



— Local —
DEVELOPMENT
FRAMEWORK



**Annual
Monitoring
Report
2006-2007**

Contents

1. Contextual Indicators	Page 2
Babergh District: Outline of Main Characteristics and Key Issues	Page 2 - 5
Core Output Indicators Summary Table	Page 6 – 8
Commentary	Page 8 - 10
2. Implementation of Local Development Scheme	Page 12 - 14
3(i). Policy Non-Implementation	Page 15
3(ii). Policy Performance	Page 15 - 18
3(iii) Commentary on Appeal Decisions	Page 18 - 19
4. Housing Delivery	Page 20 – 21
(i) Housing Trajectory	Page 21 – 25
(ii) Affordable Housing	Page 27 – 28
(iii) Gypsies and Travellers	Page 28 – 29
5. Local Development Orders (N / A)	Page 32
Appendix 1: Housing Trajectory Detailed Table	Page 35
Illustrative Material	
Figure 1 Map of Babergh District	Page 3
Figure 2 Housing Trajectory: Suffolk Structure Plan (1996 – 2016)	Page 30
Figure 3 Housing Trajectory: East of England Plan (2001 – 2021)	Page 31

Babergh District Council

Babergh Local Plan / Local Development Framework

Annual Monitoring Report 2006-07

NB: The period covered by this AMR is 01 April 2006 - 31 March 2007

Introduction

The requirement upon all local planning authorities to prepare and submit an Annual Monitoring Report each year arose under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act in September 2004. This Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) is the second to be produced by Babergh Council under Regulation 48 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

Contextual Indicators

This section provides a contextual background to the rest of the monitoring report. It is a summary of the geography and demographics of the Babergh district, and of the key issues affecting the District. The key environmental, social and economic characteristics of Babergh are included.

Geography and Demographics

Babergh District had a population of 86,700* in mid 2006, according to the Office for National Statistics official mid year estimate. This appears to represent a small increase on the equivalent figure for the previous year (86,100) although the effect of rounding these figures could alter the extent of the actual increase either upwards or downwards. These figures have changed since last years AMR as the Office for National Statistics has altered the way it has calculated the figures and taken into account new information.

Babergh district has a geographical area of 596 square kilometres. The district is predominantly rural, but there are two main market towns: Sudbury and Hadleigh. The largest town is Sudbury with a population of 12,080 (2005 Suffolk County

Council estimates) adjacent is Great Cornard (normally counted with Sudbury) having a population of 8,060 (2005 Suffolk County Council estimate). Sudbury and Great Cornard are the largest urban areas in the district and they are identified as the locations for the largest scale housing growth. The second largest town is Hadleigh, with a population of 8,150 (2005 Suffolk County Council estimate). Parts of the continuous urban areas of Ipswich, particularly Pinewood, extend into the district on its eastern fringe (this urban parish had a population of 4,500 as of the mid 2005 SCC estimate).

The district also contains a wealth of attractive villages, historic buildings and countryside. Much of the countryside is of high landscape value, with two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a number of Special Landscape Areas. There are also 28 conservation areas and approximately 4,000 listed buildings within the district.

The character of the District changes from deep countryside in the west to river estuaries of the Orwell and the Stour in the east and south respectively. Parts of the area are also serviced by good rail links to London via Sudbury, Ipswich and Manningtree.

* ONS figure for total resident population, rounded to the nearest 100




Figure 1: Map of Babergh District

Issues

- The district has a low crime rate and represents an attractive 'rural idyll' for residents and visitors
- This has attracted outward migration from London and the south-east
- House prices are high and the problem of affordability has increased in the district
- There is also pressure on the countryside for change of use of land to housing, equine-related uses and extensions to gardens
- Agriculture continues to be under financial pressure and has subsequently diversified in many cases; leading to a variety of uses for redundant farm and

other rural buildings and new uses for farmland where farmers are trying to increase their income

- Pressures arising through the planning system to develop brownfield sites for housing and the desire of commercial organisations to maximise capital receipts has meant that employment land has come under pressure for re-development as housing
- There is a serious shortage of employment land in the district
- Any well-designed and built new commercial developments in good locations let or sell very quickly
- The district is also attractive for tourists and maximising the economic benefit to the district while trying to minimise the adverse impact is necessary
- Certain parts of the district are particularly dependent on one employer, which causes concern

Issues by Topic

Housing

- Ensuring that annual completions reflect the allocated numbers arising through Structure Plan / Regional Spatial Strategy requirements
- Achieving the right type and mix of housing for 'open market' housing requirements
- Achieving the required proportion, type and size of affordable housing where it is needed

Economy

- Safeguarding existing and delivering new employment land in the right locations
- Ensuring businesses are in up-to-date premises and ensuring that vacant and unoccupied land and premises are reoccupied efficiently
- The core retail frontages in town centres are under pressure from non-retail uses
- In Hadleigh there is an identified quantitative and qualitative need for a new supermarket and accommodating this scale of modern development in an historic town without harming its character is a complex development issue

Countryside

- The attractive countryside is under pressure for change (see points above). This creates major issues for local communities and the planning authority

Sustainable Communities

- Reducing dependence on the use of the private car
- Retaining facilities in villages is also difficult as keeping them well-used and economically viable is a major problem and changes of use from a village facility to residential use are often commercially more attractive
- Rural housing affordability and availability
- Availability of transport facilities and access to services in rural areas

Development Issues

- Development pressures in Babergh remain very strong and the effective control of these presents substantial challenges
- Accommodating appropriate development of most forms in the district proves difficult to achieve in practice, due to factors such as negative perceptions of development in general and the resultant opposition to it

- The pattern of development in Babergh presents difficulties, as most residential developments are very small in scale. This can often make them easier to assimilate into localities and local communities but makes the securing of benefits such as affordable housing provision much harder
- The Chilton Mixed Use proposal presents planning, implementation / delivery issues for the district, in terms of housing (including affordable housing), access, design, infrastructure, landscape impact and the scale of development, etc.
- There are still some previously developed and under-utilised areas of land that are suitable for development within the district, and ensuring that these are developed appropriately is a concern
- There are major areas either allocated for housing or with planning consent for housing that need to be developed within the Local Plan period
- Market conditions for housing development are currently strong but also very changeable and this can create problems for new development and its delivery
- With the large number of listed buildings and Conservation Areas, safeguarding and enhancing the historic environment is a substantial concern for the district
- Ensuring that development uses sustainable means of construction and energy generation

Opportunities

- The larger housing schemes, particularly those in and around the Sudbury area and Hadleigh, offer the scope to create more sustainable communities and can potentially deliver significant volumes of affordable housing
- The Chilton Mixed Use Development proposals provide a major opportunity to provide an attractive new sustainable community with significant new employment areas
- Tourism can increase its contribution to the local economy if it is carefully managed, as there are many attractions in the district
- Sudbury town centre is a thriving and vibrant centre and serves a significant catchment area

