

Consultation Workshops Core Strategy (2011 – 2031) Submission Draft

Overall Summary

Four workshops were held at:

Bildeston (Chamberlain Hall)	Wednesday 19 th October 2011
Hadleigh Guildhall	Monday 31 st October 2011
Acton Village Hall	Thursday 3 rd November 2011
Suffolk One	Tuesday 8 th November 2011

The workshops were managed and facilitated by officers from Babergh District Council, with support from other adjoining authorities including Suffolk County Council, Mid Suffolk District, Ipswich Borough and Tendring District Council, and from the Haven Gateway Partnership.

Who was invited?

Representatives were invited to participate in the workshops from Town and Parish Councils, local businesses, the development industry (including house builders and planning agents), local schools, groups representing various interests in society (including the old, the young, those with disabilities or from other racial backgrounds), groups or organisations representing environmental interests, representatives from local health service providers and other partner organisations / stakeholders. Posters were also displayed in locations around the district inviting interested parties to attend the workshops.

Who attended?

The workshops were well attended by representation from across the district, and across a range of interests. In total 36 Town / Parish Councils were represented (some by more than one Councillor at/or across one or more event. Representatives from various businesses and other organisations also attended, as did a number of Babergh District Council members.

What was the format?

The workshops provided more information and context for the Submission Draft Core Strategy and enabled participants to discuss issues and ask questions in groups. Each workshop had 2 or 3 groups who covered some of the key elements within the Core Strategy. Following the discussion, feedback was provided by each group. The workshops finished with an open question and answer session.

Record of the workshop events

A summary of the discussion at each of the workshops is provided on the following pages. This represents the key issues that were raised by each group and is presented here as discussed on the night.

Notes from Core Strategy Workshop - Bildeston 19 October 2011

Present: 15 participants - the Ward Member and two other Babergh Councillors, 11 Parish Councillors and Mr Antill, + 6 facilitators + PB, AS and Rich Cooke.

Apologies: Brent Eleigh, Monks Eleigh and Bures St Mary Parish Councils, Chelsworth Parish Meeting and Whatfield CEVCP School

Settlement Policy

There were representatives from Cockfield, Lavenham, Lindsey, and Thorpe Morieux Parish Councils present in this group, the local Ward Member and a resident of Newman's Green. Facilitators: Mike Smith and Gary Guiver.

- Discussion around the Village Clusters Map – doesn't show Cockfield connections to Bury St Edmunds, and importantly doesn't quantify movements. The purpose of the map was queried. An explanation was given of the map as an illustration of what people told BDC at the workshops held in the autumn of 2010, and how this helped inform our approach to village clusters as a way of allowing some growth in smaller villages.
- The principle of having small scale growth in smaller villages was supported.
- Need to get away from labelling villages as being unsustainable.
- Don't need growth in the form of 'executive' homes. More two bedroom houses are needed.
- Where commercial sites/premises are vacant for a long time planning permission should be granted for housing – but also concern that this would lead to a loss of potential employment sites.
- Comment about the length of time it takes to for an affordable housing scheme to be completed – the need may have changed, people have moved on.
- Concern about the amount of greenspace being lost in urban developments and density and lack of new green spaces in new developments.

Growth Strategy

Only two parish council representatives present in this group (Lavenham and Cockfield), with the Ward Members for Waldingfield and North Cosford. Facilitators: Jackie Ward and Steve Clarke.

- Infrastructure – public transport (lack of good bus services, and withdrawal of some e.g. Cockfield – affects how people move from village to town); roads and accessibility generally; Broadband – important for home-working and small businesses.
- Flexibility – important that local communities have the right sort of growth – at a level to keep communities sustainable, e.g. support for local schools and services – this means small (two bedroom) houses.
- Balance – growth needed, but important to conserve the environment that is so important for tourism.
- Shops/town centres – changes e.g. use of the internet will change town centres and we should be prepared for this – vacant town centre premises should be used for housing.
- The recession is affecting small shops (short term?). The role of village centres is changing and may affect viability in the long term.
- Employment areas – villages often have existing businesses that may have constrained premises – we should allow them to expand.
- ***Need clarity over the definition of local need for communities in policy CS6.***

Sustainable Development

Representatives from Lavenham, Cockfield, Lindsey, Thorpe Morieux and Bildeston Parish Councils. Facilitators; Michael Wilks, John Davies.

