5 years. No update in 2003-4 –

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
				Grade B Stour: 27km all Grade A	Butley: 9km all Grade A Deben: 16km all Grade A Orwell: 6.5km Grade A and 6km Grade B + 9km Grade C Stour: 25km Grade A and 2km Grade B Orwell and Stour have shown improvement. All other estuaries retained good water quality.		estuarine water quality only monitored every five years
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?							
AN	Bathing water quality (EA)	BDC	N/A				
AN	Bathing water quality (EA)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve air quality?							
2006 (recorded 2009)	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded? <i>Babergh DC Air Quality Annual Report</i>	BDC	2006: Annual mean NO ₂ conc'n: Lattinford Bridge on A12 24.7 µg/m ³ 70 Cross Street, Sudbury: 36.1 µg/m ³ 87 Cross Street, Sudbury: 59.4 µg/m ³ Hourly: Max: Highest in year 89.8 March, Lowest in year: 55.8 October Min: Highest in year 4.4 Jan, Lowest in year: 0.6 Sep Average: High: 31.7 Feb, Low: 21.6 Aug	Objectives for NO ₂ : Hourly mean 200 µg/m ³ not to be exceeded more than 18 times per year (from 31/12/05) Annual mean: 40 µg/m ³ (from 31/12/05) (National Air Quality Objective) Also: Annual mean limit value of 40 µg/m ³ by 01/01/10 1-hour limit of 200 µg/m ³ not to be exceeded more than 18 times a year by 01/01/10 (Air Quality Daughter Directive-adopted as legislation)	2005 NO ₂ mean concentration at: 1) Lattinford Bridge on the A12: 24.0 µg/m ³ 2) 70 Cross St, Sudbury: 38.4 µg/m ³ (Babergh Air Quality 2004 Annual Progress Report (April 2005)) 2003: Lattinford Bridge: 28.4 µg/m ³ (2003) 70 Cross St, Sudbury: 39.4 µg/m ³	BDC believes that the objectives for the other six national Air Quality Objective pollutants are likely to be met, hence they are not routinely monitored. Because NO ₂ concentrations approach AQO levels at certain points in the district (principally by major roads), it is monitored at 8	☹ Little change in levels of either annual or hourly NO ₂ . Targets met, with no limits being exceeded



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					(2003)	locations in the district. All 8 locations use diffusion tubes to monitor NO ₂ , and a correction factor has to be applied to the results. There is one continuous monitoring station at Lattinford Bridge (no correction factor necessary)	
	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded?	Suffolk	AQMA website UK Air Quality Archive- possibly out of date (no records for Babergh) but says: Ipswich 3, Suffolk Coastal 1 (woodbridge) and no others in Suffolk (FH 0, [cited Jan 09]				
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve air quality?							
2009	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (SSAG)	BDC	2008: 1- Cross Street, Sudbury new AQMA 0:(2006) 0: 2007	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	4 AQMA's covering 18 properties in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5. AQMA quite a crude measure of air pollution	⊗ New AQMA identified in Sudbury- may lead to long term improvements. Future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads, heatwaves can increase NO _x , fine particulates (PM ₁₀), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)
2009	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (SSAG)	Suffolk	2006: 2 2007: 4 AQMA website UK Air Quality Archive- possibly out of date (no records for Babergh) but says: Ipswich 3, Suffolk Coastal 1 (woodbridge) and no others in Suffolk (FH 0, [cited Jan 09]	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy. Approximately 210 properties were affected in 2007.	0 in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5. The air quality in certain places appears to be declining. But given the size of the County the	⊗ But future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads, heatwaves can increase NO _x , fine particulates (PM ₁₀), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
						numbers are not high.	
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise the loss of Greenfield land to development?							
2008	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on Greenfield land	BDC	AMR 2007/08: 106, 39% AMR 2006/07: 93, 34% 2005/6 69 32% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	The RSS requires 60% of housing development to be on PDL (i.e. no more than 40% on greenfield).	2001/02 104 43% 2002/03 311 61% 2003/04 96 45.3% 2004/05 115 59%	Seems to be increasing proportion of development on greenfield	☹ The district does meet national and regional targets, but, because it is a rural district and has had to allocate greenfield sites for development, this may change in the future.
2008	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on Greenfield land	Suffolk	2006/07: 1416, 39% 2005/06: 1476, 44% 2004/05 916 36.9% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 1292 57.7% 2002/03 1358 48.4% 2003/04 1283 46.4% Overall trend is towards a reduction in completions on Greenfield sites.		☺ There is a reducing trend and the county meets regional and national targets.
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise the loss of Greenfield land to development?							
2007	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on Greenfield land (SSAG) From RAMR	BDC	2006/07: 1259 36% 2005/06: 2168 59.8% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	2004/05 1912 57.8% 2003/04 1832 55.3% Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 N/R 2002/03 3569 94.8%	The LDF is at an early stage and BDC will be allocating further sites- due to rural nature some of these may be greenfield.	☹ Decrease in commitments on greenfield for 2006/07 but difficult to tell whether this is a one off.
2007	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on Greenfield land (SSAG)	Suffolk	2006/07: 13,258 11757 47% 2005/06: 15277 55% 2004/05 13,294 49.3% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	60% PDL	2001/02 7765 52.7% 2002/03 9008 49.9% 2003/04 13,682 49.8% Overall downward		☹ No obvious pattern emerging as figures seem to fluctuate.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					trend		
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise the loss of Greenfield land to development?							
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area (SSAG)	BDC	Dwellings per hectare 2005/6: 46	Dwellings per hectare 2004/5: 42.17 Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 34.96 "To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. 2 nd highest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.	Not recorded for 2001/2 or 2002/3.		☺ Currently 2 nd highest density in Suffolk, but no past trend data for comparison
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area (SSAG)	Suffolk	2004/05: 33	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare.	Excluding BDC: Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 30.39 Combined density in Suffolk meets the recommended guideline. County totals do not include all districts in previous years so trends are difficult to discern.		☺ Housing meets the recommended guideline for the county as a whole. Varies between districts and data for previous years are incomplete. Density is also increasing over time slowly.
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land to development?							
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a)	BDC	2005 Local Plan Grade 2: 1.8 Ha Grade 3: 140.43 Ha	No direct indicator although best and most versatile agricultural land should not be allocated for development, brown field land should be used first.			⊖ There has been a need to allocate substantial areas of agricultural land following an urban capacity study, to meet the housing needs of the District.
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a)	Suffolk	No data				No data available
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it maintain and enhance soil quality?							



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use (Districts/EA)	BDC	Potentially contaminated sites: 489 Need to set a baseline – number and area of potentially/declared contaminated sites.	No target			This indicator includes potentially contaminated land sites and sites defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e. declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. If a site is Declared Contaminated, then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use (Districts/EA)	Suffolk	Need to set a baseline – number and area of potentially/declared contaminated sites.	No target			This indicator includes potentially contaminated land sites and sites defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e. declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. If a site is Declared Contaminated,

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
							then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it maintain and enhance soil quality?							
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Soil Association, Bristol)	BDC	2009: no data 4 farms 41.4 ha	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Soil Association, Bristol) <i>David.Rimmer@defra.gsi.gov.uk</i>	Suffolk	Jan 2009: 82 farms 27 farms 3059.7 ha	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
Headline Objective: To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible							
Will it promote sustainable use of minerals?							
SSAG	Recycled aggregate production (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003: 480,000 tonnes 2004: 500,000 tonnes (estimated) (annual average 1996-2003: 330,918 tonnes)	The Waste Local Plan calculates that, over the period 1995-2006, an annual average of 347,000 tonnes of recycled aggregates should be produced (an annual average of 347,000 tonnes)	1996: 101,938 1997: 157,000 1998: 150,000 1999: 320,000 2000: 418,000 2001: 505,786 2002: 514,622	Despite the decline in 2003, the annual average of 347,000 tonnes between 1995-2006 is still expected to be met. However, production is dependent on the fiscal attractiveness of secondary	☺ Although the 2003 figure shows a 6% reduction on 2002 levels, recycled aggregates as a percentage of total mineral sales continued to rise in 2003



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
						aggregates relative to primary aggregates, and also depends on the raw supply of secondary aggregate material	
Headline Objective: To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible							
Will it promote sustainable use of water?							
AH	Water consumption data for Suffolk not available. Depends what EA could supply. Possible link to efficient use of water through reuse or reduction of need appliances, buildings etc)??	BDC	2004 Daily per capita 145 litres	National mean figure 151 litres			☺ Consumption figure is below national level. CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in Suffolk.
AH	Water consumption data for Suffolk not available. Depends what EA could supply. Possible link to efficient use of water through reuse or reduction of need appliances, buildings etc)??	Suffolk	No data available.				CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in Suffolk.



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Water Cycle Study June 2011	Water Cycle Element	Current Situation					
	Water Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Currently a small surplus in AWS' supply across the District.Very little water available for abstraction at low flows across the District.					
	Water Supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none">No issues.					
	Wastewater Treatment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Seven WwTWs have been identified as currently being at capacity with no available headroom: Dedham, Elmsett, Glemsford, Holbrook, Nayland, Sproughton and Sudbury. Developers and the Council should approach AWS directly for development within these catchments.Seven WwTWs have been identified as having minimal headroom capacity, or limited capacity (by AWS): Bildeston, Boxford, Bures, Chelmondiston, Great Wenham, Hadleigh and Monks Eleigh.					
	Wastewater Collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">No issuesMinor historical exceedence of sewer capacity in and around Sudbury, Stratford St Mary and East Bergholt due to surface water in storm events					
Headline Objective: To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible							
Will it maintain water availability for water dependant habitats?							
AH	Water availability for water dependant habitats (EN / Wildlife Trust)	BDC	No data				No information available yet.
AH	Water availability for water dependant habitats (EN / Wildlife Trust)	Suffolk	No data				
Headline Objective: To reduce waste							
Will it reduce household waste?							
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (SSAG)	BDC	Per head 2006/07: 404 kg Per head 2007/08: 388 kg	Per head 2004/05: 396.4 kg Per head 2005/06: 405 kg	Slight increase per household is due in part to garden waste recycling. These figures seem low		☺ The amount of waste produced is now decreasing 2007/08