Summary of the Core Output Indicators by Key Policy Themes 2006/07

Theme	No.	Data Required	Data Supplied
Business Development	1a	Amount of floorspace developed for employment by type.	B1 (a) – 1086 B1 (b) - 412 B1 (c) – 412 B2 - 1975 B8 – 387 Many of these consents are flexible allowing a mixture of uses in each building.
	1b	Amount of floorspace developed for employment by type, in development or regeneration areas.	B1 (a) – 436 B1 (b) - 412 B1 (c) – 412 B2 – 1302 B8 – 387 Many of these consents are flexible allowing a mixture of uses in each building.
	1c	Amount of floorspace by employment type, which is on previously developed land.	B1 (a) - 24 B1 (b) - 0 B1 (c) -0 B2 – 739 B8 -0
	1d	Employment land available by type.	B1 (a) – 23.8 Ha B1 (b) – 5.5Ha B1 (c) – 5.5 Ha B2 – 31.9 Ha B8 – 2.36
	1e	Losses of employment land in: i. employment areas and; ii. in local authority area.	(i) = 0 (ii) = 2.33 Ha
	1f	Amount of employment land lost to residential development.	2.33 Hectares
Housing	2a(i)	Net additional dwellings over the previous five-year period or since start of relevant DPD period, whichever is the longer.	1615
	(ii)	Net additional dwellings for the current year.	275
	(iii)	Projected net additional dwellings up to the end of the relevant DPD period, or over 10-year period from its adoption, whichever is the longer.	3979 supply as at 2007.
	(iv)	Annual net additional dwelling requirement	345 Structure Plan 280 Draft East Of England Plan

	(v)	Annual average number of net additional dwellings needed to meet overall housing requirements, having regard to last year's performance.	425 pa over the Structure Plan Period to 2016 or 285 pa over the East of England Plan period to 2021
	2b	Percentage of new and converted dwellings on previously developed land.	Financial Year ending: 2001 – 55% 2002 – 57% 2003 – 39% 2004 – 55% 2005 – 43% 2006 – 68% 2007 – 66%
	2c(i)	Percentage of new dwellings completed at: less than 30 dwellings per hectare	16%
	(ii)	Between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare; and	40%
	(iii)	Above 50 dwellings per hectare.	44%
	2d	Affordable housing completions.	73 net
Transport	3a	Amount of completed non-residential development within UCOs A, B and D complying with car-parking standards set out in the LDF.	All non-residential developments comply with the parking standards set out in the development plan and these are applied across the whole of Suffolk.
	3b	Amount of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of a GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, employment and a major health centre.	This information is not currently monitored.
Local Services	4a	Amount of completed retail, office and leisure development; and	Retail – 189 m2 Office – 1086 m2 Leisure – 0 m2
	4b	Amount of completed retail, office and leisure development in town centres.	Retail – No completions Office – No completions Leisure – No completions
	4c	Amount of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard.	None.
Minerals and Waste	5a, 5b, 6a & 6b	For minerals and waste planning authorities only.	N/A
Flood Protection and Water Quality	7	Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on either flood defence grounds or water quality.	One application was approved contrary to advice from the Environment Agency.

Biodiversity	8(i)	Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance, including change in priority habitats and species (by type); and	The Suffolk Wildlife Trust has no record of any change in the area of any priority habitats or species numbers. The County Biological Records Centre has made substantial progress in updating baseline information and it is hoped to have better data in future but it will not be updated annually. 6 Planning permissions were granted last year with a condition relating to priority habitats and species. There were also 6 consents granted with an informative attached. 0 Planning Applications were refused in part due to the species affected.
	(ii)	Change in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value including sites of international, national, regional, sub regional or local significance.	No changes in the areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value.
Renewable Energy	9	Renewable energy capacity installed, by type.	Solar PV: 16 kw (max at full sun). Air to Water: 28.5kw 6 kw wind turbine

The completion figures (indicators 2a(i) and 2a(ii)) shown above include a net 8 dwellings on a site which had an unsatisfactory completion according to building control records as well an additional 12 dwellings where the receipt of a completion certificate from independent inspectors was delayed.

Commentary on Core Output Indicators

Business Development (Indicators 1a,b,c,d,e,f)

For commercial completions, very few planning consents are restricted to a single use, this is to allow businesses to grow and evolve without having to apply for a new consent, and most of the employment areas are suitable for a variety of uses. The figures shown are based on estimates of how these uses may be split.

With the new Local Plan substantial areas of employment land should theoretically be available for new development. Several local and international companies have expressed an interest in developing new premises on or relocating to these new sites in Hadleigh, on the Ipswich fringe and in Sudbury. The new land will help these industries expand and benefit the local economy if the land is genuinely made

available. Many of these expressions of interest have not yet been converted to planning applications and on the former British Sugar site at Sroughton there has been an application and appeal for 1100 dwellings. This illustrates the pressure from alternative uses on employment land, it also shows that some land owners intend to seek other uses rather than employment and this land may not really be available for employment uses.

Again this year the amount of business floorspace completed seems low particularly in relation to the number of schemes and floorspace permitted each year, although it is similar to neighbouring districts. It is not completely understood why this is the case but it may be the result of the low formation rate of new companies. Prolog has re-submitted an application for a substantial new business premises.

The amount of floorspace completed for different use classes does vary from year to year and with the new allocations the floorspace constructed would be expected to increase over the next few years by virtue of the area of land newly available. This may be counterbalanced by some landowners holding out for the higher land value of residential development and some others just acquiring the land and not selling it or developing it. At present there is a shortage of good commercial floorspace, which sells very quickly when it is available; sometimes so quickly it does not appear on the open market. Local estate agents say that they have people regularly asking for details of new premises if they are available.

Only a limited amount of the floorspace has been built on previously developed land, which reflects the necessity in the district to allocate greenfield sites for employment use to meet the need. There is insufficient brownfield land available to meet the demand for employment land.

An area of employment land (2.33Ha) was lost to residential development over the year, which if it carried on at this rate would have a significant impact on land available over the plan period. If over the East of England Plan Period significant new employment uses are not constructed then the ambitious employment targets of the plan will not be met.

Housing (Indicator 2 a,b,c,d)

For residential development, the supply of land has increased substantially over the last 2 years with the new allocations confirmed by the adoption of the Local Plan last year and new windfall planning consents granted. The level of supply is not as high as last year and this is partly due to old consents lapsing and partly due to the higher level of completions. There appears, at present to be sufficient allocations, sites identified for residential development and consents to meet both the current Structure Plan and Draft East of England Plan requirements.

Many of the sites awaiting consent may produce more dwellings than the number shown in the Local Plan as densities increase. The completion rates still remain below those needed to meet the Structure Plan requirements (set out in indicators 2a(iv) and 2a (v) above) although they are now close to the rate in the Draft East of England Plan.

More detailed commentary can be seen within the housing trajectory, but over recent years completions have largely been on windfall sites, which have usually been brownfield and this year's figure (for brownfield land development) is above national, regional and Structure Plan targets at 66%.

With the new greenfield allocations it is unlikely that this level of brownfield completions will continue although most windfall sites will be brownfield. Following discussions with developers it also seems likely (subject to market conditions) that the rate of development of new housing will increase substantially over the next few years. If this happens then some of the shortfall of completions should be made up and completions should be at or above the rate required by the East of England Plan (but probably below the rate required by the Suffolk Structure Plan 2001 which will be replaced).