What do we mean by sustainable development?

- Protecting the natural environment
- Promoting sympathetic development
- Importance of village infrastructure – drainage, energy, etc
- balanced communities – jobs as well as housing
- need for development to sustain villages and maintain services
- importance of mix of new dwellings to support village services (e.g. 2/3 bedroom houses)
- needs to be met in individual villages rather than in clusters
- heritage protection rules too rigid/restrictive
- wind farms ok so long as don't live near one/not on my doorstep
- protection countryside for benefit of tourists
- importance of meeting sustainable standards for new housing
- design of new homes replicates the past
- innovative building designs needed
- protect green infrastructure (including allotments)
- lack of public transport in some villages
- lack of safe cycle routes
- Suffolk Link not reliable.

Notes from Core Strategy Workshop - Hadleigh 31st October 2011

Present: 28 participants including the Chairman of Babergh District Council's Strategy Committee, a Ward Member and one other District Councillor, representatives from 10 Town & Parish Councils, as well as representation from Suffolk Acre, Suffolk Pensioners Association, Great Cornard Upper School Governing Body, WKP Architects and local landowners.

Apologies: Layham Parish Council and Copella Fruit Juices Ltd.

Discussion Groups

There were two groups, both covering the same elements of the Core Strategy, aiming to focus on the settlement pattern, growth strategy and the distribution of development, as well as briefly discussing sustainable development.

Group 1: What do we mean by Sustainable Development?

A short exercise was carried out, before any discussion took place inviting participants to discuss in pairs, what is meant by sustainable development and indicate a few bullet points on post-it notes. The list included the following points;

- Self sustaining
- Self perpetuating
- Renewable
- Infrastructure provision
- Sustaining the infrastructure of parishes
- Growth by choice
- Maintaining character

Core Strategy – Workshop Feedback

- Good quality 3 bedroom houses to bring people in and help villages grow
- Clustering of parishes
- Vibrancy
- Not need a lot of new houses (Lady Lane)
- Shared services in Parishes
- Supporting services
- Renewable energy to be provided including wind and solar power
- Also limit to the number of solar and wind farms permitted

Discussion

The following summarises the main points raised during the discussion;

- Consideration of the relationship between the proposed number of jobs (9,500) and the proposed number of new houses (2,500).
- Questioned where the jobs are coming from and if there are enough newcomers to Babergh.
- What relationship will any future neighbourhood plans have with this Core Strategy?
- If existing housing sites are displaced by other development, such as retail at Sudbury, where are the houses going to go instead?
- Can the Planning Department deal with a large number of small housing applications?
- There was a general feeling to support small scale windfall development.
- Acknowledged that larger development may lead to planning gain.
- Question about which parishes would like more homes.
- Expensive houses in villages do not often support local facilities.
- Affordable housing tends to be on rural exception sites.
- Specific mention of settlements needing 2 / 3 bedroom houses.
- Concern that environmental landscape protection is not as strong as it could be.

Group 2: What do we mean by Sustainable Development?

A short exercise was carried out, before any discussion took place inviting participants to discuss in pairs, what is meant by sustainable development and indicate a few bullet points on post-it notes. The list included the following points;

- Not to spoil the environment we currently have
- Having the resources to maintain and improve places as they currently are;
- Local community to decide what should be sustained;
- Suitable housing for the elderly for now and for the future
- Energy efficient design
- Supported by local established infrastructure;
- Use of renewable materials
- Use of alternative energy sources including wind/ sun and water
- Development that is needed
- Environmentally suitable
- Adequate infrastructure including transport links
- Employment provision
- Ecologically and environmentally sustainable
- Transport, housing and business in close proximity
- Long term projects to look to future generations beneficial to the local economy
- Affordable housing needs led, where jobs are located
- Generally self contained
- Don't need to go out for basic needs
- "green" energy efficient

- Business friendly
- Key infrastructure provision
- Range of services and commercial provision- industry, office, agricultural.