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					relative to the county level. 07/08 figures show a decrease as more is recycled.		
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (SSAG)	Suffolk	Per head 2005/06: 539 kg Per head 2006/07: 556 kg	Per head 2004/05: 552 kg Per head 2003/04: 535 kg	Difficult to say we have a trend at present. More green garden waste is being collected so this will increase the figures		☹ There appears to be no obvious trend at present.
Headline Objective: To reduce waste							
Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?							
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (SSAG / BVPI)	BDC	% recycled: 2005/6: 33.3% % recycled: 2006/7: 36.3% % recycled: 2007/8: 39%	% recycled: 2004/5: 34.74% % recycled: 2003/4: 25.8% BVPI targets: 2003-4: 14% 2005-6: 21%	A huge increase on the 2002/3 figure of 11.0%		☺ Already beyond the targets. 2007/08
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (SSAG / BVPI)	Suffolk	% recycled: 2004/5: 30.5% % recycled: 2005/6: 41% % recycled: 2006/7: 43%	% recycled: 2003/4: 24.79% % recycled: 2002/3: 11.32% % recycled: 2001/2: 11.1% BVPI targets: 2003-4: 28% 2004-5: 35% 2005-6: 38%	There have been very marked improvements and the BVPI targets are now being met.		☺ The 2002-3 and 2004-5 BVPI target has not been met, mainly due to a slower-than-anticipated rollout of the three-bin collection system, and lower-than-expected recycling levels at Household Waste & Recycling sites. Targets for future years remain challenging.
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it effect traffic volumes?							
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (Suffolk)	BDC	2005: 7 day annual average flows – all traffic = 283,772. 46 sites (Suffolk CC)		2000: 270,760 2001: 275,641 2002: 280,079 2003: 284,866 2004: 279,924	Traffic levels have increased in the last 2 years.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes.
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (Suffolk)	Suffolk total	2003: 7 day annual average flows – all traffic = 2,232,866. 283 sites (Suffolk CC)		1999: 2,067,679 2000: 2,088,699 2001: 2,109,313	Traffic levels have increased each year since 1999.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					2002: 2,166,875		
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it reduce the need for local travel?							
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere (SSAG)	BDC	2005/6: Major towns: % Other towns: 38% Elsewhere: 62%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for sustainable development (Structure Plan Policy CS3(a)). 2003/4: Major towns: 9% Other towns: 34% Elsewhere: 58% 2004/5: Major towns: % Other towns: 47% Elsewhere: 53%	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 21.5% (43%) Other towns: 55% (26%) Elsewhere: 23.5% (31%) 5-yearly data for 1991-96 and 1996-01 show that development in major towns increased (from 13% to 35%), while in other towns and elsewhere it decreased. From 2001/2 to 2003/4 development in major towns decreased each year but figures for other towns and elsewhere showed fluctuation.	Amount of development taking place in major towns in decreasing, while development elsewhere is higher than last 2 years.	⊗ Amount of development taking place in major towns has decreased in recent years, and in 2003/4 most took place elsewhere.
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003/4: Major towns: 39% Other towns: 31% Elsewhere: 30%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for sustainable development (Structure Plan Policy CS3(a)).	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 46% (44.5%) Other towns: 34% (37%) Elsewhere: 20% (18.5%) 5-yearly data for 1991-96 and 1996-01 show that development in major towns dropped		⊙ Development is increasingly being directed away from elsewhere to major and other towns, in accordance with the structure plan.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					from 42 to 37%, with slightly more in other towns and elsewhere. In 2001/2 to 2002/3 increased development has taken place in major towns, with less elsewhere. 2002/3 figures show more development in major towns and less elsewhere, compared to the historical data.		
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it reduce the need for local travel?							
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	BDC	Total Rural Population 45,557 Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 13,296 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 29.2% in 2004/5	Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 18,921 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 41.5 in 2003/4 Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	% of rural population with access to all five listed facilities has halved - 64% recorded in 2002/3 (no data for 2001/2).	Rapid loss of rural services during last 2 years is a concern.	⊗ There has been a significant decrease this year indicating a rapid decrease in rural service provision. Does not meet target. Needs to be monitored and improved in the future.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	Suffolk	Total Rural Population 217,716 Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 71,883 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 33.0 (2004/5)	Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 87,505 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 42.0 (2003/4) Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2003/4: 42% 2002/3: 43.2% 2001/2: 41.0% Appears to have been a big decrease in provision of rural services over the past year. ONS have updated their population figures which may have affected this indicator this year.		⊗ The source of population data has changed and so figures are not directly comparable. Not all districts returned data for each year, therefore it is not accurate to compare. However there is a general trend towards fewer facilities with reduced numbers and % of people with access to these facilities in rural areas.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it reduce the need for local travel?							
SB/BG	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT)	BDC	No data				
SB/BG	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT)	Suffolk	No data				
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it increase the proportion of journeys made using modes other than the private car?							
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	BDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 30% this covered, working at home, by train, cycle, bus, walking % sustainable 2001 Census: 18.3% Babergh DC employees 2005: 18.24 % 2006: 18.18 % Does not include those working at home	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. Not include were car or van passengers at 5.89%	No other comparable data recorded.		⊖ There appears to be little change.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	Suffolk	% sustainable 2001 Census: 21.2% Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2004: 28.0%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2003: 25.2% No other comparable data recorded.		⊖ Limited trend information. An increase has been recorded in use of sustainable modes by Suffolk employees but is this representative of the wider population?
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it increase the proportion of journeys made using modes other than the private car?							
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI)	BDC	2005 survey 35.2% walk, 22.3% bus, 3.2% cycle, 39.3% car	2004 survey 36.7 walk, 25.6% bus, 2.5% cycle, 35.2% car 2003 survey 44.2 walk, 16.7% bus, 1.8% cycle, 37.3% car	The trend in Babergh seems to be slightly towards to more car use. This perhaps reflects the rural nature of the district.	To reduce the use of the car on the school run.	⊖ Babergh appears to be going in the opposite direction to the County.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI)	Suffolk	2005 survey: 41% walk, 19% bus, 7.4% cycle, 32.4% car	Suffolk target of 23% by bus in 2004 2004 survey: Now target for car is 31% 41% walk, 18% bus, 5.9% cycle, 35% car. 2003 Survey: 41.6% walk, 17.1% bus, 6% cycle, 35.3% car	The split of transport uses varies slightly year to year but the trend is towards more sustainable forms of transport. The county may have reached the limit for reducing car use because of its rural nature and parental choice.	To reduce further the use of the car on the school run.	☺ There has been steady progress to reduce the use of the car and encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport.
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it increase the proportion of journeys made using modes other than the private car?							
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG)	BDC		For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No other data collected to date. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.		☹ There is a need to develop monitoring systems that allows the collection of data for this revised indicator.
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG)	Suffolk	Data from Ipswich only 2003/4: Number of commercial developments >1,000sq m: 3 (total area: 41366sq m) Number of these developments complying with PPG13 parking standard: 0 (total area: 0 sq m)	For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No other data collected to date. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.	Developments in 2003/4 did not meet PPG13 parking standards.	☹ In Ipswich, standards were adopted in 2001, but developments in 2003/4 did not meet PPG13 parking standards. Monitoring systems have yet to be implemented in many authorities
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it reduce emissions of green house gases by reducing energy consumption?							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial / industrial use www.berr.gov.uk/w/hatwedo/energy/statistics/regional/regional-local-electricity/page36213.html	BDC	2007 Domestic use per consumer: 5,392 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 221.3 GWh	2006 Domestic use per consumer: 5,457 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 245 GWh 2005: Domestic use per consumer: 5,572 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 241 GWh	2 nd lowest industrial use in Suffolk. 2004 Domestic use per consumer: 5,763 kWh 2003: Domestic use per consumer: 5,668 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 210 GWh		
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial / industrial use	Suffolk	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 5,337 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 2003 GWh		No trend data available to date.		
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it reduce emissions of green house gases by reducing energy consumption?							
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial / industrial use www.berr.gov.uk/w/hatwedo/energy/statistics/regional/regional-local-gas/page36200.html	BDC	2006 Domestic use per consumer: 17000kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 146.5 GWh 2006 Domestic use per consumer: 17,584 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 178 GWh	2005: Domestic use per consumer: 18,267 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 191 GWh 2004 Domestic use per consumer: 19,104 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 215 GWh	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 19,072 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 344 GWh 2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 18,926 kWh (18,536 kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 369 GWh (336GWh) Domestic gas use is decreasing annually, and while industrial use has decreased since 2002.	Increasing use of gas in the District.	

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial / industrial use	Suffolk	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 19,028 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 3502 GWh		2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 19,043 kWh (18,688 kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 2701 GWh (3064 GWh) Domestic use has decreased slightly this year, but remains above 2001 figures. Industrial use has increased.	Increase in gas use in county since 2001 (although domestic use has decreased slightly this year).	
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it reduce emissions of green house gases by reducing energy consumption?							
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns) DEFRA, HECA www.audit-commission.gov.uk/performance/data/provision.asp	BDC	HECA (% improvement in domestic energy efficiency since 1996) 2006/07: 22.4 2005/06: 18.8 2004/05: 17.0 2003/04: 14.2 2002/03: 11.1 BV63: 2007/08: 64 2006/07: 63	63 in 2004/05 58 (BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA overall figure for improvement in total district stock since 1996 is 14.2% (HECA Progress Report) BVPI Target for 2004/05 59.7 HECA Strategy target 19% by 2006	1.1.1 BVPI 63 2001/02 2002/03 HECA (% improvement in domestic energy efficiency since 1996) 2001 6.41% 2002 8.3% 2003 11.1%		☺ There has been a steady increase in the score and the target for 2004/5 has been met. BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1 st April 1996. The DEFRA website advises that because HECA

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
							Strategies and monitoring techniques differ, the information should not be used to compare the performance of LAs.
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns)	Suffolk	? (BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA – DEFRA website advises that 'HECA strategies and monitoring techniques differ, therefore the information should not be used to compare the performance of authorities.' This suggests that to aggregate the figures and find an average for Suffolk may also not be appropriate.		1.1.2 BVPI 63 2001/02 ? 2002/03 ?		BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1 st April 1996.
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it increase the proportion of energy needs being met by renewable sources?							
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG)	BDC	2004/5: 0 2003/4: 0	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	None since at least 1996/7 There are small schemes for individual properties being developed in the district but the capacity is small.		⊗ No schemes in the pipeline
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG)	Suffolk	2004/5: 22.25 MWh 2003/4: 19.5 MWh	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	Mid Suffolk and Waveney now have plants; with the largest wind turbine in the UK built at Lowestoft.		⊕ Things are improving but the targets will be difficult to meet.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property from rivers and watercourses?							
SSAG	Flood Risk – Planning Applications Approved Against Environment Agency Advice (SSAG)	BDC	2005/6:1 2004/5:0 2003/4: 0 (data from Environment Agency High Level Target 12 report to DEFRA)	2002/3: 1 Target is 0	Reduction to zero from 2002/3		☹ Mixed trend, need to monitor this over a longer term to establish trend
SSAG	Flood Risk – Planning Applications Approved Against Environment Agency Advice (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003-4: 8	2002/3: 8 Target is 0	No change on 2002/3 figures.		☹ Mid-Suffolk figures are of concern, but other districts seem to be moving towards sustainability in this area
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property from rivers and watercourses?							
RC	Properties at risk of flooding (EA)	BDC					
RC	Properties at risk of flooding (EA)	Suffolk	11,943* *note this excludes FHDC.				
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property from rivers and watercourses?							
RC	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected) (EA)	BDC	4 properties Suffolk wide* Many events go unreported.				
RC	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected) (EA)	Suffolk	4 properties Suffolk wide* Many events go unreported.				
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property on the coast?							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
RC	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected) (EA)	BDC	3 properties Suffolk wide* Many events go unreported.				
RC	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected) (EA)	Suffolk	3 properties Suffolk wide* Many events go unreported.				
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it reduce the risk of coastal erosion?							
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG)	BDC	N/A				No coastal areas.
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG)	Suffolk	Totals from the 2 coastal districts: 0				☹ Policies apply in both coastal Districts, and whilst there will always be some pressure the number of applications is likely to remain very low.
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it reduce the risk of damage to people and property from storm events?							
RC	Incidence of storm events (properties affected) (EA)	BDC	No data				
RC	Incidence of storm events (properties affected) (EA)	Suffolk	No data				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?							
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG)	BDC	RAMSAR 1(part) SPA 1(part) SAC 0 0ha SSSI 17 2573ha CWS 164 1574ha LNR 8 142.23 [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	Gained 1 SSSI and 14 CWS since 2003. LNRs appear to have decreased but probably due to miscount previously		☺ Increase in SSSIs and CWS is promising. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are baseline data. 5 yearly indicator

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG)	Suffolk	RAMSAR 6 8141ha SPA 7 18227.5ha SAC 11 2542.9ha SSSI 142 31341ha CWS 875 19509ha LNR 25 377.84ha [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	Gained 42 CWS since 2003. Decrease in LNRs due to miscount previously. Apparent changes in hectareage due to changes in method - only including Suffolk area this year.		☺ Increase in CWS is promising. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are baseline data. 5 yearly indicator
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?							
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (EN / Wildlife Trust)	BDC	2006 Favourable: 24.6% Unfavourable Recovering: 12.3% Unfavourable No Change: 10.7% Unfavourable Declining: 52.5%	No trend data but they appear to be generally less than in good condition.	The overall condition of the SSSIs is affected by the scale of the Stour and Orwell estuaries which are generally not in a favourable condition.		☹ Only a quarter of SSSIs are in a favourable condition.
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (EN / Wildlife Trust)	Suffolk	No data				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it help deliver targets and action for habitats and species within the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan?							
	Achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	BDC	Data is not available yet but this should be available in the next year				Data available in Oct 2006
	Achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	Suffolk	Data is not available yet but this should be available in the next year				Data available in Oct 2006
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Will it help deliver targets and action for habitats and species within the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan?							
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	BDC	Data is not available yet but this should be available in the next year				Data available in Oct 2006
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	Suffolk	Data is not available yet but this should be available in the next year				Data available in Oct 2006
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it help deliver targets and action for habitats and species within the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan?							
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (SWT)	BDC	Habitat Action Plan Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland total 1 Condition – 1 (100%) Reason N/T Ponds total 1 Condition – 1 (100%) Reason N/T Species Action Plan Bats known roosts N/A Bats potential roosts total 26 Survey prior to decision – 26 (100%) Condition – 26 (100%) Reason – N/T Great Crested Newts N/A [Suffolk Wildlife Trust]	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.	Number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to planning decisions has increased since 2001/2.		☹ Data limited but number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to potential bat roosts has increased.
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (SWT)	Suffolk	Habitat Action Plan Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland total 1 Safeguarding Condition – 1 (100%) Reason for refusal – N/T Ponds total 17 Safeguarding Condition – 2 (12%) Reason for refusal – 1 (6%) Species Action Plan Bats all roosts total 321 Survey prior to decision – 41 (13%) Safeguarding Condition – 153 (48%) Reason for Refusal – 2 (1%) Great Crested Newts total 19 Survey prior to decision – 1 (5%)	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.	Number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to planning decisions have increased since 2001/2.		☹ Data limited but number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to bat roosts have increased.