Indicator 2c. Housing density has been included for sites of 10 dwellings or more and shows that the majority of sites are completed at over 30 dwellings to the hectare with 44% at over 50 to the hectare. This indicates a continued shift towards a more efficient use of land and providing a higher number of dwellings on any given site, it also increases the variety of housing available on the market. Many new and reserved matters applications are now at high densities where it is a challenge to maintain appropriate high quality design solutions. This also means that most of the allocated sites are likely to deliver more dwellings than the figures shown in the Local Plan policies. Although, because we cannot be certain which sites will be developed at present and only few have detail planning consent, the final numbers each site will deliver is an estimate and shown in the appendices to this report.

Indicator 2d. This year there were 73 affordable housing completions, so about 27% of all completions were affordable. In terms of numbers this is a slight increase on last year but a reduced percentage. The Council has ambitious targets for delivery of affordable housing which should be achieved with expected high building rates over the next 5 years; however the need for affordable housing is still a serious issue without a completely satisfactory answer. Achievement of the overall target is dependent on higher rates of completions over the next few years because the total number of dwellings completed recently has been lower than expected. It is difficult to predict when some affordable housing will be delivered, particularly when it is part of a mixed general open market housing site.

Local Services (Indicator 4a, b, c)

There has been a relatively small amount of floorspace completed in local centres in the year. This reflects the mixed-use nature of the allocated employment sites, (where B1 use is possible) and the rural nature of the district where redundant farm buildings can be converted to employment uses including B1 offices. There are also villages with substantial numbers of shops particularly those villages popular with tourists. Leisure uses can also be completed within or adjacent to villages. There has been refurbishment and re-letting of shop units in the town centres. In the larger villages where antique shops were popular there have been applications to change to other uses, as the popularity of antiques declines.

Indicator 4c amount of eligible open space managed to green flag standard is not considered a good indicator because it is too simple and also involves the payment of an annual fee to have the land registered as meeting this standard. The indicator only reflects one type of open space and open space can perform many functions.

Flooding (Indicator 7)

The one application approved contrary to the Environment Agency's advice was approved at committee where members were mindful of the comments of the Environment Agency but it was not considered a significant issue. Only one barn

was in the floodplain and the applicant's submission had satisfied the requirements of PPG25 and this submission was forwarded to the Environment Agency.

Renewable Energy (Indicator 9)

Due to the quality of the district's landscape and airspace restrictions it is unlikely that large wind farms would be acceptable in the district. Any renewable energy schemes will be on a local scale rather than large scale and of regional importance. There is also concern that small domestic wind turbine and solar panel proposals will have an adverse impact on the many listed buildings and conservation areas in the district. This is emphasised by two appeal decisions where the renewable energy proposals were rejected on the grounds that they would have a harmful impact on conservation areas or listed buildings.

This type of development will require careful consideration to ensure it is appropriately designed and located. It is difficult to monitor this indicator unless there are more schemes where renewable energy is part of the original planning application or building regulations applications. There may of course be more schemes that we are not aware of as yet.

Over the last year there have been a few specific applications for small-scale renewable energy schemes, such as solar panels, small wind turbines and a combined heat and power plant. The schemes listed as complete are mainly council schemes but there is one private wind turbine. Included is a new form of renewable energy heating system, taking heat from the air (air to air), this also shows that new products are becoming available.

Local Indicator

Babergh District Council has grant aided and helps administer home insulation schemes as well as domestic renewable energy schemes and we have 2 years records as follows.

Number of Schemes Installed across the District

Year 2005/06	
Loft and /or Cavity Wall Insulation	254
Solar	2

Year 2006/7	
Loft and /or Cavity Wall Insulation	176
Solar	14
Wind Turbine	2
Other	2

There has been an increase in the number of domestic renewable energy schemes over the two years, but the number of subsidised loft and or cavity wall insulation has decreased. This does not necessarily mean that there has been a decrease in the number of domestic insulation improvements, but that there has been a decrease in the number of subsidised schemes. The scheme will be changing to supporting one operated by BG rather than directly by the council for future years. These figures show that people are interested in the issue but only show part of the picture, it also does not show whether we are achieving the government's ambitious carbon emissions targets and we do not have the information available to do this at present.

2. Implementation of the Local Development Scheme

Background

The Council adopted the first Local Development Scheme (LDS) for Babergh in February 2005. This covered the first almost five-year period from early 2005 to late 2009. However, in the light of various comments from the Government Office (GO East), the scheme was amended and re-issued in August 2005, to incorporate some revisions that GO East considered necessary. The first document listed in the LDS is the Babergh Local Plan (Alteration No. 2). During the periods covered by the LDS and this AMR, the clear priority was to pursue the adoption of the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 2 (which was actually much more akin to a complete Plan review than a Plan alteration). The detailed elements of this process and progress against their timetable were as follows:

Stage	Timetable	Progress
Production of Inspector's report	April – end November 2005	Timetable Met
Publishing of Inspector's report	December 2005 / January 2006	Timetable Met
Drafting of Post Inquiry Modifications	January 2006	Timetable Met
Deposit of Post Inquiry Modifications (consultation period)	February – March 2006	Timetable Met
Consideration of responses to PI Modifications / Possible need for any further modifications – allied to the above	April – May 2006	Timetable Met
Adoption of Plan	June / July 2006	Timetable Met – adoption 1 st June 2006

Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 2

The Babergh Local Plan Alteration No2 was adopted in June 2006 and will be saved initially for a period of 3 years. The Local Plan will be replaced in sections over the next 5 years.

Statement of Community Involvement

The Babergh Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was formally adopted by the Council in December 2006. This now forms the basis for involving the community in the planning system; it covers the production of documents which will form part of the new Local Development Framework as well as how people will be consulted in relation to planning applications. It also suggests actions to be taken by applicants to involve the public with major, minor, Conservation Area and Listed Building applications.

Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment

NB This work and its report outputs do not need to be included in the LDS but were included in the original document, in the interests of completeness and fullness of information

A considerable amount of work was undertaken in 2004 and 2005 working jointly with other Suffolk local planning authorities on the baseline data and initial scoping report for the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Local Development Framework (LDF). This initial work placed Babergh in a strong position from which to progress individual scoping and subsequent reports for the various LDF documents to be produced. With most baseline data now gathered by 2004, a draft scoping report was produced by July of that year.

It was not necessary to progress further with a final scoping report at that stage, since no new LDF documents were programmed for commencement of preparation until later in 2006. However, work to update and revise the draft scoping report was carried out in late 2006 and a final draft scoping report was produced. Statutory consultees, along with others with expertise or interest in relevant areas were consulted on the draft Scoping Report and Baseline information. Following this consultation we now have an agreed methodology for carrying out a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Core Strategy when it is produced.

The process for carrying out the SA and SEA for the Core Strategy is more complex than is probably necessary for Supplementary Planning Documents, so during this monitoring year (and after) a simplified process was also consulted on. We now have in July 2007 an agreed process for carrying out SA and SEA of Supplementary Planning Documents. The Baseline data for these documents will need updating from time to time.