Discussion

The following summarises the main points raised during the discussion;

- What is being sustained? - Environment, population, jobs?
- Targets questioned - in respect of whether they are “top down” or “bottom up”. The Core Strategy is based on “bottom up” but relies on evidence to back this up.
- Intrinsic Growth or imported growth - we can’t stop growth but we can put policies in place to manage it.
- Ageing population what % of homes are for the working population
- There is a lack of suitable homes for the elderly to move into- many want to stay in villages where there are buses shops, health facilities etc,
- Every location is different- One size does not fit all.
- Villages should not have to take development if they don’t want to.
- Villages should be able to enable affordable housing
- If communities want development they should be able to have some
- The rural exceptions criteria for housing needs is too narrow and should be reviewed to reflect other groups including people that may be described as “key workers” e.g. carers, cleaners, gardeners, etc
- More transparency needed on what happens to 106 monies secured through planning applications.
- Jigsaw of fitting elements together - Local needs, Land values, who makes the decision, funding.
- Where will the funding come from to deliver affordable housing in the future?
- Policy CS16 rural exceptions sites- criteria needs to reflect wider needs
- Infrastructure provision at Hadleigh considered important that adequate provision is made- questioned about stage this is considered in more detail (Site allocations and master planning).
- Role of the Local Infrastructure programme In the future.

Questions & Answers session:

Q. Is there a discrepancy in the amount of houses to be provided?

A. *3,000 houses are already in the pipeline through existing commitments and planning permissions. This was explained briefly.*

Q. How quickly is policy moving forward, when will the detail site allocations etc. follow?

A. *Depends in part on the outcome of this consultation, as if there are substantial changes this will need re-consultation and take more time. Site specifics work will start next year and will take about 3 years.*

Q. Is the LDF a failure given that timescales not met, Local Plan dated and supposed to be quicker than old planning system?

A. *Rich Cooke expressed his view that the LDF was far more complex and time consuming than previous system. We will aim to ensure the Core Strategy is adopted next year and follow on as soon as resources allow, with the next stages of the Local Development Framework.*

Q. How much bearing does the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the NPPF have. Is there a danger of the Government becoming too dictatorial if the CS is not agree soon enough?

A. *Agreed that a plan to ensure local interpretation and local values are able to inform and drive future planning decisions. Importance of getting a plan in place was emphasised.*

Q. How do neighbourhood plans fit into the Core Strategy process?

A. *Details are still unknown, the procedure seems to be very cumbersome and a tall order for many local communities. Discussion is yet to take place at the council about how this may be managed and will be able to proceed. It is a resource hungry process and will need careful management for the community and the authority.*

Notes from Core Strategy Workshop - Acton 3rd November 2011

Present: 40 participants including 4 Babergh District Council Members, representatives of 15 Town and Parish Councils, as well as representation from local businesses including the Stoke-by-Nayland Club and Copella Fruit Juices.

Discussion Groups

There were three topic groups, all covering the same elements of the Core Strategy, aiming to focus on the settlement pattern, growth strategy and the distribution of development, as well as briefly discussing sustainable development.

Group 1: What do we mean by Sustainable Development?

A short exercise was carried out, before any discussion took place inviting participants to discuss in pairs, what is meant by sustainable development and indicate a few bullet points on post-it notes. The list included the following points:

- Growth that continues to provide into the future
- Within financial and practical boundaries
- Infrastructure provision
- Brownfield / Greenfield policy
- Development that enables all villages to grow
- Employment
- Needs driven
- Growth with access to facilities
- Mixture of housing
- Balance of housing to provide jobs and to sustain businesses, to create a vibrant village and provide kids for the local schools etc
- Development that creates or supports a sustainable community
- Support the aspirations of people living in communities
- Economically sustainable, transport and infrastructure sustainable
- Impact in the environment
- People want a job, a house and the ability to have required quality of life
- Workable development that can easily be built on / increased where necessary.