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			Safeguarding Condition – 5 (26%) Reason for refusal – 0 (0%) [Suffolk Wildlife Trust]				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it help to reverse the national decline in farmland birds?							
ME	Bird survey results (BTO/RSPB)	BDC		The survey sample size for Babergh is too small to provide a sound basis for a reliable conclusion. 2006			
ME	Bird survey results (BTO/RSPB)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (SSAG)	BDC	2009 Grade 1 97 Grade 11* 230 Grade 11 3586 Total 3913 Buildings at Risk in 2009 18 This includes both locally identified buildings and English Heritage's list.	Grade 1 97 Grade 11* 230 Grade 11 3588 Total 3915 Year 2007 Buildings at Risk in 2006 24 (0.6%) This includes both locally identified buildings and English Heritage's list. Over the last 2 years 8 buildings have been removed from the buildings at risk register. (2006) Grade 1 88 Grade 11* 219 Grade 11 3403 Total 3710 Buildings at Risk in 2003 11 (0.3%) 2 nd highest number of LBs in Suffolk. No target.	Total LBs in 1995 was 3673, increasing to 3709 as of 2003. Reveals a gradual increase over time. % at risk has remained fairly constant and is within target.		☺ The increasing number of listed buildings is positive and the 2006 target for buildings at risk has been met.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
				Lowest percentage of Buildings at Risk in Suffolk. Suffolk target is 0.7% by 2006.			
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (SSAG)	Suffolk	Grade 1 404 Grade 11* 867 Grade 11 15,184 Total 16,446 Buildings at Risk in 2003: 134 (0.8%)	No target Just above the county target of 0.7% by 2006.	MSDC did not start reporting 'buildings' as opposed to 'listing entries' until 2003 therefore it is difficult to assess trends. However, taking into account the approximate difference in the figures for MSDC, and that no district or borough has shown a decrease in the number of LBs, in Suffolk the general trend has been a gradual increase in LBs since 1995. The overall number of listed building increased by 9 over the last financial year.		☺ Number of listed buildings has increased gradually since 1995. Number at risk has decreased this year and is moving towards the 2006 target.
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (SSAG)	BDC	AONB (Ha) 9191 Special Landscape area (Ha) 19764 National designated historic parkland (Ha) <u>229.0</u> <i>(5 parks)</i> County designated historic parkland (Ha) <u>Not applicable</u> 2004/05	To ensure that 100% of historic parks and gardens are maintained and enhanced.	Overall drop in National Designated Parkland by 564.8 Ha since 2001, although number of parks has increased by one.		☹ Not measured annually. Number of parks has increased but area designated has dropped.
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (SSAG)	Suffolk					

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG)	BDC	28 CAs (1816 ha) 2006 4 Article 4 directions	Largest hectareage in Suffolk. 3 rd highest number in Suffolk. No target. Sudbury CA has been extended.	Number remained constant since 1996. Since monitoring in 2000, the number of Article 4 directions has remained fairly constant. Article 4 for Glemsford covers approx 400 properties.		☺ The number and area covered by Conservation Areas helps safeguard the quality of the environment of the district.
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG)	Suffolk	170 CAs (6320 ha) 22 Article 4 Directions (covering approx 6934 properties)	No target.	157 in 1996 163 in 2001 165 in 2002 168 in 2003 At start of monitoring in 2000, 21 Article 4 Directions covering approx 7153 properties)		☺ The increasing number of conservation areas each year is positive. Data on number of properties covered by Article 4s is not complete but is improving. Improved accuracy has result in a reduced number.
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG)	BDC	5 Appraisals as of 04 18% of all conservation areas 1 Appraisal completed within the last 5 years. 2006 1 enhancement schemes completed 03/04 2 enhancement schemes completed 04/05 2 enhancement schemes completed 05/06	2 nd lowest percentage coverage in Suffolk. No target. Similar to other Suffolk Authorities. No target.	Increase of 2 since 1996. 8 schemes completed in 1995/96 3 in 1996/97 3 in 1997/98 3 in 1998/99 1 in 1999/00 1 in 2000/01 0 in 2001/02 0 in 2002/03 Total 24 - downward trend		☺ Steady progress

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG)	Suffolk	56 Appraisals 33% of conservation areas 7 enhancement schemes completed 03/04 6 in SCDC and 1 in BDC	No target. No target.	29 completed since the baseline figure of 24 in 1996. 53 as of 2003 27 schemes completed in 1995/96 21 in 1996/97 16 in 1997/98 9 in 1998/99 11 in 1999/00 9 in 2000/01 1 in 2001/02 0 in 2002/03 Total 101 incl. 03/04 - downward trend		☹ Slow progress. Number of schemes completed shows downward trend to 0 in 2002/3 but a significant increase in 2003/04, albeit primarily down to SCDC. Monitoring of enhancement schemes needs revisiting.
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of archaeological value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG)	BDC	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	Figure has been 0 for all years since 1997-8		☺ None damaged since at least 1997-8
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	1997-8: 0 1998-9: 2 1999-0: 0 2000-1: 1 (+1, SCDC, see above) 2001-2: 0 2002-3 0 (+1, SCDC, see above) Figure is 0 for all years apart from 1998-9 and 2000-1. Figures are so low that this cannot count as a proper 'trend'		☺ No SAMs have been damaged since 2000-1

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of archaeological value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Planning permissions affecting known or potential archaeological sites (SSAG)	BDC	2003-4: 2	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1998-9: 1 1999-0: 0 2000-1: 0 2001-2: 0 2002-3: 0	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	☺ This is largely dependent on the location of development, but the 2003-4 figure is the highest since the start of <i>Suffolk's Environment</i>
SSAG	Number of applications affecting no known archaeological site but judged of high potential and approved with conditions requiring prior excavation or recording during development (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003-4: 26	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1997-8: 6 1998-9: 11 1999-0: 17 2000-1: 22 2001-2: 11 2002-3: 1	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	☺ This is triggered only rarely, for few SCC applications affect areas of high archaeological potential
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of geological value in both urban and rural areas?							
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (EN)	BDC	2003/04 baseline Bobbishole, Belstead 1.8ha on citation (www.english-nature.org.uk)	No target	Notified under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act in 1987. No change since then.		☺ No loss
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (EN)	Suffolk	2003/04 baseline 29 sites 21484.849ha (includes parts of Breckland forest and Thetford Heaths in Norfolk) (www.english-nature.org.uk)	No target	All notified under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act prior to 2000, apart from Thetford Heaths (15 Nov 2000). No change since 2000.		☺ No loss
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of geological value in both urban and rural areas?							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (EN)	BDC	Favourable 1.67 Ha from English Nature GIS measurement 2006.				☺ Favourable condition
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (EN)	Suffolk	Favourable 70.31 Ha Unfavourable No Change 0.33 Ha Unfavourable Declining 1.25 Ha Total 71.89 Ha				☺ Favourable condition for most sites
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?							
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG)	BDC	Net completions on PDL 2005/6: 147 (= 67.7 % of total completions) Net completions on PDL 2004/5: 80 (= 42.7% of total completions) Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 116 (= 54.7% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk.	% PDL completions in 2006 is higher than recorded in previous year, but indicator has fluctuated within range 39% to 65%, 1999/0 to 2002/3.		☹ Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG)	Suffolk	Net completions on PDL 2004/5: 1567 (= 63.0% of total completions) Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 1483 (= 53.6% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Suffolk meets regional target 2002/3.	% PDL has varied between 42%-63% since 1998/9. This year recorded the highest % since 1998/9 and % has increased for past 3 years.		☺ Suffolk total is currently above the regional target, and highest since 1998/9. However the indicator fluctuates, and % of completions on PDL has varied year on year.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?							
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG)	BDC	Net commitments on PDL 2005/6: 1,455 (= 40 % of total commitments) Net commitments on PDL 2004/5: 1,395 (= 42.2% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 1,478 (= 44.7% of total commitments)	Net commitments on PDL not recorded in previous years.		☹ Lower than last year, but indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG)	Suffolk	Net commitments on PDL 2004/5: 13,294 (= 49.3% of total commitments) Excludes St Edmundsbury Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 13,790 (= 50.2% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Suffolk meets regional target, 2002/3, for first time since mid 1999.	Net commitments on PDL for Suffolk as a whole showed minimal change compared to last year (50.1%) % PDL has risen from values of 34% and 33% recorded in mid 1999 and 2000 (NB data was not available for all authorities in these years).		☹ Suffolk total nearly meets the regional target. However the situation varies considerably between districts.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?							
HH	Number of vacant dwellings	BDC	2005: 76 uninhabitable, 325 long term empty and 428 2 nd homes Number of long-term vacant dwellings (empty more than 6 months) (source – Babergh Council Tax Records)	2004: 37 uninhabitable 343 long term empty and 537 2 nd homes 2003: 68 uninhabitable 979 long term empty or 2 nd homes 2002: 61 uninhabitable 898 long term empty or 2 nd homes 2001: 64 uninhabitable 894 long term empty or 2 nd homes 2000: 38 uninhabitable 868 long term empty or 2 nd homes	The number of uninhabitable dwellings fluctuates and it is difficult to detect a trend. There appears to be a steady decline in the number of long term empty dwellings over the last 3 years.		☹/☺ Difficult to discern a trend for the uninhabitable data, however there has been a decline in recent years of the number of long term empty and second homes.
HH	Number of vacant dwellings	Suffolk	Number of long-term vacant dwellings 2004 – 3067		No trend data available from this source		☹ No trend data.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and character of the countryside?							
SSAG	Landscape Character Areas and the influence of planning (SSAG)	BDC	Babergh is part of 2 landscape character areas Suffolk Coastal and the South Suffolk and North Essex Claylands.	The areas have been resurveyed in 2005 and there has been an improvement in these two areas, with an increase in the quantity of important features	These character areas are larger than the area of the district. The full details of the changes are contained in 2005		☺ There has been an improvement in key landscape features affecting the district.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					Suffolk's Environment produced by SCC		
SSAG	Landscape Character Areas and the influence of planning (SSAG)	Suffolk	Original survey 1999. Reports % land use (6 categories), km length of linear features (4 types) and number of point features (3 types) for each of the 7 landscape character areas in Suffolk: Breckland, East Anglia Chalk, High Suffolk Claylands, Broadlands, Fens, South Suffolk Claylands, Suffolk Coast and Heaths	To ensure that the character areas in Suffolk preserve their distinctive features.	Only 2 areas have been resurveyed, in 2001. Most significant change observed is more use of fencing as a boundary treatment, rather than traditional hedging. In 2005 4 areas resurveyed so no complete picture.		☺/☹ Not measured annually. Limited data available so far, so trends cannot be ascertained, but part of the County has been resurveyed in 2005 with significant improvements in 4 of the 7 landscape character areas.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and character of the countryside?							
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons	BDC	No data				Information not available yet.
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons	Suffolk	No data				Information not available yet.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and character of the countryside?							
HH	Area of designated landscapes - AONB, Environmentally Sensitive Areas (CA/DEFRA)	BDC	ESA's are now joined with Countryside Stewardship Schemes. CSS area – 1341 ha 2006 ESA area – 4098 ha 2006 CSS area – 1172 ha 2004 ESA area – 3270 ha 2004 AONB – 9,191.20 ha 2004	No target.	2002/3 9487 ha 2001 9172 ha 1996 9172 ha		☺ There has been an increase in area since 2004

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
HH	Area of designated landscapes - AONB, Environmentally Sensitive Areas (CA/DEFRA)	Suffolk total	ESA's are now joined with Countryside Stewardship Schemes. CSS area – 11,191 ha 2006 ESA area – 25,380 ha 2006 CSS area – 9,388 ha 2004 ESA area – 21,179 ha 2004 AONB – 46220.57 ha 2004	No target	2002/3 46516 ha 2001 46126 ha 1996 46126 ha		☺ There has been an increase in area since 2004
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and character of the countryside?							
HH	Number of Environmentally Sensitive Area / Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (DEFRA)	BDC	ESA's 167 in 2006 CSS's 78 in 2006 ELS's 151 in 2006	No Target ESA's 168 in 2004 CSS's 83 in 2004 ELS's 55 in 2005	The CSS and ESA schemes are now not accepting new applicants so they will diminish over time as the agreements expire.		☺ There has been an increase in the number of schemes for all schemes overall and total area since 2002/3
HH	Number of Environmentally Sensitive Area / Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (DEFRA)	Suffolk	ESA's 708 in 2006 CSS's 408 in 2006 ELS's 767 in 2006 HLS's 3 in 2006	No Target ESA's 726 in 2004 CSS's 430 in 2004 ELS's 272 in 2005	The CSS and ESA schemes are now not accepting new applicants so they will diminish over time as the agreements expire.		☺ There has been an increase in the number of schemes and area since 2002/3
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and character of the countryside?							
HH	Light pollution / tranquil areas? CPRE	BDC	No data		The data source is not detailed enough to see Babergh as a separate area.		
HH	Light pollution / tranquil areas? CPRE	Suffolk	% of area in each of the 5 light pollution bands Dark Blue 0-1.70 Blue 1.71-50 Light blue – 50.01-150 Yellow – 150.01-240 Red 240.01-255		2000 Dark Blue – 7% Blue – 25% Light Blue – 59% Yellow – 8% Red – 1%		☹ Overall levels of Light pollution has increased.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
			(Source CPRE)		1993 Dark Blue – 5% Blue – 48% Light Blue – 40% Yellow – 7% Red - 1%		
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and character of the countryside?							
HH	Number of planning applications refused for reasons due to poor design	BDC	This is a difficult Indicator as design may be one of several reasons.				This is not information recorded at the moment and it is probably not a good indicator as there may be other reasons for refusal.
HH	Number of planning applications refused for reasons due to poor design	Suffolk	This is a difficult Indicator as design may be one of several reasons.				This is not information recorded at the moment and it is probably not a good indicator as there may be other reasons for refusal.