Revisions to the Local Development Scheme

In last years Annual Monitoring Report several recommendations were made for revising the Local Development Scheme, these are set out below:-

'Recommendations on LDS:

1. Revise commencement date for work on Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) and therefore its ensuing programme as well
2. Revisit programme for production of Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to a timetable that reflects the above deferral: this will also need to be deferred considerably
3. Defer commencement of production of Affordable Housing and Employment Land Retention SPDs (and ensuing programme accordingly)
4. Revise LDS programme to illustrate the actual production timetable for the SCI (as delivered)'

These recommendations have resulted in a revised LDS, but some of the issues that may considerably affect timing of the production of these documents have not been completely resolved. The new Regional Spatial Strategy the East of England Plan has not been adopted yet. Some staff have now been replaced and work on the evidence base and three Supplementary Planning Documents has commenced.

A revised Local Development Scheme was submitted to the Government Office for approval at the end of March 2007 and was approved by them in May 2007. The new revised Local Development Scheme has been adopted by the full Council in July 2007. Generally the timetable is set to run six months to a year behind the original timetable with the first formal consultation for the Issues and Options relating to the Core Strategy Policies and Proposals Map due to commence in April 2008.

Development Plan Document	Start Date	Adoption Date
Core Strategy Policies and Proposals Map	March 2007	March 2011
Development Control Policies (and Proposals Map)	November 2007	January 2012
Site Specific allocations, Policies and Proposals Map Amendment	July 2008	May 2012

Detailed comments on the revised scheme will be made in next years AMR.

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Babergh Design Guide; Affordable Housing; and Employment Land Retention

The Babergh Design Guide is a new SPD and has been added to the revised Local Development Scheme. Over the monitoring year covered by this report substantial work has been carried out prior to the first drafts of these three documents.

Core Strategy Policies & Proposals Map and Site Specific Allocations, Policies & Proposals Map

Work on these documents was due to commence during 2006 and progress has been made on some of the information base required, sometimes working with neighbouring authorities. A strategic flood risk assessment process has commenced along with work on the housing market assessment and employment land review.

3(i) Policy Non-Implementation

This section deals with policies of the adopted Development Plan that are not being implemented (reg. 48, (4) & (5) refer). The regulations also require analysis of why policies are not being implemented and the local authorities proposed response to any such situations. It is considered that assessing the implications of policy non-implementation first will be useful in arriving at the final proposed action(s) where any are to be taken.

There are no policies not being implemented this year.

Commentary

The policies listed in last years annual monitoring report as not being implemented have either been deleted or amended and retained during the adoption process for the Local Plan following the Inspectors report. Therefore there are no policies the Council are required to comment on in this section.

3(ii) Policy Performance

This section has been included as an extension of the regulatory requirement (reg. 48, (4) & (5) refer) to examine policies not being implemented. The section aims to consider the performance of policies in achieving the broad aims and objectives of each part of the Development Plan and against the Core Output Indicators.

Policy	Assessment of Performance	Implications	Proposals
Babergh Local Plan Alteration No2 June 2006			
Chapter 1			
LP01	Reasonably Effective		
Chapter 2			
EN01	Effective		
EN02	Effective and Ineffective	Important sites may be under threat.	Keep monitoring the policy in future years. Many DC officers find the policy works satisfactorily.
EN03	Effective		
EN04	Effective		
EN05	Effective		
EN11	Effective		
EN15	Effective		
EN19	Effective		
EN22	Effective		
EN25	Effective		
EN26	Effective		
Chapter 3			
HS01	Effective		
HS04	Effective		
HS05	The policy is considered	The policy is not consistently	Review the policy with development control;

	ineffective and can be abused, it deals with replacement dwellings in the countryside	applied and will lead to a progressive change in the countryside	consider additional guidance. The policy may allow larger houses to be built where there is a large plot.
HS06	Effective		
HS08	Effective	There may be instances where applicants try to avoid this policy.	Develop ways to ensure it's application with DC officers
HS09	Effective		New guidance will help the policy be more effective.
HS11- HS25	Effective		
HS27	Effective		
HS29	Effective		
HS31	Effective		
HS32	Effective		
HS33	Effective		
HS34	Effective		
HS35	Effective		
HS38	Effective		
HS41	This policy had mixed comments		Review the policy as it is applied, there are some problems with the evaluation of proposals
HS42	Effective		
Chapter 4			
EM02	Effective		
EM03- EM06	Effective		
EM08	Effective		
EM10	Effective		
EM19	Effective		
EM20	Effective		
EM24	Effective		
Chapter 5			
SP01	Effective		
SP02	Effective		
SP03	Effective		
SP04	Effective		
SP05	Ineffective	Farm shops may be established even where there is insufficient produce from the farm to justify the farm shop	Consider with development control how to make the policy more effective in it's implementation, at appeal inspectors take a more relaxed view of what can be sold.
Chapter 6			

CR02	Effective		
CR04 & CR05	Effective		
CR10	This policy had mixed comments; there can be an adverse impact on the countryside from fencing and other urban features.		It is usual that permitted development rights are removed and appropriate landscaping conditions are imposed.
CR12	Effective		
CR13	Effective		
CR15	Effective		
CR17	Effective		
CR18	Effective		
CR19	Effective		
CR20	Effective		
Chapter 7			
CN01	This policy had mixed comments and perhaps should be in the core strategy in future		The new design guide SPD should help with the implementation of the policy. A new revised policy could be part of the Core Strategy.
CN02	This policy had mixed comments, some positive and others negative		Keep monitoring the policy in future years.
CN04	This policy had mixed comments, some positive and others negative		Keep monitoring the policy in future years.
CN06	Very Effective		
CN07	This policy had mixed comments, some positive and others negative		Keep monitoring the policy in future years.
CN08	Effective		
CN12	This policy had positive and negative comments		Keep monitoring the policy in future years.
CN17	This policy had a mixture of comments, both positive and negative		There could be a rationalisation of the conservation policies which could be incorporated into the Core Strategy
Chapter 8			
RE03	Effective		
RE09	Effective		
RE16	Effective		

Chapter 9			
TP01	Effective		
TP03	Effective		
TP15	Effective		
TP16	This policy had mixed success. Green Transport Plans.	Green travel plans are important and the policy may not be used where it is needed.	The policy only applies to employers with 25 employees or more, but is applied when necessary.
Chapter 10			
SD01	This policy had mixed comments. Safeguarding primary shopping frontages.	The vitality and viability of the town centre may be adversely affected	It is considered that the policy generally works well.
SD02	Effective		
SD06	Effective		
SD11	Effective		
Chapter 11			
HD01	Effective		
HD03	Effective		
Chapter 12			
CP01	Not commented on in the survey		
Suffolk Structure Plan 2001			
ENV1	Effective		
ENV3	Effective		
ENV4	Effective		
ENV6	Effective		
ENV8	Effective		
ENV14	Effective		
ENV16	Effective		
ENV17	Effective		
ENV19	Effective		
ECON2	Effective		
ECON3	Effective		
ECON4	Effective		

Commentary

A survey has been carried out of development control officers and their use of policies and whether they consider the policies to be effective, members have also commented on some of the policies. The survey covered the policies they are most likely to use from the adopted Babergh Local Plan, Alteration No2 2006 and the Suffolk Structure Plan 2001.

