



Babergh District Council
Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report
Incorporating the regulations of the SEA directive

Baseline Data
Last updated May 2010

Local Development Framework

Mr Rich Cooke
Development Plan Manager
Babergh District Council
Tel : 01473 825775
E-mail: rich.cooke@babergh.gov.uk

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

SOCIAL BASELINE DATA

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it improve access to high quality, health facilities?							
26/01/09	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (Datasource: Suffolk County Council, Local Transport Plan 2006 -2011; DfT accessibility indicators)	BDC	2005 data (DfT) Hospital: 57.4% of households are within 30 mins by public transport, and 97.1% within 60 mins GP: 87.3% households are within 15 mins by public transport and 99.3% are within 30mins.	No target identified 2004 data 4 % of households are within 30 mins by public transport of a Hospital 87.7 % of households are within 60 mins by public transport of a Hospital 59.8 % of households are within 15 minutes of a GP by public Transport 86.9 % of households are within 30 minutes of a GP by public Transport	Situation improved between 2004 and 2005 according to DfT figures.	Limited trend information available	😊 Appears to be relatively high proportion of the households that are within 60 mins of a hospital and 30 mins of a GP by public transport. Generally figures compares well with figures for Suffolk with the exception of % of households within 30 min by public transport. Improvement seen over the year 2004 to 2005.
26/01/09	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (Datasource: Suffolk County Council, Local Transport Plan 2006 -2011; DfT accessibility indicators)	Suffolk	2005 data: (DfT) Hospital 30 mins- 86.3% 60mins- 99.4% GP 15 mins- 88.0% 30 mins- 99.9%	No target identified 2004 data 30 % of households are within 30 mins by public transport of a Hospital 75.6 % of households are within 60 mins by public transport of a Hospital 73.6 % of households are within 15 minutes of a GP by public Transport 92.1 % of households are within 30 minutes of a GP by public Transport	Situation improved between 2004 and 2005 according to DfT figures.	Limited trend information available	😊 Appears to be relatively high proportion of the households that are within 60 mins of a hospital and 30 mins of a GP by public transport. Improvement seen over the year 2004 to 2005.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
26/01/09	Overall death rate by all causes (nchod.nhs and PCT) per 100,000 (Datasource : NHS from www.nchod.nhs.uk Table 03C_073DR00+_07_V1_D)	BDC	Directly Age Standardised: 2007: 513.4 2006: 505.6 2005: 523.8	Target: reduce the number of early deaths (Suffolk LAA 2005-2008) 2004: 568.7 Age standardised 2003: 546.6 560.5 2002: 556.4 565.1 2001: 571 582.2	Death rate by all causes generally lower than early 2000s. Slight rise 2006-07.	Due to ageing population and Babergh being an attractive place for retiring to, some of the increase could be unavoidable.	😐 Mixed trends. Previously decreasing, but has stabilised in recent years. Figures for Babergh (for population under 75) below average for East of England and England.
26/01/09	Overall death rate by all causes (nchod.nhs and PCT) Per 100,000 (Datasource : NHS from www.nchod.nhs.uk Table 03C_073DR00+_07_V1_D)	Suffolk	Directly Age Standardised: 2007: 519.3 2006: 510.8 2005: 548.22	Target: reduce the number of early deaths (Suffolk LAA 2005-2008) 2004: 570.26 Age standardised 2003: 597.91 609.6 2002: 595.91 608.7 2001: 605.18 615.7	Similar to Babergh, was decreasing but slight increase between 2006 and 2007.	Due to ageing population and Babergh being an attractive place for retiring to, some of the increase could be unavoidable.	😐 Previously decreasing, but has stabilised in recent years
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
26/01/09	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT) (Datasource: NHS from www.nchod.nhs.uk Table 11B_075_DR0074_07_V1_D)	BDC	2009- all cancers only available data Direct standardised rate: 2007: under 75: 97.4 all ages: 156.4 2005:144.3	Target: Reduce mortality rates from cancer by 20% in people aged under 75 by 2008 (Suffolk LAA 2005 - 2008) 2004: 158.6 Age standardised 2003: 147.4 107.6 2002: 135.4 104.2	Slightly different figures collected for 2007- covers ALL cancer types. 3 rd lowest in Suffolk	Difficult to draw accurate conclusions due to limited trend information available. Shows overall improvement for under 75s.	😊 Low rate for under 75. Significantly lower than previous years (if data is same).