A.3 Economic baseline data

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	BDC	2005/06; 5801 sq m (B1-B8) 2004/05; 6323 sq m (B1-B8) 2003/04; 2048 sq m (B1-B8)	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	There has been a recent increase in the take up of business floorspace but it can vary from year to year depending on the size of units available and what is completed.		☺ New business floorspace is being built.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	Suffolk	Too much data missing to calculate a meaningful county total.	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too much data missing to evaluate a meaningful county trend.		☹ Gaps in information means overall and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	BDC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2006(m²) 0.0, 2004 (m²) Not recorded Outstanding permissions March 2006 (m²) 0.0 on PDL, March 2004 on PDL (m²) Not recorded Total outstanding allocations at March 2006 (Ha) 32.9, 2004 (Ha) 9 Outstanding allocations at March 2006 on PDL (Ha) 24, 2004 on PDL (Ha) 0	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		☺ Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make, but large areas of land have been allocated through the Local Plan process.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	BDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2006(m²) 26,715, 2004 (m²) 33000 Outstanding permissions March 2006 (m²) 9,256 on PDL, 2004 on PDL (m²) 14017 Total outstanding allocations at March 2006 (Ha) 36.2, 2004 (Ha) 1.8 Outstanding allocations at March 2006 (Ha) 14.12, 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1.4	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		☺ Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make, but large areas of land have been allocated through the Local Plan process.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	Suffolk	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m²) Data missing from 3 authorities Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m²) Data missing from 3 authorities Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) Total 147.64 (excluding MSDC) Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) Total 51.86 (excluding MSDC)	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too many values missing this year to look at county trends in outstanding permissions. Outstanding land allocations (total and on PDL) have both decreased from March 2003.		☹ Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
AMcC	Percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the	BDC	2004: 0.15%	There were 285 registrations and 280 deregistrations, with 3420 VAT registered companies. 2003: 0.9% 2002: 1.0%			☹ Low and decreasing rate of business formation

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	area (AC voluntary QOL / SDA / Suffolk Observatory)			2001: 0.9%			
AMcC	Percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (AC voluntary QOL / SDA / Suffolk Observatory)	Suffolk	2004: 0.35%	2003: 1.2% 2002: 1.6% 2001: 0.7%			⊗ Low and decreasing rate of business formation
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
AMcC	Change in number of businesses paying business rates (NNDR)	BDC	2005(Dec): 2820 business premises Change from previous year: +39 Vacant 2005: 352 2006: 341	2004: 2781 Change: +84 2003: 2697 Change: +12 2002: 2685 Vacant: 2004; 369, 2003: 322 2002: 310 The normal range for vacant premises is 330 to 360 with current figure at the lower end of the range. A property may be vacant for a few days or several years.			⊕ Steady increase in the number of business units
AMcC	Change in number of businesses paying business rates (NNDR)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve the resilience of business and the economy?							
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG)	BDC	% all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 2.8 energy and water – 1.3 manufacturing 18.2 construction 5.2 distribution, hotels and restaurants 26.5 transport 3.7	No specific target % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 2.3 energy and water - manufacturing 15.9 construction 12.1 distribution, hotels and restaurants	Comments given on countywide basis only. Source- ONS - Local Area Labour Force Survey [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]		⊕ Baseline Data



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
			banking, finance and insurance 18.6 public admin., 20.3 other services 9.2 total services 69 (Suffolk Observatory 2006)	12.3 transport and communications 8.9 banking, finance and insurance 9.1 public admin., education and health 29.4 other services 9.2 total services 69			
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG)	Suffolk	(2005) % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 2.5 energy and water 1.2 manufacturing 16.3 construction 8 distribution, hotels and restaurants 19.4 transport and communications 9.9 banking, finance and insurance 12.3 public admin., education and health 25.1 other services 5 total services 71.8 2006 Suffolk Observatory : % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 0.5 energy 0.9 manufacturing 12.6 construction 5.5 distribution, hotels and restaurants 24.7 transport 8.1 banking, finance and insurance 15.9 Public admin. 26.4 other 5.4 total services 72.4	No specific target <u>East of England</u> % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 1.6 energy and water 0.7 manufacturing 14.1 construction 8.2 distribution, hotels and restaurants 19.9 transport and communications 7.2 banking, finance and insurance 17.6 public admin., education and health 24.6 other services 6 total services 75.3 <u>Great Britain</u> % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 1.2 energy and water 1 manufacturing 14.3 construction 7.5 distribution, hotels and restaurants 20.1 transport and communications 6.8 banking, finance and insurance 15.6 public admin., education and health 27.1 other services 6.1 total services 75.7 Source- ONS [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]	As an essentially contextual indicator, the scope for informative commentary here is limited. However, this is useful as a possible measure of diversity in the local employment base. Caution is needed in making comparisons due to uncertainties in continuity of data. Leaving aside what generally seem to be relatively minor fluctuations, trends include an apparent large decline in the distribution, hotels and restaurants employment sector (from 28.2% to 19.4%). The public admin. /education & health sector shows an apparent rise from 21.6% to 25.1%, as the 2 nd largest change.		⊕ Baseline Data
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve the resilience of business and the economy?							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (AMR)	BDC	Agriculture 405 Production 285 Construction 405 Motor Trades 125 Wholesale 210 Retail 265 Hotels and catering 185 Transport 120 Post & Telecoms 20 Finance 15 Property & Business Services 815 Education 15 Health 20 Public Admin & Other Services 195 Neighbourhood Statistics 2007	Agriculture 400 13% Production 320 10.4% Construction 395 12.8% Motor Trades 130 4.2% Wholesale 205 6.7% Retail 285 9.2% Hotels and catering 185 6% Transport 135 4.4% Post & Telecoms 15 0.5% Finance 20 0.7% Property & Business Services 750 24.4% Education 15 0.5% Health 15 0.5% Public Admin & Other Services 215 6.9% Neighbourhood Statistics 2004			☹ Baseline Data, setting contextual framework although over time will show changes.
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (AMR)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve the resilience of business and the economy?							
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (AMR)	BDC	0 – 4 Persons 2,930 74.8% 5 – 24 Persons 760 19.4% 25 – 199 Persons 228 5.8% 200 + Persons 0 0% Suffolk Observatory 2006	0 – 4 Persons 2405 78.1% 5 – 9 Persons 390 12.7% 10 – 19 Persons 150 4.9% 20 + Persons 135 4.4% Neighbourhood Statistics 2005			☺ Steady increase in the number of businesses
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (AMR)	Suffolk	0 – 4 Persons 20,532 69.7% 5 – 24 Persons 6815 23.1% 25 – 199 Persons 1968 6.7% 200 + Persons 151 0.5% Suffolk Observatory 2006				☹ Baseline Data, setting contextual frame work although over time will show changes
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it promote growth in key sectors?							
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local	BDC					

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	authority to specify key sectors) (SSAG / AMR)						
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local authority to specify key sectors) (SSAG / AMR)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve economic performance in advantaged and disadvantaged areas?							
AMcC	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (local agents)	BDC	2003/6 Office: £ 6.00 to £ 9.00 per sq ft There is limited demand for offices at present (2006) Industrial: £ 3 to £ 6.50 per sq ft There is buoyant demand for industrial premises, particularly for purchase and very few are vacant.		The local market has only seen a slight increase in rents over the last 3 years		⊖ Baseline Data, setting contextual frame work
AMcC	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (local agents)	Suffolk	2003/6 Office: £ 6.50 to £ 14.00 per sq ft Industrial: £ 3 to £ 6.00 per sq ft	There is a wide range of premises available in Suffolk in different locations and on a variety of terms.	The local market has only seen a slight increase in rents over the last 3 years		⊖ Baseline Data, setting contextual frame work
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it encourage rural diversification?							
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG)	BDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2006(m²) 26,715, 2004 (m²) 33000 Outstanding permissions March 2006 (m²) 9,256 on PDL, March 2004 on PDL (m²) 14017 Total outstanding allocations at March 2006 (Ha) 36.2, 2004 (Ha) 1.8 Outstanding allocations at March 2006 on PDL (Ha) 14.12, 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1.4	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		⊕ Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make, but large areas of land have been allocated through the Local Plan process.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG)	Suffolk (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m ²) Data missing from 3 authorities Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m ²) Data missing from 3 authorities Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) Total 147.64 (excluding MSDC) Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) Total 51.86 (excluding MSDC)	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too many values missing this year to look at county trends in outstanding permissions. Outstanding land allocations (total and on PDL) have both decreased from March 2003.		⊖ Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it encourage rural diversification?							
AMcC	Planning consents for B1, B2 and B8 in rural areas (part of employment land availability for regional level). Could be expanded to include additional uses such as retail (LAs)	BDC	2005: 31,591 sq m 2006: 26,715 sq m	Limited information makes time series comparisons difficult. However when this information is considered along with the new allocations then this must be considered as beneficial for the economy of the district.			⊕ Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make, but there is a good supply of sites in the form of allocations and consents.
AMcC	Planning consents for B1, B2 and B8 in rural areas (part of employment land availability for regional level). Could be expanded to include additional uses such as retail (LAs)	Suffolk	2005: 292,020 sq m				⊖ Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To revitalise town centres							
Will it increase the range of employment opportunities, shops and services available in town centres?							
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG)	BDC	2006/07 A1 uses 55% (Hadleigh = 54% Sudbury = 55%) 2006 A1 uses 53.5% (Hadleigh = 50% Sudbury = 58%)	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre. Lowest % of districts to return data in 2003/4.	53.5% A1 uses 2004/05 52% A1 uses, 2003/4 61.0% A1 uses, 2002/3	A1 uses match the national average in Hadleigh, and have decreased in both towns. Decrease needs to	⊖ Relatively low A1 uses and decreasing trend. Decrease needs to be monitored and addressed. Local authorities will continue to come under

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					61.5% A1 uses, 2001/2. 9.5% decrease since 2001/2.	be monitored and addressed.	pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises.
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG)	Suffolk	55% A1 uses, 2003/4	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre. There is an above average number of A1 units in Suffolk's town centres (55%).	62.9% A1 uses, 2002/3 62.3% A1 uses, 2001/2 7% decrease since 2001/2, following a slight increase last year.	Average % of A1 uses across county has decreased this year, though is still above national average. A number of individual towns are below it, and should be monitored.	⊕/⊖ County total is still above average but has decreased this year. A number of towns are below national average. Local authorities will continue to come under pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises.
Headline Objective: To revitalise town centres							
Will it decrease the number of vacant units in town centres?							
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG)	BDC	7% vacant 2006/07 7.5% vacant 2005/6 5% vacant 2003/4	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%) 2 nd lowest % of districts to return data in 2003/4.	7.1% vacant 2002/3 Decreased by 2% from 03 to 04, but has increased again in 2005/06		⊕ Relatively low percentage. The low percentage is some indication of healthy town centres
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG)	Suffolk	6% vacant 2002/3	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%)	6.7% vacant 2002/3 Small decrease since last year of less than 1%.		⊕ Overall the % of vacant units is low and decreasing. The low percentage is some indication of healthy town centres, with Brandon and Debenham the main concerns.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce commuting?							
AMcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census). Can also look at import/export of workers in plan	BDC	< 2 km: 20% 2-5 km: 12.4% 5 – 10 km: 13.3 10 – 20 km: 18.7% 20 – 30 km: 7.2% 30 – 40 km: 2.3% 40 – 60 km: 2%	Average distance travelled to work = 17.45 km Babergh DC 2006 travel to work survey Less than 1 mile: 11.19% 1-3 miles: 14.69% 3-5 miles: 5.59%	No trend data, Babergh travel to work survey may well not be representative of the district.		⊕ Baseline Data



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	area.		>60 km: 6% Census 2001	5-10 miles: 15.38% 10-20 miles: 37.76% over 20 miles; 15.38%			
AMcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census). Can also look at import/export of workers in plan area.	Suffolk	SCC 2006 travel to work survey, all surveys :- Less than 1 mile: 5.7% 1-3 miles: 19.8% 3-5 miles: 15.2% 5-10 miles: 23.5% 10-20 miles: 21.5% over 20 miles; 14.3%				☹ Baseline Data
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce commuting?							
AMcC	Planning consents for B1, B2 and B8 in urban areas (part of employment land availability for regional level). Could be expanded to include additional uses such as retail (LAs)	BDC	Urban is taken as the EERA definition of over 25,000 population. So from an EERA monitoring point of view there are no planning consents in or adjacent to urban areas in Babergh				
AMcC	Planning consents for B1, B2 and B8 in urban areas (part of employment land availability for regional level). Could be expanded to include additional uses such as retail (LAs)	Suffolk	At least 166,000 sq m in 2005	This does not include all authorities.			☹ Baseline Data
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce commuting?							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home (Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home indicate trends - this is subset of the above indicator plus rural working from home)	BDC	2001: 4888 = 12.13%				☹ Baseline Data, it is difficult to obtain similar data to establish a trend.
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home (Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home indicate trends - this is subset of the above indicator plus rural working from home)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it improve accessibility to work by public transport, walking and cycling?							
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG)	BDC	2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 0	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	Not recorded in previous years.		☹ Historical data for this indicator is limited (few if any submissions annually) and therefore trends are difficult to discern.
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 3 (2003/4 total based on SCDC and WDC only.)	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	2002/3 (2001/2) Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 (0) 2002/3 (2001/2) Approvals where		☹ Historical data for this indicator is limited (few if any submissions annually) and therefore trends are difficult to discern.