The majority of Local Plan policies were considered effective or very effective (72 out of 86 surveyed 84%), with only 1 not commented on. The increased percentage of policies (over last year) which are considered effective reflects the fact that the local plan is newly adopted and the modification of the policies through the local plan review process. There were 13 (14%) of the policies surveyed causing concern,

some were considered unnecessary or in need of further refinement in order to ensure they are more effective. Some of these policies though have been used effectively and so it is hoped that they can be used effectively in the majority of circumstances, rather than with certain applications only. In most cases the proposed response has been to discuss with development control officers how to improve the use of the policies and make them more effective, this will take place during the year.

From a listed building and Conservation Area point of view there are two policies which are considered effective, they are CN06 (very effective) and CN08, and it is possible that other related policies should be merged with them, as they are not considered as effective or necessary. Some of the policies can be considered unnecessary as they duplicate guidance, there is also concern that the policy relating to Scheduled Ancient Monuments is not effective enough but these are protected by other legislation. It would seem that these policies would benefit from a major review which can take place as the new Local Development Framework policies are developed.

Policies which are considered effective or where no comments were made about them will continue to be monitored to establish whether the situation changes over the next year. The final version of the Local Plan was only adopted part way through this monitoring year and the policies should be considered in more detail after another year of use as they will have had a chance to bed in over the year.

3 (iii) Commentary on Appeal Decisions

There were 46 appeals against the Council's decisions to refuse planning permission during the monitoring period. Thirteen of these were allowed (28.9%) but 32 (71.1%) were dismissed, this is in the middle of the range for Suffolk authorities and similar to 3 other authorities, with one slightly higher and two with lower success rates. Winning nearly three quarters of all appeals is considered a good performance. In the separate Listed Building and Conservation Area Consent appeals process there was only 1 appeal which was dismissed. The rates are remarkably similar to last year's figures. This suggests generally that the policies are effective and that they are used appropriately.

Appeals were lost for a variety of reasons and a variety of policies were used. Adverse impact on Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, the countryside and street scene were the more common reasons for refusal for different types of applications. This reflects the quality of the buildings, towns, villages and landscape in the district. No particular conclusions can be drawn about the effectiveness or otherwise of policies from these varied appeal decisions.

One group of appeals which are likely to increase are those relating to the inclusion of renewable energy proposals within or adjacent to Conservation Areas and on or near Listed Buildings. This year a few appeals were made in this category and they were dismissed, it is difficult to preserve and enhance a Conservation Area or a Listed Building with current technology. The harm of the renewable energy proposals outweighs their environmental benefits, and this will continue to be an issue in a district with 28 Conservation Areas and nearly 4000 listed buildings.

Another issue, which has continued to cause a problem, is boundary treatment and new entrances to properties in rural areas. There is no specific policy relating to this issue with the result that appeals met with mixed results. In discussions with

planning officers this problem has also been raised, which suggests that a new policy may be required in the future.

While most policies are considered effective at present they should also be judged against the changing agenda in planning and environmental guidance particularly in relation to sustainable development. This will happen in future annual monitoring reports.

4. Housing Delivery and Expected Completion Rates

(i) Housing Trajectory

Introduction

The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is still in draft form, although a great deal of weight can be attached to it. For this monitoring year the Council has to compare its rate of housing development initially against that set out in the Suffolk Structure Plan 2001 (Policy CS8) as it is still the adopted strategic planning document for Babergh, although less and less weight can be attached to it. The Structure Plan housing allocation for Babergh was 6,900 for the period 1996 - 2016 (345 per annum). Having said this, it also needs to monitor against the development rate that will emerge through the new RSS.

The latest available information on the Draft East of England Plan as the new RSS (replacing Regional Planning Guidance 6) is that it sets out a figure of 5,000 + (up to 600 dwellings (total (up to)5,600 or 280 per annum) for Babergh during the later period of 2001-2021*¹. The 5,000 dwellings are deemed as the appropriate provision for Babergh district's own needs.

The (up to) 600 dwellings element is allocated to the Ipswich Policy Area (including the Ipswich fringe parishes). The East of England EiP Panel sees this element of provision as providing for Ipswich's own needs, rather than those of Babergh. This then represents a decrease of 1,300 dwellings overall for the district compared to the previous period looking at the two simply. Expressed another way, the new draft target is 81.16% of the old figure. However, the situation is more complex than this. Clearly the level of completions between the two periods, that is 1996-2001, will be important to assess. Three sets of monitoring record figures available cite this figure as:

1. 1,490 (Babergh Council Tax record data on stock change alone)
2. 1,464 Babergh DC (Building Control) information alone; and
3. 1,542 respectively; the latter including Suffolk CC data contained in the Structure Plan (1996-99) of 1,020 dwellings and completed through adding the 1.75 final years of Babergh DC (Building Control) information (522 dwellings).

Total range = 78 dwellings

Figure 1 (above) July 1996 (est) - end March 2001

Figure 3 above only adds in 0.75 of the completions for the year 99 – 2000

The Structure Plan year ran from the 1st of July 1996

¹ * Figure recommended by EiP Panel in their report of June 2006 following examination of RSS

It is difficult to establish which figure is the most reliable. The figures have been considered again following last years AMR. However, if the SCC figure is more accurate, the rate required to reach the Structure Plan target of 1,639 (345 x 4.75 [1st July 96 to 31st March 01]) has not been achieved, with an identified shortfall of 97. If the medium figure is correct then the shortfall is 149 and if the lowest figure is more accurate then the shortfall becomes 175. Accordingly, there appears to have been under-provision. It will now be a priority to establish the full extent of that under-provision but it is suspected that the historical Babergh Building Control figures are probably not fully reliable (in their precise time recording of completions). There could be reasons why the Council Tax records are not completely reliable either, because of possible delays in adding dwellings to the total stock between their construction and banding assessment / occupation by residents. These updated figures do suggest a narrower range of future requirements.

Housing Completions 2001-07 (reg 48 (6) & (7) refer)

Years	Net additional dwellings (Ann req. 345 (SSP) / 280 (RSS))	<i>Net additional dwellings – Ipswich Policy Area (Ann Guide Figure 55 (SSP) / 30 (RSS))</i>	% of total new and converted dwellings on PDL
		<i>NB These figures are included in the previous column</i>	
2001/02	242 (inc. 136 = 56.2% windfall)	105	57
2002/03	510 (inc. 364 = 71.4% windfall)	108	39
2003/04	212 (inc. 132 = 62.3% windfall)	10	55
2004/05	187 (inc. 164 = 87.7% windfall)	0	43
2005/06	189 (inc. 150 = 79.4% windfall)	6	68
2006/07	275 (inc. 146 = 53% windfall)	6	66
Total	1,615 (reqs. 2070 / 1,680)	235 (Guide 330 / 180)	Average 54.7

Suffolk Structure Plan 2001 Trajectory (1996 – 2016)

The first trajectory graph at Figure 2 presents a basic scenario based upon circumstances that are now largely out-of date. This depicts the housing requirements arising from the Suffolk Structure Plan 2001 (period 1996 – 2016) and shows that based only on previous annual completion trends (1996 – 2006) future completions and overall stock are projected to remain in under-supply. The assumptions behind this projection need to be examined, since past trends by themselves are not always a good indicator of what will happen in the future. In particular, a major change in circumstances has recently come about with the adoption of the Babergh Local Plan (2nd Alteration). The Suffolk Structure Plan and its allocation of 6,900 dwellings from 1996-2016 is expected to be replaced in 2008

by the new RSS, although various dates have already been given for the formal adoption of the new plan.