Discussion

The following summarises the main points raised during the discussion;

- Growth- shift of balance between the level of growth proposed for the urban / rural areas changed since earlier “preferred options” draft from 80% urban and 20% rural to 60% urban and 40% rural, with a significant reduction in the number and proportion of houses proposed for Sudbury. The reasons for this shift were summarised as;
 - Growth options consultation (Autumn 2010) including and particularly the parish and town council workshops responded very much in support of organic growth in the rural areas

Core Strategy – Workshop Feedback

- Many parishes consider that a reasonable level of growth is needed to help support services and bring families into villages
 - Approach is not one size fits all- needs to be flexible and respect differences between settlements.
- Village clusters map - inaccuracies pointed out- indicated that we need to be informed if anything on the map has been misrepresented and that amendments can be made if required- It is important the information reflects the correct position and is based on what the parishes have told us.
- Concern about the cross boundary relationship with the approach advocated for the functional clusters. Bures St Mary, a case in point, with most of its supporting villages in an adjoining district. Also provides a discrepancy between the classification of the Essex side of Bures Hamlet by Braintree and an “other village.
- Bures - was also pointed out that it was considered wrong to view it as one settlement with Bures Hamlet (Essex) and many of the key facilities including a shop and the railway station were in the adjoining district. Although boundary invisible and there is no physical distance between the boundary it is still considered to be the wrong approach for this location.
- **Jobs:** There was considerable discussion about the figure of 10,000 jobs. Employment land review and Suffolk Haven Gateway referred to as evidence base for the jobs requirement.; More clarification sought on where these jobs are going to and where will they come from?
- Jobs made up of variety of sectors and important to remember it is not just about factories and industrial estates, but service sector, tourism and retail as well as working from home, all contribute to jobs numbers.
- Also stressed that the jobs figure of 10,000 is for a 20 year plan for the whole of Babergh.
- Cross boundary working and the duty to co-operate also relevant, especially on the Ipswich boundary as jobs will also need to serve some of the growth coming from Ipswich.
- Longer term and more detail stages to follow with master planning and site allocations to determine more details of where jobs may be located.
- Some frustration about the inability to say **now** where and how many jobs there will be.
- Strategic sites and urban extensions referred to and explained role as mixed use locations with an opportunity to provide some jobs in these locations as well as houses.
- Questioned about flexibility of the core strategy - what if the job numbers are wrong- overall flexibilities discussed briefly including the opportunity to revisit single issues if delivery becomes uncertain and evidence suggests need to review. Also indicated that an Examination of the Core Strategy Document would also need to have certainty about delivery and demonstrate flexibility.
- Concerns about level of jobs and suggested that if view is that we have got it wrong then need to respond, but must be supported by evidence as why we are wrong and why the alternative level suggested is appropriate. The figure of 10,000 has not been plucked out of the air, it is based on evidence.
- Question where the money will come from for employment growth.
- **Infrastructure:** Discussion about how development provides infrastructure and the role of Section 106 agreements and in the future CIL. Explained how collaborative working and negotiations lead to inform the right type and extent of infrastructure required to support new development. E.g. of schools used as early discussions already taken place with SCC and information available about existing capacities and growth requirements. Also explained how infrastructure needs become part of the equation for discussion and negotiation with developers early in the planning process, through master planning and / or site allocations procedures.

- Key concern in Sudbury is the need to sort out road infrastructure, bypass etc.
- Suggested that the area of Bull Lane is where urban extension of Sudbury should take place.
- Growth in rural areas- refer to policy CS6 - suggestion that this should provide the flexibility that many parishes seem to be looking for- asked have we got it right?
- Neighbourhood plans - need to conform with the Core Strategy. Detail on procedures still awaited, but want to work with parishes and communities if they wish to be proactive about what they want to see in their villages/ towns.
- Is there an historic link between jobs growth and housing growth?
- Timescale is important. What comes first? Does growth drive infrastructure provision, or does it determine the need / opportunity for growth?
- The structure of the LDF Documents was explained to illustrate the context for Core Strategic Overview - followed by more specific detail, with site allocations and master planning etc.