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					travel plan was condition of development: 3 (2)		
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it improve accessibility to work by public transport, walking and cycling?							
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	BDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.3% Babergh DC employees 2005: 18.24 % 2006: 18.18 % Does not include those working at home	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	No other comparable data recorded.		☹ No trend information.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	Suffolk	% sustainable 2001 Census: 21.2% SCC surveys 2005: 23.41 % 2006: 26.19% Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2004: 28.0%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. 2004: 25.24 % SCC sample survey	Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2003: 25.2% No other comparable data recorded.		☹/☹ Limited trend information. An increase has been recorded in use of sustainable modes in sample surveys carried out by Suffolk CC but is this representative of the wider population?
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce journey times between key employment areas and key transport interchanges?							
AMcC	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	BDC					
AMcC	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it increase the proportion of freight transported by rail or other sustainable modes?							
AMcC	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Port Authorities / AMR)	BDC	22% from Felixstowe but 0% from Harwich This represents 300,000 containers per annum.				☹ Baseline Data



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
AMcC	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Port Authorities / AMR)	Suffolk	22% from Felixstowe but 0% from Harwich				☹ Baseline Data
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it increase the consumption of locally produced food and goods?							
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (LAs)	BDC	4 Farmers Markets 5 Farm shops	These may encourage the sale of farm produce locally but can be in unsustainable locations.			☹ No trend information.
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (LAs)	Suffolk					☹ No information.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it increase the consumption of locally produced food and goods?							
AMcC	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (contact supermarkets directly)	BDC					No data source
AMcC	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (contact supermarkets directly)	Suffolk					No data source
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it encourage indigenous business?							

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
AMcC	Number of enquiries to business advice services (business link, LAs)	BDC	2006 approx 30 per quarter for small businesses		Not monitored in detail so it is difficult to get a trend.		☹ No trend information.
AMcC	Number of enquiries to business advice services (business link, LAs)	Suffolk	2006 approx 320 per month				☹ No trend information.
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it encourage indigenous business?							
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Suffolk for managed workspaces? Wider source?)	BDC	2006: 245 registrations and 240 deregistrations Net change: 5 2004: 285 registrations and 280 deregistrations Net change: 5	2003: 300 registrations and 270 deregistrations. Net change: 30 2002: 280 registrations and 245 deregistrations. Net change: 35 2001: 255 registrations and 225 deregistrations. Net change: 30	This indicator is for VAT registrations and does not pick up companies below £50,000 turnover or those who have not voluntarily registered, but is an indicator of new companies forming. The formation rates are:- 2004: 8.3, 2003: 8.7, 2002: 8.2, 2001: 7.6		⊗ Relatively low formation rates for new companies and the net change is at a 3 or 4 year low.
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Suffolk for managed workspaces? Wider source?)	Suffolk	2006: 1885 registrations and 1630 deregistrations Net change: 255 2004: 2045 registrations and 1965 deregistrations Net change: 80	2003: 2130 registrations and 1860 deregistrations. Net change: 270 2002: 2075 registrations and 1720 deregistrations. Net change: 355 2001: 1850 registrations and 1695 deregistrations. Net change: 155	The formation rates are:- 2004: 8.9, 2003: 9.3, 2002: 9.1, 2001: 8.3		☹ Limited trend information and these start up rates are lower than the regional or national average.
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it encourage inward investment?							
AMcC	Number of enquiries to Suffolk Development Agency / LA / Suffolk	BDC	566 Inquiries to Suffolk Development Agency in the first half of 2006				

Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
AMcC	Number of enquiries to Suffolk Development Agency / LA / Suffolk	Suffolk	6151 Inquiries to Suffolk Development Agency in the first half of 2006				
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it make land available for business development?							
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	BDC	69.1 ha 2006	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns			☺ There is a good range of planning consents and with the new local plan there are new land allocations.
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	Suffolk	Too much data missing to calculate a meaningful county total.	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too much data missing to evaluate a meaningful county trend.		☹ Gaps in information means overall and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it make land available for business development?							
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	BDC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m ²) Not recorded Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m ²) Not recorded Total outstanding allocations at March 2006: (Ha) 32.9, 2004 (Ha) 9 Outstanding allocations at March 2006 on PDL (Ha) 24, 2004 on PDL (Ha) 0	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		☺ There is a good range of planning consents and with the new local plan there are new land allocations.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	BDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m ²) 33000 2006 (m²) 26,715 Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m ²) 14017 2006 (m²) 9256 Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) 1.8 2006 (Ha) 36.2 Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	There is still a good supply of employment consents and allocations have increased		☺ There is a good range of planning consents and with the new local plan there are new land allocations.



Collected	Indicator	Scale	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
			(Ha) 1.4 2006 (Ha) 14.2				
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	Suffolk	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m ²) Data missing from 3 authorities Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m ²) Data missing from 3 authorities Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) Total 147.64 (excluding MSDC) Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) Total 51.86 (excluding MSDC)	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too many values missing this year to look at county trends in outstanding permissions. Outstanding land allocations (total and on PDL) have both decreased from March 2003.		☹ Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.



Appendix B - List of documents produced by SSAG for use of Suffolk Authorities in producing their Scoping Reports for the Sustainability Appraisal of LDFs

Table B.1 - Documents produced by SSAG

Document	Purpose	Status	Comments
Consultation document for draft SA framework	Prepared for informal consultation	Complete	
Consultation responses following informal consultation and subsequent changes to the SA framework	To demonstrate early consultation and expert input in developing the SA framework.	Complete	
Context Review of other plans, programmes and objectives (scoping of documents)	To inform the development and content of DPDs and the SA framework.	Still two or three documents to be scoped otherwise complete	Two documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoping of documents • List of documents scoped
Baseline data schedule	To provide a baseline of information and trends where appropriate to assist in characterising the DPD area and for monitoring of potential significant effects.	Complete List of indicators to be developed further by SSAG to be compiled	Existing targets included as appropriate. Some gaps will need to be filled by individual Council's. Regional and national comparators not always included.
Sustainability Framework comprising Objectives, Sub Objectives and Indicators	To provide a framework for the appraisal of policies and proposals.	Complete	
Defining objectives schedule	Early consideration of key objectives to be included.	Complete	
Testing the compatibility of SA objectives	To identify where there is 'possible conflict' between objectives so they can be revised where appropriate or the need to mitigate can be highlighted.	Complete	There are two documents: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a large spreadsheet that includes SSAG's reasoning 2. an A4 summary.
Suggested common format for Scoping Reports	As an aid to coming to a view on the most appropriate format. To assist in providing some level of consistency across Suffolk.	Complete	
Documentation of effects	This template was derived from the draft SA guidance to provide an example of how the SA framework could be used to document the appraising of a plan policy.	SSAG discussed and amendments to be made to layout and summary template to be produced.	There are two documents: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. documentation of effects template 2. documentation of effects summary template (the public version)

Appendix C - Early indicators and objectives for the SA framework produced by SSAG



C.1 Defining Core SA Objectives for Suffolk

Table C.1 - Defining Core SA Objectives for Suffolk

SA cons paper Sept 04 – Example objectives (guidance for SEA/SA)	SEA Directive Topics	Sustainable Development Framework for East of England October 2001	RSS14 Scoping Report 17/9/04	Suffolk's Environment Objectives as at October 04 (in brackets 5 yr review objective which may be better)	Sustainability issues identified	Proposed SA Objectives
Social						
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Population and human health	To achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society and fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas in the region	Share access to services and benefits of prosperity fairly		As a whole the region is doing well economically but social deprivation is high in some areas, Future development should not increase disparities (RSS14) There are pockets of severe deprivation (SDF)	To reduce poverty and social exclusion
To improve health of the population overall					Though generally good, there are pockets of poor health and an ageing population (SDF) Life expectancy is higher than UK average (SDF)	To improve the health of the population overall
To improve the education and skills of the population overall					Skills and knowledge base seems to be at risk of falling short of that needed for unsustainable growth (SDF)	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall
To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home				<p>To ensure that housing provision is affordable and does not exclude certain income groups</p> <p>To ensure an adequate supply of new housing to achieve both the overall Structure Plan target and the quotas set for individual authorities</p> <p>To ensure there is an adequate supply of land to meet Structure Plan requirements</p> <p>To plan to meet the housing requirements of the whole</p>		To meet the housing requirements of the whole community



				community by providing housing opportunities and choice, including a mix in the size, type and tenure of housing in sustainable locations		
To reduce anti-social activity				To reduce both crime and the fear of crime	Although levels of crime are relatively low, the perception is different (SDF)	To reduce crime and anti-social activity
To encourage a sense of community identity and welfare						To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation
To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment				To ensure that all in Suffolk who are able to work can participate in the workplace through the maintenance and expansion of the labour market	Age discrimination ignores the impact of demographic change (SDF) Some areas have very high unemployment rates (SDF)	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment
To improve the quality of where people live					Loss of public open space (RSS14)	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation
To improve accessibility to essential services and facilities				(To maintain and enhance the range, quality and accessibility of facilities for formal and informal recreation) ?	Poor access to services in rural areas. Community vibrancy is low for small communities (RSS14)	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population
To improve accessibility for those most in need						To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population
Environmental						
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Water and soil			To promote and provide for walking, cycling, park and ride and public transport use as alternative modes of travel and reduce the need to rely on the private motor vehicle	High car dependency and strains on public transport infrastructure. Bus service availability relatively poor. High car use impacts on urban form and character, and congestion. (RSS14) Increasing trend towards air travel, leading to increased noise, air pollution and airport growth (RSS14) Mass transportation is a key unsustainable	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment



					trend (SDF)	
To improve water quality				To reduce pollution and improve water quality in Suffolk's rivers and estuaries (To maintain and, where possible, enhance water resources / quality)	Inefficient use and pollution of water (SDF) Quality of river in rivers is of concern (SDF)	To improve water and air quality
To improve air quality	Air			To ensure that the quality of air in Suffolk is as high as is practicable	Air quality problems, especially on main transport routes, exacerbated by increasing vehicle use (RSS14) Air quality is generally good, but with exceptions at some times of year in some areas (SDF)	To improve water and air quality
To maintain and enhance biodiversity, flora and fauna	Biodiversity, fauna and flora	To protect and maintain our most valuable regional assets such as designated habitats, landscapes of natural beauty, and our historic built heritage, and to improve the wider environment by means of adequate investment and management	Protect and maintain vulnerable regional asset (natural, built and historic environment)	To protect and enhance biodiversity throughout the county	Historical reductions in biodiversity and (semi-) natural habitats, particularly wetlands. Habitat fragmentation. (RSS14) Increasing tourist pressure on fragile environmental assets (SDF) In some cases biodiversity assets and distinctive landscapes have been reduced to unsustainable levels, and cannot be sustained without increased intervention (SDF)	To conserve and enhance biodiversity
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Material assets	To protect and maintain our most valuable regional assets such as designated habitats, landscapes of natural beauty, and our historic built heritage, and to improve the wider environment by means of adequate investment and management	Protect and maintain vulnerable regional asset (natural, built and historic environment)	To protect and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of Suffolk's landscape To protect and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of the built environment.	Erosion of quality and distinctiveness in the built environment (RSS14) Reduction in tranquillity since 1960s (RSS14) Pressures on landscape character, eg from urbanisation and out of town developments (RSS14) The local character and distinctiveness of settlements and landscape are lost to poorly designed modern development (SDF)	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Cultural heritage and landscape	To protect and maintain our most valuable regional assets such as designated habitats, landscapes of natural beauty, and our historic built heritage, and to improve the wider environment by means of adequate investment and management	Protect and maintain vulnerable regional asset (natural, built and historic environment)	To protect designated areas of the historic environment To protect Suffolk's archaeological interest	Loss of historical assets through major development, bypasses and insensitive development (RSS14) Region has a large number of SAMs at risk, and agricultural practices are often a primary cause (RSS14) Erosion of cultural heritage including historical assets (SDF) Valued historical buildings are at risk of decay, especially historic farm buildings made redundant through changes in agriculture (SDF)	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance
To reduce	Climatic	To reduce our consumption	Reduce	To promote and enable the use	Amount of energy obtained from	To reduce



contributions to climate change	factors	of fossil fuels	greenhouse gas emissions Avoid exploiting global environment	of renewable energy sources (and energy conservation)	renewable sources is low compared to UK average, and potential resources (eg long coastline) (RSS14) Climate change is a key unsustainable trend, linked to continued use of fossil fuels, and greenhouse gas emissions (SDF) High energy production and consumption (SDF)	contributions to climate change
To reduce vulnerability to climate change				To ensure that new development is safe and not exposed unnecessarily to flooding (To locate new development to minimise the risk from flooding and impact of flood risk on existing development)	Risk to homes and habitats from flooding and climate change (RSS14)	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply					Imbalance between water demand and supply. Lack of water will be a constraint to further development and influence water supply for people, habitats and biodiversity. (RSS14) Inefficient use and pollution of water (SDF) Water resources are in under growing pressure and critically scarce at times of drought (SDF)	To reduce water consumption
To minimise the production of waste		To minimise our production of by-products or wastes, aiming for 'closed systems' where possible	Cut waste	To promote and enable best practice on waste management, minimising waste arising through encouraging the reuse, recycling and recovery of waste	Increasing amount of waste produced. Region is also a net importer of waste, mainly from London (RSS14) Unsustainable lifestyle changes are leading to high consumption and waste (SDF) High proportion of waste disposal, rather than re-use, recovery or recycling (SDF)	To reduce waste
To conserve soil resources and quality			Deliver more sustainable use of land	To maximise the development potential of vacant, underused and derelict land and buildings, thus minimising the loss of greenfield land	Impact of intensive agricultural practices on soil quality (nitrogen / nitrates). Region contains 58% of UK's grade 1 and 2 soils and 73% of region is arable. (RSS14) Intensive agricultural production systems are unsustainable (SDF) Inefficient use of the urban fabric and buildings (SDF)	To conserve soil resources and quality
		To avoid using the global environment to underwrite our own unsustainable way of life (e.g. dependence on unsustainably produced and/or transported food imports or timber)			Imports and non-local sourcing of food, manufactured goods and other commodities, that could be sourced locally (SDF)	