Housing delivery particularly during the period from 2001 – 2007 came predominantly from windfall sites, as the table above demonstrates. This has now moved substantially towards allocated sites because large allocated sites are being developed. Given that there was no up-to-date adopted Plan during most of this period, this is unsurprising, the Local Plan Alteration No. 1 having been adopted in 1995. These factors are likely to help explain why completions were low during this period (except for 2002-3). Windfall delivery rates over the whole Structure Plan period (so far) also exceeded the assumptions on windfalls underlying the new Local Plan (90 units per annum).

Windfall completions 1996 to 2001

Year	Total completions	Windfall completions	%
1996/97	268	125	47
1997/98	337	121	36
1998/99	240	132	55
1999/00	387	239	62
2000/01	232	192	83

Housing Supply Table 1996-2016 (Suffolk Structure Plan 2001)

Whole district (including Ipswich Policy Area)					
Completions 1996-2007	Commitments 2007 (-5%)	Other sites where principle of development accepted (-5%)	New Adopted Plan Allocations	Windfall Assumptions 2007-2016 (10 years at 90 p.a.)	Total
3,079	1,336 (1,269)	709 (673)	1,429	810	7,373 (7,260)
Ipswich Policy Area (BC Records)					
Completions 1996-2007	Commitments 2007 (-5%)	Other sites where principle of development accepted (-5%)	New Adopted Plan Allocations	Windfall Assumptions 2006-2016 (9 years at 10 p.a.)	Total
598 (259 + 333 +6)	21 (20)	169 (161)	30	90	908 (899)
Ipswich Policy Area (Council Tax Records)					
750 (514 + 232 + 4)	21 (20)	169 (161)	30	90	1,060 (1,051)

The table shows that given the available data, the Council's development strategy can be expected to meet the Structure Plan requirement for 1996-2016 comfortably. A small negative allowance needs to be made for non-implementation of planning permissions and the recent Local Plan Inspector endorsed a locally set figure of 5% for this. This might also apply to the new allocations but experience shows that these allowances are far more likely to be associated with delays than actual non-

implementation. Working against this, experience also shows that Local Plan allocation sites often end up producing higher dwelling numbers than the allocation originally envisaged and whilst some sites may transpire in the opposite trend, the former scenario is more commonplace. Even assuming the worst case, with a 5% non-implementation allowance also applied to the allocations, the strategy can still be expected to yield some 7,373 dwellings during the period to 2016. In addition, recent experience shows that the assumptions used here for windfall dwelling delivery are set very low.

No specific housing allocation figure was prescribed for the Babergh part of the Ipswich Policy Area in the Structure Plan. Although Policy HS26 (formerly HS10) of the 2nd Alteration of the Local Plan and its predecessor, HS15 of the 1st Alteration Plan in 1995, both took a restrictive stance towards residential development in the Ipswich fringe. However, for indicative purposes the Structure Plan 2001 envisaged 1,100 dwellings in the IPA from 1996-2016. Accordingly, the provision that was calculated in that document appears to be a relatively accurate prediction.

Conclusion: Sufficient land and sites provided to meet Suffolk Structure Plan (2001) requirements for the period 1996-2016.

East of England Plan Trajectory (2001 – 2021)

The second trajectory graph at Figure 3 shows a more up-to-date scenario and reflects the anticipated housing requirements (5,600 in total) of the new RSS: the East of England Plan covering 2001 – 2016. This also takes more account of the adoption of the new Local Plan (Alteration No. 2) in 2006. The allocations in this are expected to provide a further 1,850 – 2,000 dwellings approximately. Very few 2nd Alteration Plan allocated sites have been developed (although Bures Rd, Gt Cornard has commenced), since its first draft stage in 2001. A few sites allocated in that draft document were developed contributing a limited number of dwellings but these were taken into account in the development strategy for the final adopted Plan.

The new Local Plan allocates sufficient sites to meet known Development Plan targets, with some additions that the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector considered necessary to meet these targets with a good degree of certainty. There is clearly well in excess of a 5 year housing land supply and the sites listed in the Appendix 1 to this monitoring report show when they are likely to be built. Following discussions with the developers and house builders it is considered that Babergh has a supply of housing land which complies with the requirements of **PPS3**. Having been through the Local Plan process it is considered that the sites shown in Appendix 1 are; available, suitable and achievable given the annual housing completion requirements of the Draft RSS (280pa). This is shown graphically in Figure 3.

Expected housing completions compared with Draft RSS requirement.

	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	Cumulative total
Draft RSS Requirement	280	280	280	280	280	1400
Expected completions	351	515	599	483	330	2278

Since the new Local Plan’s adoption (June 2006) and beforehand too, a flurry of potential development activity has been encountered, with the landowners / developers of many large sites approaching the Council for pre-application

discussions. During this monitoring year a resolution to grant consent for the Grays Close/Lady Lane, Hadleigh allocation has been made and final legal details are being resolved as well as a revised application for the HMS Ganges site. This shows clear indications of intentions among development sector interests to pursue planning permissions for very substantial scale residential development. The smaller allocated sites in particular can be expected to be delivered relatively quickly as a general rule, where the issues delaying or stifling development can usually be expected to be less difficult to resolve than on the major sites. Although there is evidence from discussions with developers that they wish to develop the larger sites quickly and this is reflected in the Housing Trajectory data table at appendix 2.

Development densities may increase, for example, as a result of PPG3 / PPS3. Housing and land markets will fluctuate and the effects of this must also be considered. However, it is difficult to predict these fluctuations and changes in balance in housing supply and demand. These are areas of further research that the Council will need to carry out and guidance on carrying out Housing Market Assessments is now available.

In Babergh there is a recent history of numerous large sites in the Sudbury / Great Cornard areas in particular, taking a very long time to achieve a full planning permission. This issue was reflected in dwelling delivery numbers for the period from 1996 – 2006 (average of 280 per year). This has frequently been associated with complex Section 106 agreements (such as the Rugby Ground site, Great Cornard and land near St Bartholomew's Priory / south of Springlands, Sudbury). These sites are now being developed at an increasing rate. In addition, improved ongoing monitoring will enable a fuller annual analysis of housing development against completion targets.

However, it must be recognised still that the means available to local planning authorities to speed up delivery 'on the ground' are limited. For this reason, a full dialogue will be opened up with local landowners, developers, house builders and agents to explore barriers to delivery and possible solutions. The Council has begun this process prior to commencement on work for this AMR. Developers, agents, and landowners of all but the smallest sites listed in the Housing Trajectory table were contacted to establish their views on when they see their sites coming forward for delivery. Discussions at some length proved useful in determination of when the bulk of the district's future residential development can be expected and this information was incorporated into the table. An additional discussion with the Council's affordable housing enabling officers has also given more certainty over the development rates during the next 5 years.