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
				2001: 141.7 111.0			
26/01/09	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT) (Datasource: NHS from www.nchod.nhs.uk Table 11B_075_DR0074_07_V1_D)	Suffolk	2009- all cancers only available data Direct standardised rate: 2007: 101.27 2005: 138.9	Target: Reduce mortality rates from cancer by 20% in people aged under 75 by 2008 (Suffolk LAA 2005 – 2008) 2004: 140.9 Age standardised 2003: 147 114.7 2002: 139.2 110.4 2001: 138.4 112.7			☹ Figure shows significant decrease for 2007. Unclear whether this will be a one off or a trend. Babergh figures below that of Suffolk.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
26/01/09	Ischaemic Heart Disease deaths under 75 per 100,000 population (Datasource: NHS from www.nchod.nhs.uk Table 09C_178DR00+_07_V1_D)	BDC	Direct standardised rate 2007: all ages: 51.2 35-64 : 19.9	Target: Reduce mortality rates from heart disease, strokes and related diseases by 40% in people under 75 by 2008 (Suffolk LAA 2005 - 2008) Crude mortality ratio: 2005: 49.4 2004: 55.9 Age standardised 2003: 61.3 43.8 2002: 57.8 44.0 2001: 63 46.9	Lower than the Suffolk values	No longer 75 and under- data not published as that so have given available data.	☹ Unable to compare as age ranges are different in 2007 to previous. Limited trend information available but suggests overall decrease.
26/01/09	Ischaemic Heart Disease deaths under 75 per 100,000 population (Datasource: NHS from www.nchod.nhs.uk Table 09C_178DR00+_07_V1_D)	Suffolk	Direct standardised rate 2007: all ages: 54.2 35-64 : 23.0	Target: Reduce mortality rates from heart disease, strokes and related diseases by 40% in people under 75 by 2008 (Suffolk LAA 2005 – 2008) Crude mortality ratio: 2005: 55.1 2004: 53.9 Age standardised 2003: 57.3 43.6 2002: 65.8 50.9 2001: 70.2 55.5		No longer 75 and under- data not published as that so have given available data.	☹ Unable to compare as age ranges are different in 2007 to previous. Suggests decrease.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
SB/BG	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT) (Datasource: NHS; PCT)	BDC	Crude mortality ratio: 2005: 141.5 2004: 135.6	Crude mortality ratio Age standardised 2003: 125.6 59.9 2002: 113.6 53.2 2001: 112.5 7.0			☹ Mixed trends.
SB/BG	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT) (Datasource: NHS)	Suffolk		Crude mortality ratio 2005: 135 2004: 124.3 Age standardised 2003: 141.3 70.1 2002: 132.1 66.4 2001: 128.7 65.7			☹ Mixed trends.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
26/01/09	Deaths from self harm and injury undetermined per 100,000 population (PCT) now Deaths from Suicide and Undetermined (per 100,000) (Datasource: NHS www.nchod.nhs.uk)	BDC	Directly Standardised Ratio: 2007: 6.97	Crude mortality ratio: 2005: 8.3 2004: 8.3 Age standardised 2003: 7.1 7.4 2002: 10.8 11.7 2001: 6 6.8	The rate fluctuates but seems to suggest a reduction in figures. Below the Suffolk average.		☹/☺ Below average for Suffolk and lowest rate since 2001. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
26/01/09	Deaths from self harm and injury undetermined per 100,000 population (PCT) now Deaths from Suicide and Undetermined (per 100,000) (Datasource: NHS www.nchod.nhs.uk)	Suffolk	Directly Standardised Ratio: 2007: 8.11	Crude mortality ratio: 2005: 8.5 2004: 7.9 2003: 8.8 2002: 8.8 2001: 9.3 Age standardised 8.7 8.9 8.7	Relatively stable over last 5 years, small fluctuation and possible slight reduction?		😊/😞 Has remained relatively stable since 2001. Figures for individual districts fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
01/2009	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (Suffolk) (Datasource Suffolk County Council)	BDC	2007 (calendar year) 5 fatal, 41 serious injuries 53.1 per 100,000 2006: 48 Casualties 55.3 per 100,000 2005: 62 casualties 73.1 per 100,000	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005) <u>2004 RTA casualties:</u> Fatal: 7 Serious: 47	Decrease in both fatal and serious casualties compared to 2006 and 2005 figures.	Rate is above that of Suffolk	😊/😞 Reductions shown over last few years and below target for Suffolk for 2007. Rate is above that of Suffolk as a whole.
01/2009	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (Suffolk) (Datasource Suffolk County Council)	Suffolk	2007 (calendar year) 39 fatal, 265 serious 42.8 per 100,000 2006: 359 casualties 51.1 per 100,000 2005: 380 casualties 55.6 per 100,000	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005) (304 for 2007) <u>2004 RTA casualties:</u> Fatal: 42 Serious: 355 (Totals for county) The target for 2008 is 322	Greater decrease in rate (per 100,000) than in Babergh alone. Target was met.		😊 Target met and decrease in casualties seen.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
12/2008	Life expectancy (Datasource : Suffolk Observatory and Census From Neighbourhood Statistics (ONS))	BDC	2004-2006 Male 78.7, Female 83.3 2002-2004 Male 78.6, Female 82.5	East of England Average: 2004-06 Male 78.3, Female 82.3 2002-04 Male 77.3 years, Female 81.4 years Longest life expectancy in Suffolk for both men and women.	Life expectancy has increased each monitoring period since 1998-2000. 2001-2003: Male 78.7 years Female 82.4 years		😊 Life expectancy is good, and has increased each monitoring period recently.
12/2008	Life expectancy (Datasource : Suffolk Observatory and Census From Neighbourhood Statistics (ONS))	Suffolk	2000-2002 Male 77.4, Female 81.9	East of England Average: 2004-06: (m) 78.3, (f) 83.3 2002-04: (m) 77.6, (f) 81.6 England average: 2004-06: (m) 77.3, (f) 81.6 2002-04: (m) 76.5, (f) 80.8	For East of England and England life expectancy increasing.		No results for specific but 😊 for East of England
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/B6	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Datasource: Census/SSAG SCC Travel to Work Report)	BDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.3% Babergh DC employees 2005: 18.24% 2006: 18.18 (LTP1) (no results broken down in SCC report but it is stated that there was no improvement)	No improvement made from 2006 to 2008 in the SCC report	No annual information available for the whole district but there is a survey of Babergh DC employees each year along with other employees in Suffolk. There appears to be little change		😞 Limited trend information but there appears to be little change in the use of sustainable means of transport which is against the County trend.
27/01/09	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Census/SSAG) (Datasource: Census/SSAG SCC Travel to Work Report)	Suffolk	SCC Travel Survey 2008: Walk/cycle: 2.9/8.3%= 11.2% Sustainable modes: 34.2% SCC Travel Survey of a sample of Suffolk employees:	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. % sustainable 2001 Census: 21.2% Suffolk County Council Employee Travel	There may be a trend towards more sustainable modes across Suffolk but the survey is of a relatively few large employers.		😊/😞 Limited trend information. An increase has been recorded in use of sustainable modes by a sample of Suffolk employees but is this representative of the wider population?

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
			2004: 25.24% 2005: 23.41% 2006: 26.19% (LTP1)	Survey 2004: 28.0%			
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	How do children travel to school? (Datasource: Suffolk County Council)	BDC	2005 survey 35.2% walk, 22.3% bus, 3.2% cycle, 39.3% car	2004 survey 36.7 walk, 25.6% bus, 2.5% cycle, 35.2% car 2003 survey 44.2 walk, 16.7% bus, 1.8% cycle, 37.3% car	The trend in Babergh seems to be slightly towards to more car use. This perhaps reflects the rural nature of the district.	To reduce the use of the car on the school run.	☹ Babergh appears to be going in the opposite direction to the County.
SB/BG	How do children travel to school? (Datasource: Suffolk County Council)	Suffolk	2005 survey: 41% walk, 19% bus, 7.4% cycle, 32.4% car	Suffolk target of 23% by bus in 2004 2004 survey: Now target for car is 31% 41% walk, 18% bus, 5.9% cycle, 35% car. 2003 Survey: 41.6% walk, 17.1% bus, 6% cycle, 35.3% car	The split of transport uses varies slightly year to year but the trend is towards more sustainable forms of transport. The county may have reached the limit for reducing car use because of it's rural nature and parental choice.	To reduce further the use of the car on the school run.	😊 There has been steady progress to reduce the use of the car and encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	Obesity in the population (PCT) Synthetic Estimate for 2001 for people age 16 and over (Datasource: PCT; Suffolk Observatory)	BDC	24.9 ONS 2003 - 2005 Neighbourhood Statistics model based figures for 21% 2001	Second lowest in Suffolk			☹ Baseline data no trend yet but second lowest in Suffolk
SB/BG	Obesity in the population (PCT) Synthetic Estimate for 2001 for people age 16 and over (Datasource: PCT; Suffolk Observatory)	Suffolk	22.6% 2001				☹ Baseline data no trend yet
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (Datasource: SSAG 5-year review and PPG17 Assessment BDC)	BDC	This information is not currently available and the Council are working on a PPG17 compliant study to inform the LDF April 2008				No data available but surveys are due to be carried out.
SB/BG	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (Datasource: SSAG 5-year review and PPG17 Assessment BDC)	Suffolk	This information is not currently available and the Council are working on a PPG17 compliant study to inform the LDF April 2008				No data available but surveys are due to be carried out.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	Change in existing provision of children's play space (Datasource: SSAG 5-year review and PPG17 Assessment BDC)	BDC	This information is not currently available and the Council are working on a PPG17 compliant study to inform the LDF April 2008				No data available but surveys are due to be carried out.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SB/BG	Change in existing provision of children's play space (Datasource: SSAG 5-year review and PPG17 Assessment BDC)	Suffolk	This information is not currently available and the Council are working on a PPG17 compliant study to inform the LDF April 2008				No data available but surveys are due to be carried out.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	Change in provision of open space (Datasource: District open space assessments)	BDC	1 public open space area lost 1997 to 2001				☹ Baseline data no trend yet
SB/BG	Change in provision of open space (Datasource: District open space assessments)	Suffolk	26 open spaces lost 1997 to 2001				☹ There appears to be a large number of open space areas lost but there may also be new ones created in housing development.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB/BG	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Datasource: Suffolk County Council, BVPI)	BDC	No data				
SB/BG	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Datasource: Suffolk County Council, BVPI)	Suffolk	2005/6 survey 66%	Target for the county of 62% for 2004/5, 63% for 2005/6 and 63% for 2006/7.	2004/5 survey: 59% 2003/4: 60.5% 2002/3: 57.4% 2001/2: 48% Improving trend since 2001 but decreased slightly in 2004/5.	% of easy to use paths has increased substantially this year and target has been exceeded.	😊 % of easy to use paths has increased substantially this year and target has been exceeded.
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it increase access to natural green space?							
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Datasource: SSAG 5-year review and PPG17 Assessment BDC)	BDC	Awaiting PPG17 work.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Datasource: SSAG 5-year review and PPG17 Assessment BDC)	Suffolk	2006: 22 10 + ha				☹ No trend info.
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?							
01/2009	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ C-A* grades at GCSE (Datasource: Suffolk Observatory; District Wide SDA / BVPI)	BDC	2007: 67.7% 2006: 68.7% 2005: 66.1%	East of England 2007: 64.8% 2006: 62.9% 2005: 59.1%	Trend shows regular increase from 64.1% in 2001. Slight decrease from 2006 to 2007 but still above Suffolk average	3 rd highest in Suffolk (previously highest)	😊 Good performance.
01/2009	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE (Datasource: Suffolk Observatory; District Wide SDA / BVPI)	Suffolk	2007: 64.4 2006: 62.8% 2004: 57.3%	England 2007: 62% 2006: 59.2% 2005: 57.1%	Trend shows performance is improving each year. % for county has increased annually from 54.3% in 2001.		😊 Trend shows performance is improving each year. % for county has increased annually from 54.3% in 2001, although some districts perform better