		To use natural resources, both finite and renewable, as efficiently as possible, re-use finite resources or recycled alternatives wherever possible	Use natural resources efficiently; re-use, use recycled where possible	To ensure that production of recycled aggregates is maximised each year (To conserve mineral resources in order to meet the long term requirements and ensure restoration to a standard suitable for specific beneficial after use)	Inefficient use of fossil fuels, minerals and raw materials (SDF) Rising demand for resources from lifestyle changes and population growth (SDF) Mineral assets are non-renewable and require wise management (SDF)	To conserve mineral resources
Economic						
To encourage sustained economic growth		To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth	Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth through the establishment, maintenance and expansion of employment uses		To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area
To reduce disparities in economic performance					Economic growth is unevenly distributed and unplanned (SDF)	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area
To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment						To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth						To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth
To enhance the image of the area as a business location						
To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy						



		To deliver more sustainable patterns of location, including employment and housing	Deliver more sustainable location patterns	To locate new development and protect existing services, so as to minimise growth in the length and number of motorised journeys and to maximise use of public transport and other alternatives to the use of private motor vehicles	Rural population increases are putting pressure on biodiversity, transport infrastructure and rural services, exacerbating existing problems. (RSS14)	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment
		To revitalise town centres to promote a return to sustainable urban living	Revitalise town centres to promote return to sustainable living	To protect and improve the vitality and viability of town centres by offering a range of community, shopping and employment opportunities	Town centres continue to be undermined by out of town shopping and business parks (SDF)	To revitalise town centres



C.2 Draft Headline Objectives

Social

1. To improve the health of the population overall
2. To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall
3. To reduce crime and anti-social activity
4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion
5. To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population
6. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment
7. To meet the housing requirements of the whole community
8. To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation

Environmental

9. To improve water and air quality
10. To conserve soil resources and quality
11. To conserve mineral resources
12. To reduce waste
13. To reduce water consumption
14. To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment
15. To reduce contributions to climate change
16. To reduce vulnerability to climatic events
17. To conserve and enhance biodiversity
18. To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance
19. To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscape

Economic

20. To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area
21. To revitalise town centres
22. To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth
23. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment

Appendix D - Responses from early informal consultations regarding common framework for SEA for Suffolk



Responses received from:

1. Dr Richard Rafe, Area Manager, English Nature
2. Dr Simone Bullion, Conservation Officer, Suffolk Wildlife Trust
3. David Palk, Development Manager, Suffolk County Council
4. Tony Rudd, Economic Development, Waveney District Council
5. Alan Wheeler, Regional Planning Consultant, EERA
6. Andrew Hunter, Development Planning Officer, Environment Agency
7. Sarah Jennings, Countryside Strategy Officer, Suffolk County Council



View from Dr Richard Rafe, Area Manager, English Nature in Suffolk

I am aware of the work under the project banner of ‘Suffolk’s Environment – towards sustainable development’. For me, it has been there in the background but we have never really engaged, and I think it has therefore not reached the potential audience or application that it possibly deserves. Nonetheless I am aware that Suffolk Wildlife Trust has had input to this work, and I hope that the Suffolk Environment monitoring has been useful to the local authorities who instigated the work.

I am disappointed that from my perspective this consultation has come ‘out of the blue’ with a very short deadline. The application of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is potentially a very powerful tool and I am pleased to see SCC and SSAG taking a proactive approach to setting SA objectives which can then form a consistent basis for SA of the individual Local Development Plans.

I would be interested to know who makes up SSAG and to whom it is responsible. I presume it has an inward local authority focus. The Introduction to the present consultation is somewhat brief in providing this type of information.

I infer that the draft Sustainability Appraisal Framework is aimed at the forthcoming production of Development Plan Documents within Suffolk, but it could presumably have a much wider application and be applied in other instances where SA is required or appropriate. The objectives within the SA framework cover a broad range of social, environmental and economic issues, not just those relating to land use and planning.

The process for the identification of sustainability objectives appears to have been thorough and rigorous. I support the draft headline objectives as set out although at this headline level the objectives are very broad and not specific enough to be measurable – the use of the sub-objectives and indicators is therefore crucial to make the framework functional.

The environmental headline objectives include the key aspects of importance to ensure the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity both as a direct objective, and supported by conserving and improving soil, water and air quality, reductions in the contribution and vulnerability to climate change, and conserving and enhancing the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes.

Document (c) tests the compatibility of the SA objectives with each other. Not surprisingly there are some potential conflicts. Although both this document and other generic guidance on this approach indicate that, where appropriate, conflicting objectives can be modified to make them compatible, the ‘final’ objectives as presented here retain some tensions and I see little possibility of these being resolved completely at this strategic level. This should not just be left ‘up in the air’. There needs to be some guidance on how to deal with such conflicts – is one objective more important than another?

SSAG 1. There will always be conflict between different aspects of sustainable growth (eg. economic growth v environmental protection) but the aim is that the framework can be used to develop and favour options which minimise conflicts and impacts.

Considering Document (d) setting out the proposed objectives, sub-objectives and indicators, I shall only comment on the environmental objectives, other than to suggest the possible use of ANGSt (Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards – English Nature) as an indicator in the healthy lifestyles sub-objective.

SSAG 2. Following additional discussion with Sarah Jennings, Countryside Strategy Officer at SCC, it seems likely that this will be developed into a suitable indicator for the future, and will be included in the framework.

Objective: to conserve soil resources and quality.

The sub-objectives are focussed on retaining Greenfield and BMV agricultural land. I would support the inclusion of something additional about good soil management, ie prevention of erosion or run-off, but I have no expertise in relevant indicators for such a sub-objective.

SSAG 3. Suitable indicators to cover soil management are being investigated by the group. Andrew Hunter (Environment Agency) has agreed to look into potential indicators relating to farm management plans, or possible DEFRA standards.



Objective: to reduce the vulnerability to climatic events.

I am pleased to see that both reducing the contribution to climate change and vulnerability to climatic events are included. I have some concerns about the wording or focus of these sub-objectives – “minimise or reduce the risk” of flooding etc could be taken to imply an emphasis on engineering solutions to ameliorate problems, whereas I would be seeking more of a strategic planning emphasis to prevent future problems arising, so explicit wording to minimise future risk and to reduce existing risk.

SSAG 4. Following discussion within the group and with Andrew Hunter of the Environment Agency (who supply flooding data), it was not considered necessary to amend the existing wording.

Objective: to conserve and enhance biodiversity.

The sub-objective concerning designated sites needs to be specific about which designations are included: SSSIs, SPAs, SACs, Ramsar sites, NNRs, LNRs, CWSs (lots of designations and lots of acronyms).

The two sub-objectives seeking to conserve and enhance habitats and species should be replaced with suggested alternatives below. The phrase ‘protected habitats’ is not defined, and protected species should be separated out from BAP species.

Suggested sub-objective: will it avoid disturbance or damage to protected species and their habitats. The indicator for this could be number of development proposals affecting protected species, with information available from SWT. My rationale for suggesting this is that some species receive specific protection under the Wildlife & Countryside Act (eg bats, great crested newts).

SSAG 5. This objective will be incorporated into the framework. The suggested indicator is already used by SSAG as "Protection of Suffolk's biodiversity measured through sampling" and this will be used here.

Suggested sub-objective: will it help deliver the targets and actions for habitats and species within the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP). The monitoring of this could be ‘state of nature’ reports and BAP achievement reports through Suffolk Biological Records Centre / Suffolk Biodiversity Partnership.

SSAG 6. This objective and indicator will be incorporated into the framework.

Suggested sub-objective: will it help deliver the PSA target to reverse the decline in farmland birds. The indicator for this could be the BTO & RSPB monitoring applied at a county level. The draft already has farmland birds as an indicator, but I think because it is in itself a PSA target, this warrants being a sub-objective in its own right.

SSAG 7. SSAG has already investigated the farmland bird indicator, and although national data is available, reliable data for the county cannot be sourced. The BTO Breeding Birds Survey is a potential source of some data, but the sample size within Suffolk is too small to be statistically robust or a useful indicator of trends. However, this will be incorporated if possible, if these difficulties can be overcome.

Objective: conserve and enhance areas of historic and archaeological importance – yes it is possible to supply statistics (number, area, condition etc) for geological SSSIs in Suffolk through English Nature.

SSAG 8. The framework will be amended to reflect this.

Richard Rafe

6 January 2004



Further E-mail on 18/01/2005

Dear Sara

Just a quick further thought on sub-objectives / indicators for the sustainability framework stemming from discussions I had yesterday with Leena Ghoshal from the Suffolk Strategic Partnership which has put together the Suffolk Community Strategy.

The Suffolk Community Strategy contains a target to increase access to natural green spaces, and such an indicator would transfer across well into the sustainability framework. It could sit under the environmental objective "to conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes", and replace, expand upon the indicator of "number / area of town / village greens and commons". Or it could be included under the social objective "to improve health", subobjective "will it encourage healthy lifestyles".

I suggest if you think this is worth pursuing you speak to Leena.

I am keen to get as much cross-over between indicators as possible, so that the same indicators are used across a range of strategies. The SSAG draft sustainability appraisal (with the caveats in my previous comments) has a good set of biodiversity indicators - The inclusion of a green spaces indicator would complete the set.

SSAG 9. Following this consultation and discussion with Sarah Jennings, Countryside Strategy Officer at SCC, we intend to utilise the green space indicator in the Community Strategy once data is available, and it will be included in framework for the future.

Yours

Richard

Dr Richard Rafe

Area Manager, English Nature, Suffolk



View from Dr Simone Bullion, Conservation Officer, Suffolk Wildlife Trust

Thank you for consulting us on this matter. The short deadline has posed a few problems, but I am able to make the following comments:

I was sent a copy of the comments provided by Richard Rafe of English Nature and we endorse all the comments he has made. I am pleased to hear from Marie Edwards (MSDC) that this process will run in parallel with 'Suffolks Environment' as the latter project has produced some very useful data in the past and it is important that the monitoring effort continues. As some of the indicators will be similar I would hope this wouldn't create too many difficulties.

We are pleased that the draft headline objective 'to conserve and enhance biodiversity' has been included and this is in line with Government Guidance. However I think the sub objectives might need some modification to make the indicators more specific and measurable.

In the first sub- objective - We agree with Richard that 'designated sites' needs to be more specific, but it is important to include non-statutory designated sites such as County Wildlife Sites as well as statutorily protected sites such as SSSIs, SPAs, SACs etc. We are able to provide data where planning related activities have affected County Wildlife Sites and Suffolk Biological Records Centre can provide data on changes in numbers and areas of designated sites.

SSAG 1. These are all covered by existing indicators for Suffolk's Environment, which are already incorporated into the framework.

With regard to the second and third sub objectives regarding 'conserve and enhance semi-natural habitats and avoid harm to protected habitats' and 'will it conserve and enhance species diversity and in particular avoid harm to protected species' what Richard is suggesting makes a lot of sense.

We therefore agree that it would be best to have a sub objective relating specifically to the Suffolk BAP habitats and species and a second sub objective relating to protected species and their habitats. Much BAP habitat lies within designated sites, but a certain amount does not. In addition many protected species (and BAP species with and without protection) live outside of designated sites, so this should cover all aspects.

SSAG 2. This suggestion will be incorporated into the framework.

We are able to provide information on the number of development proposals affecting protected species as we are routinely recording this. As well as scoring 'protected species' as a general category, we also separate out bats, great crested newts and reptiles, badgers, but we have the facility to add new categories as required. We also record where semi-natural (BAP) habitat is affected by development proposals outside of designated sites.

SSAG 3. A new indicator will be incorporated into the framework to reflect this.

The section on Testing the Compatibility of the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives is particularly useful. I do have concerns where particular objectives seem to generate a lot of adverse scores against other objectives. The ones which stand out are objectives 20 and 23 relating to economic growth and investment. The critical element seems to be what is 'sustainable'. I am sure that even if a development were to bring about prosperity and economic growth, yet damaged the environment, it cannot be considered as truly sustainable. I therefore think that where there are tensions the compatibility assessment should provide clarification to assist with subsequent decisions and mitigation/compensation.

Are you intending to give equal weight to all objectives?

SSAG 4. There will always be conflict between different aspects of sustainable growth (eg. economic growth v environmental protection) but the aim is that the framework can be used to develop and favour options which minimise conflicts and impacts.