There are new large sites allocated in the Local Plan, plus other smaller sites and windfall sites that are expected to deliver the Structure Plan housing requirement overall. Most of these larger allocations are at the preliminary stages in their delivery, with some notable exceptions.

Housing Supply Table 2001-2021 (RSS: East of England Plan)

Whole district (including Ipswich Policy Area)					
Completions 2001-2007	Commitments 2007 (-5%)	Other sites where principle of development accepted (-5%)	New Adopted Plan Allocations	Windfall Assumptions 2007-2021 (14 years at 90 p.a.)	Total
1,615	1,336 (1,269)	709 (673)	1,429	1,260	6,349 (6,246)
Ipswich Policy Area (BC Records)					
Completions 2001-2007	Commitments 2007 (-5%)	Other sites where principle of development accepted (-5%)	New Adopted Plan Allocations	Windfall Assumptions 2007-2021 (14 years at 10 p.a.)	Total
339	21 (20)	169 (161)	30	140	699 (690)
Ipswich Policy Area (Council Tax Records)					
236	21 (20)	169 (161)	30	140	608 (587)

Again the table shows that the Council's existing development strategy, through its newly adopted Local Plan, can be expected to deliver enough land and sites to meet the draft RSS housing requirements for the period from 2001-2021, including factoring in all worst case scenarios.

The East of England Plan in its latest form prescribes a specific housing allocation figure for the Babergh part of the Ipswich Policy Area of up to: 600 dwellings. Policy HS26 (formerly HS10) of the 2nd Alteration Plan maintains a restrictive stance towards residential development in the Ipswich fringe. The above data suggest that this allocation figure would be appropriate and these also confirm that neither new land allocations are necessary in this location, nor is the acceptance of any substantial windfall sites for residential development.

Conclusion: Sufficient land and sites provided to meet East of England Plan requirements for the period 2001-2021.

Distribution of Planning Consents and Completions for the year 2006/07

During the last financial year consents were granted for 675 net additional dwellings, with 514 in Sudbury and Gt Cornard, and 81 in Hadleigh. In the villages listed as sustainable in the Local Plan there were consents granted for 50 dwellings leaving consents for 30 dwellings in villages classed as non-sustainable.

There were 111 dwellings completed in Sudbury and Gt Cornard, and 64 in Hadleigh. The number of dwellings completed in the non-sustainable villages was 54, which was higher than the 46 completed in the villages classified as sustainable. These latter figures may reflect an unusually high number of affordable housing completions in small villages. This suggests that the development strategy of focussing development in the towns or sustainable villages appears to be generally working although the number of new dwellings in the unsustainable villages is higher than might be expected and should be monitored in future years.

Planning consents by size of application 2006/07

Size of application, (dwelling numbers)	Total dwellings	Number of Consents
1 - 2 dwellings	84	68
3 -10 dwellings	83	14
11 - 50 dwellings	126	6
Over 50 dwellings	382	2
Total	675	

This table shows that small infill sites have made a significant contribution to consents granted last year, but over half of all dwellings granted consent came from the larger sites of over 50 dwellings (382 of 675 dwellings).

Dwelling completions by number of bedrooms 2006/07

Number of bedrooms	Completed dwellings	%
1	13	5
2	74	27
3	100	36
4+	78	28
Unknown Number	10	4

In the past there has been concern that many new dwellings had 4 or more bedrooms with few having 2 or 3 bedrooms; but in the past monitoring year only 28% of the total number completed had 4 bedrooms, with 68% of dwellings completed with 3 bedrooms or less. It will be necessary to assess the findings of the housing market assessment / housing needs survey in order to establish how housing delivery (by house size) relates to the needs of the local market. The table below shows dwelling consents by number of bedrooms for this monitoring year.

Dwelling consents by number of bedrooms 2006/07

Number of bedrooms	Number of dwellings granted consent	%
1	49	7
2	289	43
3	160	24
4+	149	22
Unknown Number	28	4

These figures show an interesting change in the balance of the size of dwellings being granted planning consent, historically many dwellings were in the 4+ bedrooms category, but this now represents only 22% of the total. Half of all new consents are now for dwellings with 1 or 2 bedrooms, this reflects many factors, on large sites the council has a policy of seeking a proportion of small dwellings, smaller infill sites are being developed and many affordable housing developments contain a high proportion of small dwellings. This will result in improved provision of housing for existing smaller households and the expected decrease in household sizes in future.

(ii) Affordable Housing

This issue has become a top corporate priority for the Council in recent years. In the past, delivery rates were low but the issue has become an increasingly severe problem with house prices in the area increasingly outstripping local income levels. With the adoption of the Second Alteration to the Local Plan in June 2006 the Council now has effective or reasonably effective formally adopted affordable housing policies. There is an issue with implementation of policy HS09 and developers have tried to avoid providing affordable housing, a new interim planning guidance note has been produced for officers to use, to try and increase the effectiveness of the policy.

The Council has become much more proactive in this area of activity and delivery rates have risen significantly. The scale of need is such that more affordable housing is needed; in larger settlements (over 3000 population) a reduced threshold may be appropriate and some form of contribution from one or two dwelling consents may be required across the district. Babergh now has an affordable housing delivery programme seeking to secure 700 new units of affordable accommodation between 2004/5 and 2009/10.

The Council's approach is to enable the delivery of affordable housing in a variety of ways:

- Provision through Section 106 Planning Obligations on open market housing sites
- Developing Rural Exceptions Sites schemes
- Facilitating Housing Association land purchases (for HA's to deliver their own schemes)
- Use of Babergh owned land (often made available to HA's for delivery)
- Negotiation of schemes using Suffolk County Council owned land (such as county farm sites)
- Facilitating schemes on Church-owned land
- Regeneration schemes (often involving demolition and building higher numbers on site, or rehabilitation of inadequate dwellings)
- Seeking funding for others' schemes through the Housing Corporation and through the Council's own finances

This approach aims to maximise the ability of the Council's limited resources to secure delivery and to tailor the approach to the individual circumstances of different sites and delivery contexts.

Affordable Housing Delivery during the year 2006/7: Overall figures (as at July 2007)

No. Completed	No. Under construction	Additional planning permissions granted in 2006/7
80 gross (73 net)	73	15

The aim is to have 700 units either completed or in the development pipeline between 2004/5 and 2009/10. These data are compiled from Babergh Housing Services.

No. wholly funded by RSLs and/or local authorities	No. wholly funded through developer contributions	No. funded through mix of public subsidy / developer contributions	No. through unknown / other sources	Total
26	40	7	0	73

Rural Provision

Turning specifically to rural schemes under construction, the figures at 31st March 2007 are:

- 9 as a rural exception site
- 15 as part of an allocation
- 6 as a local needs scheme
- 2 as planning obligations
- 3 as a general needs scheme

During the year this figure will be added to as new schemes commence development.

Regeneration

There were no regeneration schemes under construction as at the 31st of March 2007, but it is expected that some will commence during the next year.