Group 2: What do we mean by Sustainable Development?

A short exercise was carried out, before any discussion took place inviting participants to discuss in pairs, what is meant by sustainable development and indicate a few bullet points on post-it notes. The list included the following points;

- Infrastructure including shops, post office, schools, pubs and public transport
- Sustain towns and villages so they can retain facilities- post office, schools, Doctors etc.
- Sustainable housing including affordable housing
- Sustainable environmentally - houses and commercial development built to save energy to high "green" standards.
- Development that can be maintained avoids negative impacts.
- All resources easily available including infrastructure, schools and jobs.
- Support from services such as police, fire, water and waste
- Facilities for the young including youth facilities under 18s.
- Ensure structure is strong enough and robust enough to cope with growth.
- Balance between places to live and places to work
- Employment / local facilities (infrastructure) / housing all work together
- Encourage new employment
- Working from home / broadband support
- Use of redundant buildings
- New working premises complemented by available low cost housing
- Small units and housing.

Discussion

The following summarises the main points raised during the discussion;

- Jobs lead growth
- Importance of tourism - boats to the river restricted
- Agriculture - poly tunnel benefit, but hostility to the policy.
- Growth - do we need growth or are things better the way they are?
- Need to plan for housing alongside jobs.
- Babergh is a commuter district
- Money is brought in from outside the district
- Babergh has a range of industries. It is important to grow the economy range

- Growth areas include- Stour Valley- balance tourism growth with environment. Also opposition from residents. Development must be sustainable.
- Home working - growth area, but internet needs improving, support for this required
- Babergh has highest proportion of people who are working age not in employment
- Also has an above average population over the age of 60
- House prices are pushed up by rich people moving in often from London
- Babergh's job target not of interest to the majority of older/retired people in villages
- More young people are needed for the jobs and housing, infrastructure needs to support this. Society needs social infrastructure.
- Affordable housing - pushing up prices of market housing. Support for AH essential for communities
- Type and design of housing- affordable housing is of good quality
- Needs to be more shared ownership for social rented which is more difficult to provide
- Delivery - developer after allocation
- Manage - Anglian Water - Highways etc
- Monitor - Water Cycle Study
- Core villages - are they expected to take more development? Principle is to spread out development - core village working with surrounding villages
- Localism - Local council and district officers to work together to deliver balanced development
- Car parking - more car parks to deal with on street parking problem
- Planners making it difficult to use cars to encourage public transport- can't change human nature.

Group 3: What do we mean by Sustainable Development?

A short exercise was carried out, before any focussed discussion took place inviting participants to discuss in pairs, what is meant by sustainable development and indicate a few bullet points on post-it notes. A detailed discussion on sustainable development and what it means for Babergh followed in this group. All points are summarised below;

- Infrastructure provision including public transport, facilities and care for the elderly.
- Low energy consumption buildings
- Jobs, to be dispersed but in accessible locations including by public transport.
- Local aspirations and home working
- Development should be close to main roads A14 / A12 – houses and jobs.
- Rural homes support local services (not always the case) - (Leavenheath has had development but lost services).
- Mini centres help support rural areas which result in less (*development*) in a single place.
- Dispersal of jobs / agricultural business is important- good local examples.
- Jobs with houses- what type is acceptable
- Evidence is needed to support the jobs target.... Are they needed?
- Balanced age profile in settlements
- Local slant on sustainable development is very important as a different interpretation for different situations or areas.
- Need to align the delivery of jobs with housing- how e.g. phasing.
- Can you constrain housing development if there are no jobs?

Discussion

The following summarises the main points raised during the discussion;

- Neighbourhood plans - what is the relationship with Core Strategy?
- Functional clusters- some considered as “nonsense”- difficult to understand the rationale;

- Overlap with hinterlands and neighbouring districts leads to lack of clarity
- Relevance of wider relationships questioned
- Seems contradictory to allocate a hub and then allow inter-changeability
- Does it direct development towards unsustainable villages?
- Acceptability of a proportion of development in neighbouring village
- Detail is lacking in the Core Strategy, as implications are not known until site allocations stage.
- Flexibility to deliver where needs arise, including outside settlement development boundaries
- Open market and affordable housing element for rural areas important. Flexibility to provide more than CS
- Type of housing needed - smaller houses - planning system needs to support this and BDC needs to enforce it. Suggest removing Permitted Development Rights (extensions limitations)
- Rebalance community (income levels)
- Mix and type of units - parish councils to input
- Ability to downsize within the same village.
- CS 10 - is it explicit enough? How do we balance these criteria?