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
							and/or have improved more than others.
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?							
01/2009	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (Datasource: Suffolk Observatory; District Wide SDA / BVPI)	BDC	Average score 2008: 770.1 2007: 760.1 Average score 2006: 676.7 Average score 2005: 301	East of England 2007: 741 2006:728 2005:281.9	Can't compare 2006 with any data previous to that. Improvement seen in recent years		😊 Performance has improved
01/2009	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (Datasource: Suffolk Observatory; District Wide SDA / BVPI)	Suffolk	Average score 2008: 712.7 2007: no data Average score 2006: 730.8 Average score 2004: 264.9	England 2007:731 2005:277.6	Performance worsened since 2006- but no data for 2007 so impossible to tell whether this is a trend or otherwise.		😐/😊 No data for 2007 but previous years have shown improvement
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of adults?							
SB/BG 2009	Proportion of the population with no qualifications (Datasource: Census 2001; Suffolk Data Observatory)	BDC	% of working age with no qualification 2006: 7.2% 2005: 13.2 % 2003-2004 : 16%	Lowest in Suffolk.	2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 27.8%	The time series data may be calculated in a different way- the figures from Nomis are higher (not used here)	😊 Proportion is relatively low and getting lower.
SB/BG 2009	Proportion of the population with no qualifications (Datasource: Census 2001; Suffolk Data Observatory)	Suffolk	2006: 12.2% 2005: 15.8 % of working age population 2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 27.8%	E of E average: 10.6% GB average: 9.00 %	Reducing, although Suffolk is 2 nd highest in E of England	Proportion of the population with no qualifications is relatively high.	😐 Proportion is relatively high for Suffolk compared to England average, though varies between Districts.
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of adults?							
SB/BG 2009	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher (Datasource: Census 2001; Suffolk Data Observatory)	BDC	2006: 25.6% February 2005: 24.0%	East of England 2006/07: 26%	Feb 2004: 24.1% Feb 2003:22.2% Feb 2002: 22.2%		😊 Shows steady improvement.
SB/BG 2009	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher (Datasource: Census 2001; Suffolk Data Observatory)	Suffolk	2006: 22.7% February 2005: 24.2%		Feb 2004: 22.9% Feb 2003: 19.8% Feb 2002: 21.6%		😐 Trend shows regular improvement in Suffolk since 2003, but a decline from 2005.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce actual levels of crime?							
SSAG 2009	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (Datasouce: Suffolk Data Observatory)	BDC	2007-08: 49.4 2006 - 2007 52.9 2005 55.4	Below average for county.	2001 46.8 2002 49.9 2003 51.6 2004 57.7		😊 The crime rate has decreased over the last few years. It remains relatively low for Suffolk
SSAG 2009	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (Datasouce: Suffolk Data Observatory; SSAG)	Suffolk	2007-08: 68.8 2006-07: 74.6 2005-06: 77.9 2004-05: 76.8 2004: 80.3	2nd only to Norfolk (66.9) in E of E E of E average 2007/08 - 74.9	2001 64.1 2002 ---- 2003 72.4 Substantially lower baseline than the national figure (113 in 2004)		😊 The crime rate has decreased over the last few years and is low for the region.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce actual levels of crime?							
SG 2009	Burglary Rate per 1000 population (Datasource: Suffolk Data Observatory)	BDC	2007-08: 5.6 2006 - 2007: 5.3 2005: 8.8 2004: 7.1	2 nd lowest in County (Waveney 4.7)	No distinct trend although generally lower than a few years ago	Below Suffolk average	😊 This last year the rate has decreased, but burglary rates have increased annually in recent years, but is still relatively low.
SG 2009	Burglary Rate per 1000 population (Datasource: Suffolk Data Observatory)	Suffolk	2007-08: 7.2 2006-07: 7.4 2005-06: 7.8 2004-05: 7.5 2004: 9.6 2003: 8.8	Suffolk second lowest county in E of E (Norfolk 6.6) E of E 8.9 in 2007/08	Downwards trend	Burglary rates generally low	😐 Burglary rate has remained fairly low compared to the national average, and is particularly low in the more rural districts.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce actual levels of crime?							
SG 2009	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (Datasource: Suffolk Data Observatory)	BDC	2007-08: 7.9 2006-07: 9.6 2005-06: 8.5 2004-05: 8.8	2 nd lowest to Mid Suffolk (7.2).	Rate is at lowest level for previous 4 years and about half the county average		😊 Violent crime rate has decreased slightly and is low for Suffolk and for the region.
SG 2009	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (Datasource: Suffolk Data Observatory)	Suffolk	2007-08: 14.8 2006-07: 16.8 2005-06: 16.5 2004-05: 16.6 2003-04: 15.6	Suffolk is highest of Districts in E of E (with average over region of 13.2 for 2007/08) but lowest that it has been in several years	The rate has reduced in the most recent figures but was steady for several year previously so difficult to draw a trend.	Suffolk has highest violent crime rate in the East, but is reducing	😞 Violent crime has decreased in Suffolk in recent years but is still relatively high (Ipswich and Forest Heath particularly)
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce the fear of crime?							
SG	Fear of Crime (Datasource: QOL, Suffolk Speaks, British Crime Survey)	BDC	94% of residents feel safe in the area where they live and only 5% unsafe according to the survey Suffolk Speaks 2005. 85% of residents from a 2005 Council survey said that Crime was a small or no problem. State of the District 2005.	East of England 2005/06 Burglary 10% Car crime 11% Violent crime 14% Local Disorder 14%	N/A	Data could be considered out of date.	😊 Fear of crime is low compared to national average and other counties in the East of England, particularly for burglary and car crime. Perceived levels of local disorder also much lower than national average. The vast majority of residents feel safe in the area where they live.
SG	Fear of Crime (Datasource: QOL, Suffolk Speaks, British Crime Survey)	Suffolk	Suffolk police force area. Respondents very worried about: Burglary 6% Car crime 9% Violent crime 14% Respondents perceiving local levels of disorder as high: 8% 87% of residents feel safe in the area where they live and 12% unsafe. According to the survey Suffolk Speaks 2005. 2006/07- Suffolk 6 th lowest crime rate in Britain (One Suffolk)	England 2005/06 Respondents very worried about: Burglary 13% Car crime 14% Violent crime 17% Respondents perceiving local levels of disorder as high: 17%	No trend data available.	Data could be considered out of date.	😊 Fear of crime is low compared to national average and other counties in the East of England, particularly for burglary and car crime. Perceived levels of local disorder also much lower than national average.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce noise and odour concerns?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SG 2009	Number of domestic noise complaints (Datasource: Environmental Health Dept BDC, Census 2001, Chartered Institute of Environmental Health www.cieh.org)	BDC	2009: 358 noise complaints 2008: 304 2007: 351	2006: 305 noise complaints 2005: 308 2004: 262 2003: 224	The figure seems to be increasing In 2009 noise complaints were received from 0.43% of the Babergh population. This is slightly lower than the national average of 0.44%		☹ Number of noise complaints is higher than previously, and seems to keep rising.
SG	Number of domestic noise complaints (Datasource: Environmental Health Depts Districts)	Suffolk	2004: 2745 domestic complaints (total for county) 2003: 2530 2002: 2764		Decreased from 2,764 in 2002 to 2,530 in 2003, but increased again this year. There were slightly fewer complaints in 2004 than 2002.	The number of complaints has decreased since 2002 but need to monitor whether the increase recorded this year continues in the future.	☹ Number of noise complaints is lower than 2002 figure, but has increased this year.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce noise and odour concerns?							
2009	Number of odour complaints (Datasource: Environmental Health Dept BDC)	BDC	2009: 34 2008: 21 2007: 37 2006: 44	2005 : 31 2004: 25 2003 :37 2002 :22 2001 : 33	Figures vary from year to year	There appears to be no particular trend and the number of complaints can go up or down.	☹ There appears to be no particular trend and the number of complaints can go up or down.
2009	Number of odour complaints (Data source: Environmental Health Depts Districts)	Suffolk	No data.				
Headline Objective: To reduce poverty and social exclusion							
Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?							
SB/BG No 2009-2007 most recent	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Datasource: Index of Multiple Deprivation, Dept of Comm & Local Govt; Suffolk County Council)	BDC	IMD 2007 Most deprived 10% = 0% population Most deprived 25% = 0% population IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 0% population Most deprived 25% = 0% population			No update since 2007	Low levels of deprivation.
SBBG 2007 most recent	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Datasource: Index of Multiple Deprivation, Dept of Comm & Local Govt; Suffolk County Council)	Suffolk	IMD 2007: Most deprived 10% = 3% Most deprived 25% = 9% IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 2% popn Most deprived 25% = 9% popn	Much lower than national average		Areas in some Suffolk towns experience relatively high levels of deprivation (particularly Ipswich and Lowestoft and to a lesser extent Saxmundham), but levels are low for county as a whole.	☹ County as a whole has relatively low proportion of population in the most deprived areas. However deprivation is relatively high in towns of Ipswich, Lowestoft and to a lesser extent Saxmundham.
Headline Objective: To reduce poverty and social exclusion							
Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?							
SB/BG	Housing benefit recipients (Datasource: BDC, Housing Dept)	BDC	2008: Council tax benefit: 5298 2006: 3619 2005: 3627	No target identified.	Slight decline in numbers from 2005 to 2006	The figures appear relatively static but we will need a longer time series. Affects just over 10% of households.	☹ Figures are lower than some parts of Suffolk and static but a longer time series is needed.
SB/BG	Housing benefit recipients (Datasource: LAs)	Suffolk	No data.				
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to key local services?							
26/01/09	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (Datasource: SSAG - Suffolk's	BDC	Total Rural Population 46,399 Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 15,915 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 34.30% for 2005 / 06	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services In 2002 / 03 this was the highest % in Suffolk, but many facilities have been	% of rural population with access to all five listed facilities has halved - 64% recorded in 2002/3 (no data for 2001/2). 2003/4 the figure was 41.5% 2004/5 - 29.18%	No record of what parishes were used/where data came from so difficult to compare.	☹ Despite concerns over loss of rural facilities it seems that in Babergh many of the villages are well provided. This needs to be monitored consistently to provide results.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	Environment AMR 05/06)			lost.	2005/6 - 34.30%		
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (Dat source: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	Suffolk	Unknown for 2007/08	Total Rural Population 217,776 Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 71,883 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 33.0% 2004/5 Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2005/6: 41% 2004/5: 33% 2003/4: 42% 2002/3: 43.2% 2001/2: 41.0% Appears to have been a slight decrease in provision of rural services over the past year. However this does not include FHDC, which had lowest % last year, so actual decrease may in fact be greater.		☹ The source of population data has changed and so figures are not directly comparable. Not all districts returned data for each year, therefore not accurate to compare.
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to key local services?							
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG) (Dat source: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	BDC	% of rural households 2005/6: 51.2%	To achieve a one-third increase in % of households in rural areas within about 10 minutes walk of hourly or better bus service by 2010 (Transport Ten Year Plan, 2000).	2004/5: 35.6% 2003/4: 33.0% 2002/3: 25.2% 2001/2: 30% After decrease in 2002/3, indicator is now higher than it has been in last 3 years.		😊 New indicator in 2001/2, and results have varied since but there appears to be a slight trend towards improvement in access to public transport.
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG) (Dat source: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	Suffolk	% of rural households 2005/6: 25.2%	To achieve a one-third increase in % of households in rural areas within about 10 minutes walk of hourly or better bus service by 2010 (Transport Ten Year Plan, 2000).	2004/5: 37.2% 2003/4: 26.0% 2002/3: 22.7% 2001/2: 23% Levels of coverage have previously have remained stable, but have increased recently and target may have been met.		☹ A substantial increase has been recorded this year for the county as a whole, but this is not reflected in all districts. However, the level of increase is on track to meet the target. New indicator in 2001/2.
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to key local services?							
2007	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators) (Dat source: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	BDC	2007: (by public transport) GP: 15mins: 87.3%, 30mins: 99.3% Prim Sc'l: 15 min: 94.7%, 30min: 99.8% 2 nd ry sc'l: 20 min: 77.8%, 40min: 94.9% Superm'ket: 15 min: 82.3%, 30: 96.5%	2004 86.9% of households are with 30 min of a GP by public transport 98.1% of households are within 30 min of a primary school by public transport 88.7% of households are within 30 min of a shop by public transport	Accessibility is increasing for all services and facilities		😊 Accessibility improving across the board
2007	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators) - define access (Dat source: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	Suffolk	2007: (by public transport) GP: 15mins: 88.0%, 30mins: 99.9% Prim Sc'l: 15 min: 93.0%, 30min: 99.6% 2 nd ry sc'l: NO INFO Superm'ket: 15 min: 91.4%, 30: 99.4%	2004 92.1% of households are with 30 min of a GP by public transport 98.1% of households are within 30 min of a primary school by public transport 92.3% of households are within 30 min of a shop by public transport	Accessibility is increasing for all services and facilities		😊 Accessibility improving across the board