Babergh Council Housing Stock (as at 31st March 2007)

Babergh Council has retained its own stock of affordable Council housing. This forms a very important element of affordable housing in Babergh through re-lets of dwellings. This stock used to include some 6,000 properties, although 'right to buy' provisions for tenants and transfers of land and property for development to Housing Associations has seen this reduce to 3,565 dwellings. Housing Associations had a stock of 1,184 dwellings (excluding shared ownership).

(iii) Gypsies and Travellers

The Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) study covering Babergh and 4 other districts in east Suffolk was finalised in July 2007. The study has made recommendations on the requirements for both permanent site provision and transit sites. There is however no clear definition of what is meant by a transit site and how it should be developed and managed. The study has identified the need for 1 permanent pitch (for up to 2 caravans) and a further need for up to 12 transit pitches within Babergh. No suggested locations have been identified. The study is rare in identifying need for transit sites rather than solely permanent provision.

At the same time the East of England Regional Assembly have carried out their own regional study and have consulted on the possible options for permanent caravan pitches for Gypsies and Travellers across the region (May 2007). They have consulted on two options, one is for no permanent provision in Babergh or the option to provide 15 pitches or one site to cater for part of the regional need rather than just that identified in Babergh alone.

In the adopted Local Plan policy HS42 relates to permanent sites for travellers and is a criteria-based policy which depends on a local need for the site being justified. The Council has not decided how it will implement the findings of the east Suffolk study or the possible regional policies, but the existing Local Plan policy appears fit for purpose to meet any identified local need for permanent sites and complies with Circular 01/2006 'Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites', at least until the East of England Plan requirement is known. Transit sites are not catered for as yet.


Over the last year there were 5 separate illegal encampments for short periods and no application has been received for a permanent site. The number of caravans varied from 1 to 8 and the recorded length of stay varied from 1 to 9 days. There are no transit or permanent sites in the district. This suggests that the two accommodation studies are accurate in their assessment of local need in Babergh.

Gypsy & Traveller housing and land use requirements as a Local Output Indicator*		
No.	Requirement	Data
1	Number of authorised public and private sites (permanent and transit) and numbers of caravans on them over the period monitored and any changes during the period.	None
2	Number of unauthorised sites and numbers of caravans on them and any known changes during the period.	None
3	Details of any permissions granted for new public/private sites, or expansion of existing sites, during the period; and any other unimplemented permissions outstanding at the end of the period.	None
4	Progress of any work to assess the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers in accordance with the requirements of housing legislation and planning policy.	Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment studies have been carried out on behalf of the district and at regional level. (May 2007)
5	If no assessment is underway, when is this anticipated to be undertaken and the nature of this work (County, (inter-) District etc).	One study is complete and another is nearly finalised.
6	An assessment of the use and performance of existing development plan policies on this issue.	It is difficult to assess the performance of policies relevant to Gypsies and Travellers, as their use is very limited with no known application.

* Babergh District has not historically been considered to have a significant current Gypsy or Traveller issue, with no sites being recorded as either authorised or unauthorised in the monitoring period. The presence of Gypsies and Travellers has always tended to be fleeting, as they pass through the District, but never actually encamp for any prolonged period.


Housing Trajectory: Suffolk Structure Plan 2001 (1996-2016)

Figure 2



Housing Trajectory: Draft East of England Plan

Figure 3



5. Local Development Orders (reg 48 (3) (d) – (f) refer)

No Local Development Orders applicable as none adopted.

Final Note: Public Accessibility of AMR via website (reg 48 (8) refers)

This AMR will be placed on the Council's website as soon as possible after submission to the Secretary of State

Housing Trajectory Data

Site Name/ Address	Site Area (hectares)	Site in Adopted Local Plan (A) or windfall (W)	Estimated Total Units to be Built (No. of units)	Completions as at 31/3/07 (No. of units)	Total No. of Units/Year (Estimated for year of completion 1 April to 31 March)								FURTHER COMMENTS e.g. stage reached, estimate of when next stage will be reached, risks to projected nos/ timing of completions + Greenfield or Brownfield
					06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	
Former HMS Ganges	16	W	325	0	0			30	110	110	75		Stage 3, These figures are uncertain , revised reserve matters application submitted
Shotley Marina	7.06	W	150	0	0	10	30	20	10				Stage 1. There are 80 dwellings to be built in the future.
Guildford Europe, Gt Cornard	4.45	W	66	34	34	20							Stage 1 for part. Another 46 dwellings to complete later.
Cornard Mills, Gt Cornard	3.18	W	116	18	18	45	45	8					Stage 1
Thorington Hall, Pinewood. (Areas F1 / F2)	5.52	W	160	0	0			10	30	30	30	20	Stage 5. Another 40 dwellings to complete later.
Walnuttree Hospital, Sudbury	Unclear	A	35	0	0								Stage 8, too uncertain to give completions
Head Lane, Gt Cornard	0.6	A	30	0	0								Stage 5 Too uncertain to assign completions to a year
Priory Stadium, Sudbury	1.6	A	60	0	0	10	50						Stage 1
Land Adj Sudbury Western by-pass	8.53	A	192		23	50	50	50	19				Stage 1
Rotherham Rd, Bildeston	1	A	26		0	10	5						Stage 8 only 15 dwellings are planned so far.
Poplar Rd, Gt Cornard	0.71	W	41	0	0	18	23						Stage 2
Friends Fields / Tawneys Ride, Bures	1.3	A	40	0	0			10	15	15			Stage 8 and stage 2 for part
Land Adj Maldon grey, Cats Lane, Gt Cornard	0.88	W	42	0	0	24	18						Stage 1
Totals			2967		75	272	439	537	478	310	190	105	
Smaller Sites													
Highbank, Sudbury	0.9	A	25	0	0		10	15					Stage 8
Goodlands Farm, Boxford	0.7	A	20	0	0			5	5	5	5		Stage 8

Site Name/ Address	Site Area (hectares)	Site in Adopted Local Plan (A) or windfall (W)	Estimated Total Units to be Built (No. of units)	Completions as at 31/3/07 (No. of units)	Total No. of Units/Year (Estimated for year of completion 1 April to 31 March)							FURTHER COMMENTS e.g. stage reached, estimate of when next stage will be reached, risks to projected nos/ timing of completions + Greenfield or Brownfield		
					06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13		13/14	
Church Rd, Sproughton	1.1	A	30	0	0						15	10	5	Stage 8
Beestons Coach Depot, Long Bessels, Hadleigh	0.45	W	20	0	0	10	10							Stage 1
St Leonards Hospital, Sudbury	0.47	W	23	0	0									Stage 4
Totals			118			10	20	20	5	20	15	5		
Affordable Housing Sites														
Churchill Close, Lawshall	0.46	W	12	0	0	12								Stage 2
Clibbon House, Gt Cornard	0.31	W	23	0	0	23								Stage 2
			35			35								
Total for the above three groups			3120											
						317	459	557	483	330	205	110		
Additional windfall sites											60	70		This is to make total windfall 90 in one year, the approximate underlying assumption in the Local Plan
Other Affordable Housing, small schemes			132			34	56	42						
Grand Total			3252			351	515	599	483	330	265	180		

21/09/07