Questions and Answers open to all participants

- Q:** How will BDC decide on where and how many new houses will go in the Core Villages – example given was Nayland with many constraints including historic buildings, conservation area etc.
- A:** *Outline of next steps with preparation of Site Allocations document, and confirmation that each community will be considered separately in terms of its needs, and the constraints and other very local issues.*
- Q:** Request for communities to be included early in the Site Allocations process.
- A:** *Confirmation that BDC will be working with parish councils in developing the site allocations.*

Notes from Core Strategy Workshop - Suffolk One, 8th November 2011

Present: 22 participants including 3 Babergh District Council Members, 16 representatives of Parish Councils, as well as representation from business and schools (a Headteacher and a student from different schools).

Discussion Groups

There were three topic groups, all covering the same elements of the Core Strategy, aiming to focus on the settlement pattern, growth strategy and the distribution of development, as well as briefly discussing sustainable development.

Group 1: What do we mean by Sustainable Development?

A short exercise was carried out, before any discussion took place inviting participants to discuss in pairs, what is meant by sustainable development and indicate a few bullet points on post-it notes. The list included the following points;

- Building which does not use energy
- What about embodied energies? Transportation issues.
- The way we live is as important as anything – incentives are easy
- Education of the population
- Top down pressure for sustainable development

- Ongoing – will last.
- Range of housing and facilities throughout life – e.g. sustainability for the elderly = housing that they can grow old in
- Climate change/flood plains/renewable energy

Discussion

The following summarises the main points raised during the discussion;

Clusters

- Principle is good, but can it vary? Local 'join-up' differs from person to person and can be influenced by location or provision of key services such as health.
- Clustering may help smaller settlements by allowing some development to help halt population decline
- It would be useful if flexible e.g. about farm buildings.
- Query what happens on the edges of Babergh, e.g. boundary to MSDC (Sproughton) or Brantham/Manningtree. Recognised this is important – reference to duty to co-operate.
- What is relationship between these areas and the areas for neighbourhood plans? = relationship between NPs and Village Plans? VPs – one purpose to establish local demand for housing. Can co-ordinate need across range of neighbouring villages e.g. sheltered housing development at Capel covers surrounding villages too. Also Shotley – number of local councils looked at the Ganges site. Can work if there is a focus for joint action.

Distribution of growth

- Comfortable with broad principle but would not want it micro-managed – needs flexibility
- What would be useful in the DPDs – current doc is now available sites – but would want to know if new sites needed
- Important that the framework doc is clear enough to identify any controversial areas – communication is key to ensure there is understanding at each stage
- Impact on individual villages is what will be of interest – important that there is work with local people to understand the implications and consequences of any changes so they can make informed suggestions e.g. on infrastructure needs – part of the process is to design this in.

Development areas

- Brantham – major site. Good to link jobs & housing
- Ipswich fringe – concern that villages will just be absorbed by Ipswich
- Question on what type of industry/employment is hoped for? Will impact on type of housing and infrastructure needed. Ratio of jobs:site an issues e.g. plans for the sugar beet site.
- Hadleigh – what could be supported as access roads and other employment infrastructure is poor.
- Confirmed importance of fast broadband/mobile phone access (support for small businesses; staying in rural areas for elderly; home working)

Housing type/mix

- Affordable housing – concern that though there is demand, perception of affordability is tainted.
- Need continuity for families through their life stages – more 2 bed houses to keep families closer together not all very large houses. Developers tend to want larger houses – profit motive?
- Need to support downsizing
- Noted differential between build costs and market prices
- Could there be flexibility in price for land released for development? E.g. windfall sites, exception sites.