I hope these comments help

Simone Bullion

Conservation Officer



View from David Palk, Development Manager, Suffolk County Council

Sara, thanks for letting us see this. I have read it through (but do not profess to have gone through it with a fine toothcomb!). My general comments are that it looks a) very comprehensive b) explains what it is trying to achieve very clearly and has a good stab at the objectives and indicators.

My detailed comments are from a minerals & waste perspective. I have struggled throughout the discussions on SA and SEA and in reading the ODPM's documentation to really get a grip of how M&W matters should be dealt with in terms of SA/SEA. The principles are clear (I think!) but the practical aspects are more murky. Let me elaborate;

I read the "defining Core SA objectives" (Document b) and found it hard to see how many of these related to M&W plans at all. Very few of the Social or Economic objectives seemed relevant (and I am wary of trying to shoehorn things in to these when they do not really fit well. The Environmental objectives are of course much more relevant (but not all) and in some cases the wording is difficult for us. For example we talk about reducing pollution and improving water quality. I am not sure M&W would do this. We certainly would seek to ensure that there was no detriment to water quality? The same for air quality which talks about ensuring that the quality of air is as high as practicable. We would certainly again seek to ensure no detriment but not sure that we would be able to improve it.

SSAG 1. Wording of objectives will be amended to "maintain and where possible improve water quality"

I understand that this is a county level strategic and comprehensive framework and that each District (and the County in its M&W plans) will need to adapt the framework to suit and perhaps this will a) make it easier for me to get my head around the procedures and b) to make more sense of the actual SA objectives to which we will be working.

In the "Draft Sustainability Appraisal Framework" the concerns are magnified. I couldn't see any of the social indicators being relevant to M&W. The environmental ones are again more relevant although I am not sure about the directness of the links between M&W developments and some of the indicators. The economic indicators also do not seem to be very relevant. In the environmental I have a number of detailed comments. These are

1) Under "to conserve mineral resources" you link this to the landbank. The landbank is however a "reserve" issue not a resource issue. Changes in the landbank do not reflect the conservation of resources. I am not sure what the chalk landbank indicator tells us (other than whether the MPA is approving sufficient planning permissions to maintain the landbank).

SSAG 2. SSAG will continue to investigate whether more suitable indicators are available, and replace the existing ones if possible.

2) On sterilisation of resources I think we need to link this up with potential policies in our Core strategy DPD. Whilst we currently have such zones I am not sure how robust or sensible they are nor whether we really monitor the effectiveness of our policy. Viv will have a better handle on this. I think we might wish to do some work on the need for and extent of any consultation zones, clearly express why they are defined and what the implications are for future development proposals.

SSAG 3. SSAG will continue to investigate whether more suitable indicators are available, and replace the existing ones if possible.

3) Why do you only refer to household waste in the "to reduce waste" category? Surely this should relate to all wastes?

SSAG 4. This reflects the bias of the BVPIs on which these indicators are currently based. There are proposals to change the PSA targets to include all municipal waste, and the indicators in the framework will be updated to include this. The main barrier to including industrial waste etc is the availability of data in these sectors, but this will be addressed if possible.

4) Some of the indicators are not "outcome" oriented but method/means. For example the number of Con Area Appraisals is not a quality indicator but merely numerical I would have thought.



SSAG 5. This is an important point since method/means indicators should be avoided where possible. The indicators will be reviewed again with this in mind, and changed to be more outcome oriented where possible (where suitable data exists).

Hope these comments are helpful.



View from Tony Rudd, Economic Development, Waveney District Council

Desi, have had a quick look through the hard copy you gave me previously. There are a few notes which I cannot recall from my previous comments/analysis, so offer the following additional:

Resilience of business/economy - a time series analysis of division/type/size would record what is happening, but not sure how it would relate to resilience - what is the ideal we are aiming for? constantly changing?

SSAG 1. Resilience is indicated by the diversity of divisions/types/sizes. For example not relying too heavily on one large employer or employment sector, and being able to adapt to change.

Office/commercial rents - does a study need to be organised as an initial baseline? rates can be very localised.

SSAG 2. This data could be sourced by contacting local estate agents.

Working from home - planning consent analysis include live/work units? not all people working from home need pp?

SSAG 3. The Census samples the whole population and will be the main source of baseline data. Although not comprehensive, planning consents will give an additional indication of trends in between Censuses.

Local products at supermarkets - suggest number of products as percentage of total or value? (As overall number of lines increase this could reduce local proportion). Could a reporting mechanism be included as a condition of future planning permissions (if any - Asda)? This approach could be used for other pp e.g. monitoring use of commercial space?

SSAG 4. Sources of baseline data are currently being investigated by SSAG, initially through making contact with supermarkets directly, to establish if this indicator is viable.

Inward investment - 'enquiries' need definition.

At a quick glance, there is no specific quality of life indicators, or suggestion as to how others (e.g. health, income) might be combined into such a measure?

I know I have discussed previously but still some concerns as to which projects, policies etc. could be subject to appraisal (and therefore how appraisal will be resourced).

Hope this helps



View from Alan Wheeler, Regional Planning Consultant, EERA

Sara,

Thank you for consulting us on this initiative: I am pleased to offer a few thoughts on behalf of the East of England Regional Assembly.

First of all, I must say how much we welcome the work that has been done. A cooperative approach to sustainability appraisal such as you are developing has to make sense in avoiding much potential duplication of work, especially in assembling the context and baseline information. It is an approach which we would hope to see followed across the region.

So far as the material itself is concerned, you might like to consider the following:

Document A - defining objectives.

We are pleased that the Regional Sustainable Development Framework has been used as a source. The assembly has worked with EEDA and the Sustainable Development Round Table to develop a Sustainability Appraisal Toolkit around the high level objectives and the sustainability challenges set out in the RSDF. The Toolkit provides a set of objectives and assessment criteria and is designed to be an appraisal tool for strategies plans and projects at regional, sub-regional and local levels, including LDDs and Community Strategies. It provided the basic framework for the appraisal of the RSS and of the RES Review and is now being used in many other contexts across the region. The Toolkit also provides links to information sources for a wide range of topics. It can be found at www.toolkit-east.org.uk and you may find a useful source.

We also welcome the reference to the RSS appraisal Scoping Report. It would be as well to make reference from hereon to the submitted Sustainability Report, as this contains improves analysis of baseline information and of related plans, programmes and environmental objectives. As well as the 10 SA objectives, the Scoping Report sets out (Table 6.1) a set of SEA environmental objectives which are incorporated in the final framework, translated into assessment questions. These, again, might be cited. The RSS SA of course sets out (Table 3.3) environmental/sustainability problems in the region and (Table 4.2) for the defined sub-regions including Haven Gateway and Gt Yarmouth/Lowestoft. We note that many of the sustainability issues identified in the table refer to the RSS, but we have not made a thorough check to see if all relevant issues have been included.

Document B - draft headline objectives

The range of objectives selected is comprehensive and appropriate. as is noted in the introduction to document D, the draft ODPM Guidance on SA of RSSs and LDFs advises (p100) that SA objectives should focus on outcomes. Generally, the objectives do this, but in rather imprecise way - "to reduce X, to improve Y etc". Given that these are sustainability objectives for the area, they should surely be ambitious. Would it not be helpful to express them in rather less relative terms, describing a desired end-state or quantified target? (As currently worded, is a 1% improvement satisfactory? Or a 75%?) You might like to review the wording of the objectives with this in mind (the RSS SA objectives are by no means perfect in this respect, either!)

SSAG 1. This is useful advice, but this something that is more appropriate for individual authorities to assess locally rather than at a county level. Therefore the framework will not change, but this is something that authorities are encouraged to do when adapting the framework to their own local requirements. The desired outcomes will relate to local targets (eg in the Local Area Agreement and other documents).

Document C - compatibility matrix

Agreed that this is a very useful analysis.

Document D - the framework



Our only comment here is about the large number of indicators included - with the implications for the monitoring regime that will be required. Again, the RSS SA has an enormous number of indicators (138) which we shall have to try and reduce to a more manageable total.

SSAG 2. It is not proposed to monitor all of these indicators on a regular basis, but just keep up to date as required for baseline purposes. Indicators are selected to tie in with existing monitoring where possible to minimise additional data collection. For example, we have tried to make use of existing indicators from Suffolk's Environment, BVPIs, and Suffolk Community Strategy, among others.

I hope the above is of some use.

With kind regards,

Alan Wheeler

Regional Planning Consultant: EERA



View from Andrew Hunter, Development Planning Officer, Environment Agency

SEA/SA Objectives

Agree in principle with the draft headline objectives - these should be wide enough to catch majority of, if not all, important environmental issues (and social and economic issues) that may be influenced by Local Development Frameworks.

However, should bear in mind that these objectives should be adapted to take account of local circumstances and concerns as per ODPM consultation paper on Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks. The ODPM consultation suggests local objectives should be added to reflect local-level circumstances; objectives that are irrelevant to the area deleted; and more detailed objectives added.

SSAG 1. It is intended that individual authorities will adapt the framework to meet local requirements. Objectives will also be adapted in such a way to suit different types of plans (eg Minerals or Waste Plans), adding more detail objectives where appropriate and removing those not relevant.

I have seen Scoping Reports prepared by a number of LPAs (with assistance from external consultants) that have used between 7 and 14 environmental, social and economic objectives. Attempting to make use of all 23 objectives might prove to be unwieldy. At the district level, it might be worth considering merging some of the social and environmental objectives.

SSAG 2. It is considered that the framework is easier to understand and use with more objectives rather than fewer. Assessing options, conflicts and compatibility will be easier with more specific objectives rather than more general merged ones. However, we do feel there is value in merging the objectives relating to water and mineral resources, to form a new objective "To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible". The subobjectives and indicators will remain the same (unless covered elsewhere in this document).

From a personal point of view, I am not entirely convinced of some of the ODPM environmental headline/sub-objectives and I would be tempted to change or amend some of these objectives to what I feel are better worded ones in the other SEA/SA Scoping Reports seen by me. There would in any event be an opportunity to reflect local-level circumstances and here the LPA could refine the objectives.

SSAG 3. SSAG would be interested in discussing this further and will ask Andrew Hunter if he could provide examples at the next meeting.

Comments on headline objectives and sub-objectives

Under the headline objective 'To provide for sustainable sources of water supply', I think you have already identified that the sub-objective 'will it reduce water consumption' may present problems in terms of any measurement in a meaningful way. I agree this is probably the case and it may be better to have another think about developing a suitable sub-objective that can be measured. Given the wording of the headline objective, I feel that the something along the lines of promoting sustainable water management might be useful. The issue is essentially the protection of groundwater resources and aquifers. Limiting water consumption so that it is in line with levels supportable by natural processes and existing storage systems is commendable, but again difficult to measure. New development will make additional demands of water supply (for homes, industry, etc) in an area where the capacity of natural systems is limited. The conservation of water resources will be assisted by ensuring new developments are designed to use water efficiently. LPAs include policies that encourage water efficiency methods in new development and I wonder if a sub-objective can be developed around such policies. For instance, do LPAs receive any information from developers regarding the inclusion of water efficiency methods in new development that would meet these policies?

The Agency's Catchment Management Abstraction Strategies (CAMS) are looking at water resource availability and once the programme for each catchment area has completed its cycle, we will have a better idea of actual water resource availability. I am not sure whether the findings of each programme will provide



data that would help measure the promotion of promoting sustainable water management. I will look into this further and let you know the outcome.

SSAG 4. The objective on water consumption (now a sub-objective, see comment 2) will be changed to "Will it promote sustainable use of water?". SSAG will continue to investigate sources of data such as those suggested above and incorporate additional indicators if possible.

Compatability matrix

Although the use of the compatability matrix is in line with ODPM guidance, I wonder if the slimming down of objectives, mentioned above, perhaps through merging objectives with similar themes together, would make the process more manageable.

SSAG 5. Again, it is considered that the framework is easier to understand and use with more objectives rather than fewer. Assessing compatibility will be easier with more specific objectives rather than more general merged ones.

Indicators - baseline review

Once a baseline review has taken place, it would be useful, in terms of picking out key messages from any identified trend, if each indicator was classified as requiring:

No action

Needing action

Priority for action

Uncertain or unclassifiable

SSAG 6. This is a useful idea but this should also be apparent through the "Issue Identified?" column of the spreadsheet. The group may consider colour coding the entries in this column using these classifications as a key.



View from Sarah Jennings, Countryside Strategy Officer, Suffolk County Council

Sara

Some comments on the Sustainability Appraisal Framework as promised. Get in touch if you want to discuss any of this further.

Objective - To conserve and enhance biodiversity

Comments on the indicators:

- **'damage to protected sites / reported condition of sites'**. EN carry out condition monitoring of SSSIs and so can provide baseline data. Suffolk Wildlife Trust should be able to provide information on damage to sites when this has occurred through the planning system. Outside of the planning system however there is no consistent monitoring of any sites other than SSSIs and no baseline data exists.

SSAG 1. The indicator will be amended to "Reported condition of SSSIs" to reflect data availability.

- **'% cover of habitat types and achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets'**. The % cover of all habitat types is currently only known for the Coast and Heaths Natural Area (through EN's Lifescapes project). Only information on heathland is available for other parts of Suffolk (through Suffolk Biological Records Centre State of Nature Reports). Phase 1 data on habitats is now 20 years old and therefore out of date. State of Nature Reports will be produced for other habitats but this has not yet been done.