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to shopping facilities?							
2008	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (SSAG - additional indicator?) (Datasource: BDC AMR)	BDC	2007/08: 76 sq m gross, 32 net (COI BD4, AMR) 2006/07: 0 sq m (COI 4b) 2005/06: 0 sq m 2004/05: 1060 sq m	This figure reflects the completion of the extension to the COOP in Hadleigh.	The trend may well be that there is limited development in town centres.		☹ Mixed trends
2007	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (SSAG - additional indicator?) (Datasource: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	Suffolk	2006/07 - poor returns for RAMR so no data. 2005/06: 422.511 sq m 2004/05: 1060 sq m	There was incomplete information but there were also very few completions over 1000 sq m in town centres, taken from EERA annual monitoring report.			☹ Reducing level of retail
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to shopping facilities?							
2007	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators) - define access (Datasource: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	BDC	2007 (DfT) Access to supermarket by public transport: 15 mins: 82.3%, 30 mins: 96.5%	2004 64.5% of Households are within 15 min by public transport of a shop selling food 88.7% of Households are within 30 min by public transport of a shop selling food 64.1% of Households are within 15 min cycle ride of a shop selling food 87.5% of Households are within 30 min cycle ride of a shop selling food	Access is improving No data in the 2007 published figures about cycle access.	Due to current economic climate, some local shops are closing- this will need to be monitored closely as this could affect the accessibility to local services	☺ Currently improving
2007	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators) (Datasource: Suffolk County Council)	Suffolk	2007 (DfT) Supermarket by public transport: 15 min: 91.4%, 30: 99.4%	2004 76.4% of Households are within 15 min by public transport of a shop selling food 92.3% of Households are within 30 min by public transport of a shop selling food 78.1% of Households are within 15 min cycle ride of a shop selling food 92.9% of Households are within 30 min cycle ride of a shop selling food	Access is improving No data in the 2007 published figures about cycle access		☺ Currently improving
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve access to childcare?							
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5 (Datasource: Suffolk County Council)	BDC	44 per 1000 children aged 0 - 4	This is the first year that information has been available in this form, but the provision seems good. The position Countywide has improved considerably in the last 3 to 4 years. No national target in 2006			☺ Baseline data no trend yet, but the provision in 2006 is good and it has improved in recent years, although statistical information is not available to back this up.
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5 (Datasource: Suffolk County Council)	Suffolk	279 per 1000 children aged 0 - 4	This is the first year that information has been available in this form. The position Countywide has improved considerably in the last 3 to 4 years.			☹ Baseline data no trend yet.
Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment							
Will it reduce unemployment overall?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
2008	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR) <i>(Data Source: Suffolk Data Observatory)</i>	BDC	Unemployed as percentage of all people of working age Nov 2008: 1.7% Nov 2007: 1.1% Nov 2006: 1.3% Nov 2005: 1.1% Dec 2007 1.1 % May 2006 1.4 %	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England <u>East of England:</u> Nov 2008: 2.2% Nov 2007: 1.6% Nov 2006: 1.9% Nov 2005: 1.7% <u>Great Britain:</u> Nov 2008: 2.8% Nov 2007: 2.1% Nov 2006: 2.4% Nov 2005: 2.3%	Babergh has below Suffolk level unemployment. This has increased in 2008 but so has unemployment in all Districts without exception		☹ Consistent very low unemployment. Still lower than Suffolk as a whole but has increased (by the same amount as in Suffolk/East). Target met.
2008	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR) <i>(Data Source: Suffolk Data Observatory)</i>	Suffolk	Nov 2008: 2.2% Nov 2007: 1.6% Nov 2006: 2.0% Nov 2005: 1.7% April 2003 2.0 July 2003 2.0 October 2003 1.9 January 2004 2.1	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England <u>East of England:</u> Nov 2008: 2.2% Nov 2007: 1.6% Nov 2006: 1.9% Nov 2005: 1.7% <u>Great Britain:</u> Nov 2008: 2.8% Nov 2007: 2.1% Nov 2006: 2.4% Nov 2005: 2.3%	Suffolk level is very similar to East of England but remains consistently below the GB levels. Unemployment has risen by a similar rate at all geographical levels.		☹ Overall unemployment rates are similar East of England totals, and have increased at a similar rate

Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment

Will it reduce long-term unemployment?

26/01/09	Census, labour market trends Long term unemployed % of workforce and % of the unemployed. <i>(Data Source: Nomis - official labour market statistics)</i>	BDC	Time in unemployment as <u>percentage of all unemployed</u> : <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Months unem- ployed</th> <th>Nov 2005</th> <th>Nov 2006</th> <th>Nov 2007</th> <th>Nov 2008</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><6</td> <td>73.0</td> <td>69.9</td> <td>72.1</td> <td>78.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6-12</td> <td>13.5</td> <td>15.8</td> <td>15.3</td> <td>14.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12-24</td> <td>9.0</td> <td>10.5</td> <td>8.1</td> <td>5.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>24</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>3.8</td> <td>4.5</td> <td>1.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Length of unemployment as <u>percentage of workforce</u> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Month unem- ployed</th> <th>Nov 05</th> <th>Nov 06</th> <th>Nov 07</th> <th>Nov 08</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><6</td> <td>0.80</td> <td>0.90</td> <td>0.79</td> <td>1.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6-12</td> <td>0.15</td> <td>0.20</td> <td>0.17</td> <td>0.24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12-24</td> <td>0.099</td> <td>0.14</td> <td>0.095</td> <td>0.089</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>24</td> <td>0.049</td> <td>0.049</td> <td>0.050</td> <td>0.020</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Months unem- ployed	Nov 2005	Nov 2006	Nov 2007	Nov 2008	<6	73.0	69.9	72.1	78.9	6-12	13.5	15.8	15.3	14.0	12-24	9.0	10.5	8.1	5.3	>24	4.5	3.8	4.5	1.2	Month unem- ployed	Nov 05	Nov 06	Nov 07	Nov 08	<6	0.80	0.90	0.79	1.3	6-12	0.15	0.20	0.17	0.24	12-24	0.099	0.14	0.095	0.089	>24	0.049	0.049	0.050	0.020	March 2006: 0.17% /12% April 2004: 0.2% / 18.8% April 1999: 0.5% / 25.1% Unemployment 12 month duration [from Nomis on 15 February 2005]	Proportion of people unemployed for the longest times are coming down and greater proportion of people unemployed for less than 6 months		😊 Consistent very low unemployment and shortening periods of unemployment
Months unem- ployed	Nov 2005	Nov 2006	Nov 2007	Nov 2008																																																					
<6	73.0	69.9	72.1	78.9																																																					
6-12	13.5	15.8	15.3	14.0																																																					
12-24	9.0	10.5	8.1	5.3																																																					
>24	4.5	3.8	4.5	1.2																																																					
Month unem- ployed	Nov 05	Nov 06	Nov 07	Nov 08																																																					
<6	0.80	0.90	0.79	1.3																																																					
6-12	0.15	0.20	0.17	0.24																																																					
12-24	0.099	0.14	0.095	0.089																																																					
>24	0.049	0.049	0.050	0.020																																																					
26/01/09	Census, labour market trends <i>(Data Source: Nomis - official labour market statistics)</i>	Suffolk	Time in unemployment as <u>percentage of all unemployed</u>	April 2004: 0.3% / 17.1% April 1999: 0.7% / 25.6% Unemployment 12 month duration [from Nomis on 15 February 2005]	Proportion of people unemployed for the longest times are coming down and greater proportion of people unemployed for less than 6 months		😊 Latest trend shows employment rate increasing																																																		