Group 2: What do we mean by Sustainable Development?

A short exercise was carried out, before any discussion took place inviting participants to discuss in pairs, what is meant by sustainable development and indicate a few bullet points on post-it notes. The list included the following points;

Sustainable development means

- having adequate housing but not too much; having enough employment within your area; protecting the environment; balancing these needs; ensuring a balance of age groups in an area to sustain the community; keeping green spaces.
- A coordinated approach between housing, schools, transport and employment opportunities.
- Sustainable development helps to retain Economic: jobs, and Social: services, homes, public transport, school, pub etc. Well being of community without impact on environment.
- Satisfy local housing requirements within the communities' resources without damaging the local environment
- Keeping communities satisfied with the development
- A satisfactory transport system
- Improved infrastructure to cope with growth
- Good all round education standard to avoid the unequal demand at certain schools
- Build low cost housing where job prospects are poor you need good transport to work
- Provide a housing stock that can be maintained by the collective commerce of the area/encourage growth proportional to the population.
- Provide a built environment that reflects available energy, food and material resources
- Enhance (continually) the existing built environment to accommodate advances in available technology, and changes in environment – infrastructure to keep pace

Discussion

The following summarises the main points raised during the discussion;

- Reconciling development in clusters with transport and accessibility- particularly with fuel prices increasing
- Put houses where the jobs are, or do villages need rural affordable housing.
- Need to respond to change- people do adapt, e.g., shopping for neighbours or ordering on-line
- Must plan for infrastructure.
- Maintain rural character, in terms of scale of development.

Group 3: What do we mean by Sustainable Development?

A short exercise was carried out, before any focussed discussion took place inviting participants to discuss in pairs, what is meant by sustainable development and indicate a few bullet points on Post-it notes. A detailed discussion on sustainable development and what it means for Babergh followed in this group. All points are summarised below;

- Crystallise and build on Suffolk Image- branding
- Joined up thinking
- Organically driven
- Sustained and promoted by resources
- Infrastructure, services and facilities
- Support to service providers
- Need more research
- Commercial tourism
- Pros and cons of business in Babergh District

- Housing and jobs
- Availability of infrastructure to schools
- (Adverse) Impact on local community
- Community spirit
- Balance
- Willingness to work together with parishes and other villages
- Shaping the future
- To sustain schools, need to link with the community
- Project people and enforcement (?)

Discussion

The following summarises the main points raised during the discussion;

- Jobs target and more background on the evidence of where this number has come from
- Jobs- low value jobs versus high value jobs
- Transport infrastructure including access to jobs
- Urban / rural balance economic development.
- The nature of business going forward- types of jobs, mixture employment opportunities
- Cost of housing and type of housing provided
- Quality of life
- Role and importance of broadband and mobile communications.
- Babergh's Unique Selling Points: - need to spell out more clearly why Babergh is a good place for business etc. Need to ensure that the Core Strategy enhances these qualities.
 - Visual Character
 - Villages
 - Quality of life
 - Location

Questions and Answers open to all participants

- Q.** What is the timescale and approach proposed for the site specific detailed planning stage scheduled for?
- A.** *Core Strategy anticipated adoption 2012. Work likely to follow on site specifics after this, towards the end of 2012, beginning of 2013. Approach likely to include working with communities using clear selection criteria, to look at early options with the relevant parishes, possibly in cluster groups.*
- Q.** The plan is for 20 years, what are the opportunities for review should things change
- A.** *There is in built flexibility which is hoped to be sufficient to adapt to changes as these occur. If this does not provide sufficient flexibility, the legislation allows for an early review of single elements of the plan if necessary.*
- Q.** As a jobs led strategy, how would you ensure the balance between jobs and housing.... How do jobs lead to housing and how do you ensure numbers are right?
- A.** *The travel to work patterns focus on economic opportunities in Hadleigh, Sudbury and Ipswich. There is also a strong, diverse and vibrant economy which is widely distributed. The urban area policies and rural economy policies play to the economic strengths. Also the approach is to "plan, monitor, manage" so can reflect and adjust along the way of necessary.*