- Should it be % achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets? This can be monitored by the BAP Partnership (although we do not currently have a BAP Officer)

SSAG 2. Following comments from Richard Rafe and Simone Bullion, the framework will now incorporate 2 subobjectives for achievement of Habitat and Species Action Plan targets respectively. As % cover of habitat types is not monitored it will be dropped from the framework.

- **Protection of Suffolk's biodiversity through sampling** - what does this mean and how will it be achieved?? Could change to % achievement of Species Action Plan targets.

- **Bird survey results** - again - what does this mean? Presumably surveys carried out by BTO (breeding bird survey, common bird census, wetland bird survey etc) could provide baseline data. Do the RSPB carry out any surveys other than on their reserves? (potential for using the RSPB volunteer and farmland alliance survey data?) Could we use the PSA target to reverse the long-term decline in the number of farmland birds?

SSAG 3. SSAG has already investigated the farmland bird indicator, and although national data is available, reliable data for the county cannot be sourced. The BTO Breeding Birds Survey is a potential source of some data, but the sample size within Suffolk is too small to be statistically robust or a useful indicator of trends. However, this will be incorporated if possible, if these difficulties can be overcome.

Achievement of BAP targets - how does this relate to the two BAP indicators discussed above?

SSAG 4. See comment 2. The framework will now be revised.

Objective - To improve the health of the population overall:

Consider including actions from SCC 'Promoting healthier communities' such as:

Action 5d - Number of footpaths upgraded to jogging areas (SCC?).

Consider including SCC BVPI relating to rights of way:

BVPI 178 - The % of total length of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (SCC).

(this could also go under 'improving the quality of where people live')



SSAG 5. These indicators will be incorporated, although BV 178 is only available for the county as a whole and may not be considered a relevant indicator by individual local authorities.

Objective - To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation:

Include targets from Suffolk Community Strategy / draft Local Area Agreement relating to accessible natural green space.

Target 2 from Chapter 3 of SCS is 'increasing accessible natural green space'.

Indicators: Area of land managed in whole or part for its ecological interest and with public access over and above public rights of way (SCC for SSP)

Areas of deficiency in terms of accessible natural green space (SCC for SSP)

Number of volunteer days spent on natural green spaces (SCC for SSP)

Number of people attending environmental events held at natural green spaces (SSC for SSP)

Is there potential to include the target from the LAA relating to increasing the no. of people involved in volunteering activities? (Outcome G) Baseline data to be established through collation of a range of Council for Voluntary Services activity.

SSAG 6. Two new subobjectives will be added "Will it improve access to natural green space?" and "Will it increase the number of people involved in volunteer activities?". The suggested indicators will be incorporated as data becomes available, with the exception of "Number of volunteer days spent on natural green spaces" and "Number of people attending environmental events held at natural green spaces" which are considered too specific to one sector.

Other comments

* How do you intend to deal with conflicts arising in the compatibility table? Is this going to be discussed further?

SSAG 7. There will always be conflict between different aspects of sustainable growth (eg. economic growth v environmental protection) but the aim is that the framework can be used to develop and favour options which minimise conflicts and impacts.

Sarah Jennings

Countryside Strategy Officer



Appendix E - Responses to Consultation on SA Scoping Report

Table E.1 - Babergh District Council, Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Response to Consultees Comments (February 2007)

Name of Consultee	Paragraph No in Response	Subject	Proposed Change	The Council's Response
Environment Agency	No 2	Context review Task A1	Relevant plans and programs scoped needs to be updated	Yes this is accepted, but plans are being changed or updated regularly, so it is likely that some plans will have changed
Environment Agency	No 3	Context review Task A1 Para 20 PPS1	The Council should take account of flood risk management	The point is accepted and one of the objectives relates to this
Environment Agency	No 4	Context review Task A1 Para 36 PPS1	Flooding should be taken into account in design	The point is noted
Environment Agency	Nos 4 - 13	Context review Task A1 Various PPS's and other documents	Various documents should be scoped including new PPS's and Flood Management Plans	The Council will scope the documents relevant to Babergh
Environment Agency	Nos 14 & 15	Context review Task A1 Haven Gateway studies	The East of England Plan should be taken into account when developing the LDF	The point is noted
Environment Agency	No 16	Context review Task A1	Report should show the Web site address for the scoped documents	This is noted and could be included
Environment Agency	No 17	Methodology Task A2	Consider an indicator relating to SUDS	Noted
Environment Agency	No 18	Methodology Task A2	Possible indicator relating to contaminated land	Noted
Environment Agency	Nos 19 and 20	Methodology Task A2	Haven Gateway water cycles study should inform the LDF process	The full report will need to be studied in order to assess the implications for Babergh
Environment Agency	Nos 21 and 22	Methodology Task A2	The sequential testing of development locations for flood risk should be	Noted, it is the intention of Babergh to fully comply with

Name of Consultee	Paragraph No in Response	Subject	Proposed Change	The Council's Response
			carried out in accordance with PPS 25	the relevant section of PPS 25
Environment Agency	No 23	Methodology Task A2	The council should carry out a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	Noted, it is the intention of Babergh to carry out an SFRA
Suffolk CC	First two paras General comments	General comments on the approach	Objectives should be more local and take onboard emerging environmental issues	Whilst the comments are noted, they make assumptions about what issues or options are important to Babergh, which has not yet been determined through the LDF process. A new monitoring framework will be developed after the Core Strategy has been finalised and it is possible that these or similar objectives could emerge
Suffolk CC	2 nd 2 Paras	Task A1 – Context Review	Various documents should be scoped and the most up to date documents listed	The comments are noted and the list will be updated as well as new documents scoped. This is an ongoing process
Suffolk CC	3 rd 2 Paras	Table 2	Comments relating to the 'historic environment'	The comments are noted and 'historic environment' will be added to the relevant objective
Suffolk CC	Task A2	Table 4	Updating of data sources and indicators	The comments are noted and the data sources and indicators will be updated
Suffolk CC	Task A2	Para 3.3	Need to refer to the 'historic environment'	Noted, the 'historic environment' will be added as suggested
Suffolk CC	Task A2	Table 6	Comments relating to household waste and car ownership	The comments are noted and the information will be updated

Name of Consultee	Paragraph No in Response	Subject	Proposed Change	The Council's Response
Suffolk CC	Task A3	Identifying sustainability issues and problems	There is a lack of detail in the analysis of the issues, which are important and particular to the district	The point is accepted and changes shall be made, but further studies are to be carried out, such as the housing market assessment which will help to put more "flesh on the bones" than is outlined in the scoping report
Suffolk CC	Task A4	Developing the Sustainability Appraisal Framework	Comments on the SA objectives and the level of detail in the framework, saying a summary is better for comparison	In the past Babergh has produced both detailed and summary documents for the SA and it is likely that the same will happen again. The objectives will be looked at again
Suffolk CC	Task A5	Consulting on the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal	Natuarl England incorporates the Countryside Agency. What are the Council's future intentions for consultation on the document?	Babergh are aware of the changes and functions of Natural England. The intention was to see what comments were made on the draft document before deciding how it would be dealt with in the future. The amendments proposed by consultees will be added and then the document will be used as a basis for carrying out a Sustainability Appraisal, without a further period of consultation.
Suffolk CC	Baseline Data 2006	Detailed comments on some Baseline Data	Detailed comments have been made on some of the original data	The comments are noted but pollution from traffic may be an

Name of Consultee	Paragraph No in Response	Subject	Proposed Change	The Council's Response
				issue in certain locations, it was suggested that this indicator is dropped
Natural England	Section 2.1	Review of relevant policies, plans etc.	Various new plans are listed	These are noted and shall be included
Natural England	Section 2.2	Sustainability objectives and SEA	Geodiversity should be added to objective 16	This shall be added
Natural England	Section 3	Baseline information and analysis of trends – Table 4	Access to public rights of way is not mentioned as an indicator. Other indicators should be included.	Access to public rights of way is included as a countywide indicator but not down to district level. Geological interest will be added to one of the indicators.
Natural England	Section 3	Baseline information and analysis of trends – Table 6	Refers to a decrease in the area of AONB's	This comment will be deleted from the final version as it is believed that it was caused by an updating of measurements rather than an actual change in the area
Natural England	Section 5	Developing the sustainability appraisal framework – Table 9	There is more likely to be conflict between objectives 17 and 18	Noted and the table will be amended
RSPB	Introductory paragraphs	Approach to SA and SEA	A new reference is given, and comments on the approach have been made	These are noted and the reference will be considered
RSPB	Task A1	Context Review	New documents are listed to be reviewed	These documents will be reviewed

Name of Consultee	Paragraph No in Response	Subject	Proposed Change	The Council's Response
RSPB	Task A2	Profile of Babergh	A map should be produced of the district to show the biodiversity of the district. Bird data sources are suggested	The council will consider producing a map to show the biodiversity of the district, and notes the new sources
RSPB	Environmental Profile	To conserve and enhance Biodiversity	More detail should be given on each of the SSSIs and Ramsar sites	This information would be too detailed to put into the SA
RSPB	Environmental Profile	Soil resources	Greenfield dwelling site commitments should be recorded	These are recorded as part of the normal monitoring process
RSPB	Environmental profile	Climate Events and Climate Change	RSPB support the use of renewable energy and are concerned about sea and river flooding	The comments are noted
RSPB	Task A3	Sustainability issues facing the District	The RSPB are satisfied that Babergh have identified the correct sustainability issues for the district	Noted
RSPB	Task A4	The Sustainability Appraisal Framework	The RSPB accepts Babergh's general approach to the SA. They would like to be involved in the consideration of development proposals	Noted
RSPB	Appropriate Assessment	Habitats Directive	Babergh should be aware of the Habitats directive and ensure it is applied when appropriate	Babergh shall ensure that the relevant methods are used when they are necessary
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Two documents listed for consideration	ODPM Circular 06/2005 and BSI PAS 2010 of 2006	Both documents deal with biodiversity and should be scoped	The documents will be scoped and added to the list
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Paragraph on indicators	Biodiversity indicators	SWT are satisfied with the range of indicators chosen but suggest Babergh consider making some relevant 'smart	The comments are noted, but it may be more appropriate that the targets are set out as



Name of Consultee	Paragraph No in Response	Subject	Proposed Change	The Council's Response
			targets'.	part of the monitoring framework for a particular document
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Paragraph relating to designated sites	SSSI's and County Wildlife Sites are given as examples	Sites both statutory and non-statutory should be monitored for changes	These sites are already shown in the baseline document
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Paragraph relating to Table 10	Evaluation objectives for biodiversity	The current first sub-objective should be separated from the consideration of European designated sites	This would add complexity to an already long list of sub-objectives and if the only site affected is of European designation, then it will be considered in isolation
Children's Services, Education Dept., SCC	Paragraphs relating to the Children and Young Persons Plan (CYPP)	Links between the CYPP and the SA process	There are clear links between the sustainability objectives and the CYPP, particularly around sustainable communities	This is noted
Children's Services, Education Dept., SCC	Later 3 paragraphs relating to new indicators	Possible new indicators relating to the CYPP	A series of new indicators are suggested specifically relating to children	Some indicators can be included as a sub set of one of the existing indicators. Others may be monitored as part of the monitoring framework following the adoption of a new Development Plan Document
EEDA	The whole letter refers to implementing the regional economic strategy	Implementing the Regional Economic Strategy	Specific elements of the strategy are listed, not all are relevant to Babergh, but many are generic and refer to general issues such as provision for business or improving skill, promoting sustainable development etc.	The comments are noted and can assist with the appraisal of policies and proposals.
SCC Strategic Environmental Assessment	Local identity and distinctiveness		Maps showing local features or designations e.g. flood risk areas or biodiversity issues to show local	This is a good idea and may be used in the future as part of the assessment process

Name of Consultee	Paragraph No in Response	Subject	Proposed Change	The Council's Response
			flavour and conditions	
English Heritage	SA objectives	Landscape and townscape	The objectives are considered appropriate and landscape and townscape have a strong historical dimension	The points are noted
English Heritage	Baseline information	Indicators	More qualitative judgements should be made about the historic character and value of an area	The point is noted and the value of this may become apparent in Babergh's community involvement when developing LDF documents



This page has been left intentionally blank.

Atkins is an international Design, Engineering & Management Consultancy. Our clients choose Atkins to plan, design and enable their major projects across a wide range of disciplines both in the UK and overseas.

We are the largest engineering consultancy in the UK and the largest multi-disciplinary consultancy in Europe. Our unrivalled reputation rests on the skills of the 15,000 specialists within the organisation.

Our clients are varied and include governments, local and regional authorities, funding agencies and commercial and industrial enterprises. We help our clients to realise their objectives by developing and delivering practical solutions, adding value to their businesses through the application of our experience, innovative thinking and state-of-the-art technology.

Atkins Limited

Woodcote Grove, Ashley Road,
Epsom, Surrey KT18 5BW, England

Contact: Cristina West

Telephone number: +44 (0) 1372 756931

Fax number: +44 (0) 1372 746608

Email: cristina.west@atkinsglobal.com

Web address: www.atkinsglobal.com/environment