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA																																																		
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Months unem- ployed</th> <th>Nov 2005</th> <th>Nov 2006</th> <th>Nov 2007</th> <th>Nov 2008</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><6</td> <td>68.1</td> <td>67.1</td> <td>67.2</td> <td>77.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6-12</td> <td>17.1</td> <td>17.6</td> <td>15.4</td> <td>13.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12-24</td> <td>9.7</td> <td>10.7</td> <td>12.0</td> <td>6.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>24</td> <td>5.0</td> <td>4.6</td> <td>5.4</td> <td>2.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Time in unemployment as percentage of</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Months unem- ployed</th> <th>Nov 05</th> <th>Nov 06</th> <th>Nov 07</th> <th>Nov 08</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><6</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>1.1</td> <td>1.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6-12</td> <td>0.29</td> <td>0.35</td> <td>0.25</td> <td>0.29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12-24</td> <td>0.16</td> <td>0.21</td> <td>0.19</td> <td>0.15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>24</td> <td>0.085</td> <td>0.092</td> <td>0.087</td> <td>0.051</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>workforce:</p>	Months unem- ployed	Nov 2005	Nov 2006	Nov 2007	Nov 2008	<6	68.1	67.1	67.2	77.9	6-12	17.1	17.6	15.4	13.1	12-24	9.7	10.7	12.0	6.7	>24	5.0	4.6	5.4	2.3	Months unem- ployed	Nov 05	Nov 06	Nov 07	Nov 08	<6	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.7	6-12	0.29	0.35	0.25	0.29	12-24	0.16	0.21	0.19	0.15	>24	0.085	0.092	0.087	0.051				
Months unem- ployed	Nov 2005	Nov 2006	Nov 2007	Nov 2008																																																					
<6	68.1	67.1	67.2	77.9																																																					
6-12	17.1	17.6	15.4	13.1																																																					
12-24	9.7	10.7	12.0	6.7																																																					
>24	5.0	4.6	5.4	2.3																																																					
Months unem- ployed	Nov 05	Nov 06	Nov 07	Nov 08																																																					
<6	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.7																																																					
6-12	0.29	0.35	0.25	0.29																																																					
12-24	0.16	0.21	0.19	0.15																																																					
>24	0.085	0.092	0.087	0.051																																																					
Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment																																																									
Will it provide job opportunities for those most in need of employment?																																																									
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Data source: 2001 Census)	BDC	2001: Long term ill - 35.8% Lone parent - 64.4%		No trend data available. Data is only easily available via census.		☹ No trend information. However, % of lone parents who are economically active is quite high and can affect quality of life targets																																																		
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Data source: 2001 Census)	Suffolk	2001: Long term ill - 31.3% Lone parent - 56.1%		No trend data available. Data is only easily available via census.		☹ No trend information. However, % of lone parents who are economically active is quite high and can affect quality of life targets																																																		
Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment																																																									
Will it help to improve earnings?																																																									
2008	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR) (Data source: National Statistics - annual survey of hours & earnings)	BDC	ASHE: Residents' full time gross annual income (mean) 2008: £32,576 2007: £28,775 2006: £26,954	April 2004: £24,554 April 2002: £26,339 [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]		Methodology changed prior to 2006 so unable to compare Using just mean value of residents full time workers (potentially slightly different results for workplace and/or part time workers)	😊 Income has been increasing in the District steadily over the past few years.																																																		
2008	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR) (Data source: National Statistics - annual survey of hours & earnings)	Suffolk	ASHE: Residents' full time gross annual income (mean) 2008: £unreliable 2007: £28,626 2007: £28973	April 2004: £24,940 April 2002: £23,194 [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]		Methodology changed prior to 2006 so unable to compare Using just mean value of residents full time workers (potentially slightly different results for workplace and/or part time workers)	☹ Income remained fairly constant over 2006-07. The data was unreliable for 2008 so it is difficult to comment																																																		
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community																																																									
Will it reduce homelessness?																																																									
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations) (Data source: BDC, Housing)	BDC	2005/06 108		2000/01 272 2001/02 275 2002/03 282 2003/04 285 2004/05 266 Upward trend until 2004 then declines with a rapid decline in 2006.		😊 Decline in recent, years in part due to the new approach. New BVPI for 05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homeless cases prevented, so numbers expected to decrease.																																																		
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations)	Suffolk	2003/04 3080		2001/02 2470 2002/03 2841		☹ upward trend (see note for St.Eds) New BVPI for																																																		

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	(Datasource: LAs)				Upward trend		05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homelessness cases prevented, so numbers expected to decrease.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it provide enough housing?							
2008	Housing Stock (SSAG) (Data source: AMR)	BDC	Stock 31/03/08: 37,838 Stock 31/03/07: 37,582 Housing stock 31/03/06: 37,307 Housing stock 31/03/05: 37,120 Total change since 2001: 1871 Annual rate: 267	Overall RSS requirement 2001-2021: 5,600. Dwellings completed to 31/03/08: 1,871. Therefore annual rate required of 287 dwellings p.a to 2021.	Annual rate has fluctuated. Current economic climate forecasts predict a future drop in build rates.	Additional housing stock is required. Trend shows that rate of increase has fallen below that required to meet RSS requirements in recent years.	☹ Additional housing development is required at increased rate.
2007	Housing Stock (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	Stock 31/03/08: 318,712 (4,471 net) Stock 31/03/07: 314,241 (4,203 net) Stock 31/03/06: 310,038 (3,368 net) Housing stock 31/03/05: 306,670 Total change since 2001: 17,720 Annual rate: 3141	To 31/03/07: 17,720 dwellings completed in Suffolk 2001-07. Overall target 2001-21: 61,700. Therefore annual rate required of 3,141 p.a.	Overall, the completion rate in Suffolk has been above the rate required by the RSS .	Although the rates are currently above the required minimum, with the current economic climate this may change.	😊 Completion rates are above those minimum annual required rate for Suffolk.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it provide enough housing?							
26/01/09	Housing Land Availability (SSAG) (Data source: AMR)	BDC	Total commitments end 2007/08: 3051 (10.6 years) Commitments end 2006/07: 1336 Total commitments end 2005/6: 3,623 Years supply: 9 years	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 4,540 Shortfall of 1,233 below the 2016 target.	Years supply has fluctuated in recent years. No clear trend. 2004/5: 3,307 which equated to 7.7 years supply.		☹ Housing land supply will fluctuate depending on stage of development of Local Authority's Local Plan. Obvious that there is a plentiful supply for coming few years.
SSAG	Housing Land Availability (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	Suffolk	Total commitments at end of 2004/5: 29,342 Years supply: 10.0 2006/7: 24,768 Years supply: 9.3	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 32,830 Shortfall of 3,488 below the 2016 target.	Years supply recorded in mid 1997, 1999 and 2000 had showed a trend of decreasing supply, falling from 8.9 years in 1997 to 7.3 years in 2000, but this is now reversed. The 2003 figure matched the previous maximum supply for the county of 8.9 years, and this was exceeded in 2004 and 2005.	Large supply available, and increasing.	☹ Supply has increased in the last 2 years, reversing a previously decreasing trend. However housing land supply will fluctuate depending on stage of development of Local Authority's Local Plan so long-term trends are difficult to identify.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
27/01/09	Affordable Housing (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	BDC	2007/08 net completions: 43 2006/07 net completions: 73 Net affordable completions 56 In 2005/6 (30 % of net completions)	(i) in settlements below 3,000 pop - 1 in every 3 new dw on sites of 0.1 ha or which propose 3 or more dw. (ii) in settlements above 3,000 pop - on allocated sites and others of 0.5 ha or more in size, capable of accommodating at least 15 dw, up to 35% of new dw (depending on local circumstances). Highest % of affordable completions in Suffolk 2003/4, and 2004/5	22.7% of net completions were affordable in 2001/2. Number of affordable approvals has fluctuated since 1997-8, ranging from 0 (2001/2) to 88 (2000/1) (where triggered). 2004/5 = 71 (= 38 % of total completions)	IN 2006/07 and 2005/06, the 2 nd highest % affordable completions seen in Suffolk.	☹ Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends, but recently Babergh has achieved high numbers and % completions compared with other districts. Monitoring issues in 2007/08 meant a lower number- to be corrected for 2008-09
27/01/09	Affordable Housing (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	Suffolk	2007/08: 760 (17.7%) 2006/07: 663 (16%) 2005/06: 613 (18%) Total net affordable completions 2004/5: 301	No target for county as a whole	9.4% of net completions were affordable in 2001/2. This years figure has changed little from the 11.3% recorded in 2002/3. 2003/4: 311 or 11.2%		😊 There has been a steady increase over time recently.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
			(= 12.7% of total completions)		2004/5: 280 Or 11.8%		
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns) (Data source: BDC Housing)	BDC	No data available		This indicator is difficult to monitor with a variety of agencies involved.		
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns) (Data source: LDCs Housing)	Suffolk	No data available				
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	BDC	2004/5 Houses/Bungalows: Private sector 1 bed: 46 Private sector 2 bed: 47 Private sector 3 bed: 62 Private sector 4+ bed: 32 RSL: 67 2004/5 Flats/Maisonettes: Private sector 1 bed: 3 Private sector 2 bed: 0 Private sector 3 bed: 0 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL: 38	No target.	2003/4 Houses/Bungalows: Private sector 1 bed: 0 Private sector 2 bed: 25 Private sector 3 bed: 37 Private sector 4+ bed: 21 RSL: None 2003/4 Flats/Maisonettes: Private sector 1 bed: 3 Private sector 2 bed: 0 Private sector 3 bed: 0 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL: None 2002/3 Houses/Bungalows: Not recorded. 2002/3 Flats/Maisonettes: Private sector 1 bed: 3 Private sector 2 bed: 0 Private sector 3 bed: 1 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL :_Not recorded 2001/2: Not recorded.		☹ New indicator, no data prior to 2001/2. Limited data.
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	Suffolk	2004/5 Houses/Bungalows (where recorded): Private sector 1 bed: 62 (11%) Private sector 2 bed: 117 (20%) Private sector 3 bed: 222 (39%) Private sector 4+ bed: 173 (30%) Not Known: 908 RSL ; 115	No target.	2003/4 Houses/Bungalows (where recorded): Private sector 1 bed: 0.8% Private sector 2 bed: 13.5% Private sector 3 bed: 41.2% Private sector 4+ bed: 40.8% RSL 1 bed: 0 RSL 2 bed: 2.5% RSL 3 bed: 1.0% RSL 4+ bed: 0 2003/4 Flats/Maisonettes (where recorded): Private sector 1 bed: 31.2% Private sector 2 bed: 37.0% Private sector 3 bed: 1.0%		☹ County figures are incomplete, so care should be taken interpreting trends. New indicator, no data prior to 2001/2. It is not possible to identify any long-term trends. Data available shows little difference in house sizes since last year but % of 1 and 2 bed dwellings (especially private sector) has increased. Correspondingly there has been a reduction in the number of 4 bed dwellings. This may not be a trend yet.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					Private sector 4+ bed: 2.1% RSL 1 bed: 26.5% RSL 2 bed: 2.1% RSL 3 bed: 0 RSL 4+ bed: 0 <u>2002/3 (2001/2) Houses/Bungalows (where recorded):</u> Private sector 1 bed: 1.1% (0.1%) Private sector 2 bed: 13.0% (13.1%) Private sector 3 bed: 39.7% (40.2%) Private sector 4+ bed: 38.6% (36.5%) RSL 1 bed: 0.7% (0) RSL 2 bed: 3.1% (4.9%) RSL 3 bed: 2.6% (4.8%) RSL 4+ bed: 1.2% (0.4%) <u>2001/2 Flats/Maisonettes (where recorded):</u> Private sector 1 bed: 13.8% (8.0%) Private sector 2 bed: 49.1% (50.0%) Private sector 3 bed: 3.6% (0) Private sector 4+ bed: 0 (0) RSL 1 bed: 25.8% (15.2%) RSL 2 bed: 8.6% (19.6%) RSL 3 bed: 0 (3.6%) RSL 4+ bed: 0 (3.6%)		
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
2007	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG) (Data source: AMR)	BDC	2006/07 (averaged): 47 Dwellings per hectare 2005/6: 46 3004/05: 42	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. 2 nd highest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.	Dwellings per hectare 2004/5: 42.2 Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 34.96 Not recorded for 2001/2 or 2002/3. No data for comparison.	No longer part of RAMR process- need to do.	😊 Relatively high for Suffolk- remained fairly constant in recent years. Rural district so will not achieve highest densities.
2007	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG - Suffolk's Environment AMR 05/06)	Suffolk	2006/07: 38 Dwellings per hectare 2004/5: 33	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. Excluding BDC: Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 30.39	Combined density in Suffolk meets the recommended guideline. County totals do not include all districts in previous years so trends are difficult to discern.		😊 Housing meets the recommended guideline and is increasing slowly for the county as a whole. Varies between districts and data for previous years are incomplete.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
SSAG 2007	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG) (Datascource: Suffolk Data Observatory)	BDC	Using average house price (all types) : mean residents income (both full and part time average) 2007: 251623:22303 = 11.3 2006: 240028:21756 = 11.0	No target.	Ratio 2003 /4: 6.7 Ratio 2002 /3: 7.9 Apparent decrease in ratio but it still remains very high and indicates major housing affordability problems.	Depends on what figures are used (e.g. if only full time figures used the ratios would be lower)	😞 Income figures based on either small or variable sample and should be treated with caution, but there is a clear trend to increasing housing affordability problems and the figures are very high.
SSAG 2007	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG) (Datascource: Suffolk Data Observatory)	Suffolk	Using average house price (all types) : mean residents income (both full and part time average) 2007: 213896:23233 = 9.2 2006: 198724:23168 = 8.6	No target.	Ratio 2003 /4: 6.6 Ratio 2002 /3: 6.0 With most districts showing an increase in their ratios an increase in the county average was likely and the figures do	Depends on what figures are used (e.g. if only full time figures used the ratios would be lower)	😞 Still high ratio and worsening

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

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	(Data source: Suffolk County Council)						
	Areas of deficiency in terms of natural green space (Data source: Suffolk County Council)	Suffolk	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it increase access to natural green space?							
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Data source: BDC)	BDC	No of sites 156, Area 904.47 Ha No of parishes deficient Standard 1: 66 No of parishes deficient Standard 2: 12 (SBRC 2006)	Standard 1 = Parish must have more than 50% total area within 500m of accessible natural greenspace of at least 2ha Standard 2 = Parish must have more than 50% total area within 4km of accessible natural greenspace of at least 20ha	First year information available.		☹ Baseline data
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Data source: LDCs)	Suffolk	No of sites 692, Area 22108.16 Ha No of parishes deficient Standard 1: 373 No of parishes deficient Standard 2: 139 (SBRC 2006)	Standard 1 = Parish must have more than 50% total area within 500m of accessible natural greenspace of at least 2ha Standard 2 = Parish must have more than 50% total area within 4km of accessible natural greenspace of at least 20ha	First year information available.		☹ Baseline data
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it encourage engagement in decision making?							
2007	Electoral turnout in local authority elections (Data source: BDC, Democratic & support services)	BDC	BDC election 2007: Turnout 24.8% to 56.4%- total over District 38.3% Babergh DC Elections 2003 Turnout 18% to 53% South Suffolk Constituency May 05 Election Turnout 69.65%	Babergh DC Elections 1999 Turnout 23% to 53% South Suffolk Constituency June 01 Election Turnout 66.56%	There appears a trend towards a reduction in turnout for local elections but possibly an increase in turnout for General Elections.		☹ Baseline data but there does not appear to be a clear trend.
	Electoral turnout in local authority elections (Data source: Suffolk County Council)	Suffolk	The SCC poll was on the same day as the General Election in 05 so it may give a false picture.	Turnout varied from 58% to 73% for the 7 th June 2001 elections to SCC			☹ Baseline data but there does not appear to be a clear trend.
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it encourage engagement in decision making?							
2008	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Data Source: Suffolk Acre)	BDC	2008: 20 2007: 17 2004: 11	This is now 22% in 2007. In 2004 the figure was 14.5% of parishes have a village plan. This is the second highest figure in Suffolk.	The figure is likely to increase slowly in the future.		😊 There has been a steady increase in the number of village plans over the years
ME	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Data Source: Suffolk Acre)	Suffolk	2008: need 2007: 136 2004: 60	This is now 27% of parishes in the county in 2007. In 2004:12.5% of parishes has a village plan.	The figure is likely to increase slowly in the future		😊 There has been a steady increase in the number of village plans over the years
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it increase the number of people involved in volunteer activities?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Data Source: Suffolk/CVS, Suffolk Acre)	BDC		Difficult indicator to quantify.			
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Data Source: Suffolk/CVS, Suffolk Acre)	Suffolk	47,542 2006 survey carried out for the SDA, is based on volunteers who work for 2hrs per week or 100 hours per year.	Difficult indicator to quantify.			☹ Baseline data.
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve ethnic relations?							
ME 2008	Number / rate of racist incidents (Data source: SCC Racial Harassment Initiative)	BDC	2007/08: 52 (10% of the County total) 2006/07: 20 (4.5% of County total) 2005/06: 31 (7% of County total)	2004/05: 27 (6% of County total) 2003/04: 27 (5% of County total)	The number of racial incidents increased slightly up to 2006/07 when it decreased substantially, but we may need a longer time series to get a better picture. The percentage figure is increasing.		☹ Although there is no discernible trend yet, the numbers are high for 2007/08.
ME 2008	Number / rate of racist incidents (Data source: SCC Racial Harassment Initiative)	Suffolk	2007/08: 512 2006/07: 445 2005/06: 439	2004/05: 418 2003/04: 496	There was a downwards trend but this seems to have reversed		☹ Although there is no definite trend, the numbers are high for 2007/08.
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve access to cultural facilities?							
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (Data source: DCLG www.bvpi.gov.uk)	BDC	Not Applicable.		No museums are funded or part funded by the District Council.		
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (Data source: DCLG www.bvpi.gov.uk)	Suffolk	Each District/Borough to do.				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve access to cultural facilities?							
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (Data source: DCLG www.bvpi.gov.uk)	BDC	Not Applicable.				
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (Data source: DCLG www.bvpi.gov.uk)	Suffolk	Each District/Borough to do.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve access to cultural facilities?							
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (Data source: DCLG www.bvpi.gov.uk)	BDC	2003/4: 1413	2002/3: 1789.	Difficult to discern a trend as the returns are voluntary, but this can act as a baseline.		☹️ Difficult to discern a trend as the returns are voluntary, but this can act as a baseline.
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (Data source: DCLG www.bvpi.gov.uk)	Suffolk	2003/4: 40,042	2002/3: 37,845	Difficult to discern a trend as the returns are voluntary, but this can act as a baseline.		☹️ Difficult to discern a trend as the returns are voluntary, but this can act as a baseline.

ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE DATA

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA																																																																																																									
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality																																																																																																																
Will it improve the quality of inland waters?																																																																																																																
AN	Water quality in rivers (Data source: Environment Agency) (Data source: DEFRA: www.defra.gov.uk/environment/statistics/inlwater/iwriverquality.htm)	BDC	<u>Water quality (EA) 2007:</u> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Chemical</th> <th>Biological</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade A:</td> <td>16.5%</td> <td>45.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade B:</td> <td>42.7%</td> <td>44.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade C:</td> <td>39.6%</td> <td>3.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade D:</td> <td>0%</td> <td>6.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade E:</td> <td>1.2%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade F:</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Chemical	Biological	Grade A:	16.5%	45.3%	Grade B:	42.7%	44.8%	Grade C:	39.6%	3.5%	Grade D:	0%	6.4%	Grade E:	1.2%	0%	Grade F:	0%	0%	<u>Water quality (EA) 2006:</u> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Chemical</th> <th>Biological</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade A:</td> <td>11%</td> <td>47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade B:</td> <td>41%</td> <td>42%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade C:</td> <td>47%</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade D:</td> <td>0%</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade E:</td> <td>0.55%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade F:</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Water quality (EA) 2005:</u> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Chemical</th> <th>Biological</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade A:</td> <td>18.2%</td> <td>50.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade B:</td> <td>45%</td> <td>43.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade C:</td> <td>35.6%</td> <td>6.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade D:</td> <td>1.2%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade E:</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade F:</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Chemical	Biological	Grade A:	11%	47%	Grade B:	41%	42%	Grade C:	47%	4%	Grade D:	0%	5%	Grade E:	0.55%	0%	Grade F:	0%	0%		Chemical	Biological	Grade A:	18.2%	50.1%	Grade B:	45%	43.5%	Grade C:	35.6%	6.4%	Grade D:	1.2%	0%	Grade E:	0%	0%	Grade F:	0%	0%	<u>Water quality (EA) 2004:</u> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Chemical</th> <th>Biological</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade A:</td> <td>3%</td> <td>57.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade B:</td> <td>42%</td> <td>33.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade C:</td> <td>451%</td> <td>9.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade D:</td> <td>4%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade E:</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade F:</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Water quality (EA) 2003:</u> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Chemical</th> <th>Biological</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade A:</td> <td>7.6%</td> <td>55.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade B:</td> <td>37.2%</td> <td>34.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade C:</td> <td>45.2%</td> <td>10.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade D:</td> <td>10%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade E:</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade F:</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Chemical	Biological	Grade A:	3%	57.5%	Grade B:	42%	33.3%	Grade C:	451%	9.2%	Grade D:	4%	0%	Grade E:	0%	0%	Grade F:	0%	0%		Chemical	Biological	Grade A:	7.6%	55.4%	Grade B:	37.2%	34.2%	Grade C:	45.2%	10.4%	Grade D:	10%	0%	Grade E:	0%	0%	Grade F:	0%	0%	Not obvious yet but close to target and slightly below in one place.	☹️ Chemical water at very good (A and B) has increased proportionally with the lowest levels remaining fairly constant Biological water quality has remained fairly constant
	Chemical	Biological																																																																																																														
Grade A:	16.5%	45.3%																																																																																																														
Grade B:	42.7%	44.8%																																																																																																														
Grade C:	39.6%	3.5%																																																																																																														
Grade D:	0%	6.4%																																																																																																														
Grade E:	1.2%	0%																																																																																																														
Grade F:	0%	0%																																																																																																														
	Chemical	Biological																																																																																																														
Grade A:	11%	47%																																																																																																														
Grade B:	41%	42%																																																																																																														
Grade C:	47%	4%																																																																																																														
Grade D:	0%	5%																																																																																																														
Grade E:	0.55%	0%																																																																																																														
Grade F:	0%	0%																																																																																																														
	Chemical	Biological																																																																																																														
Grade A:	18.2%	50.1%																																																																																																														
Grade B:	45%	43.5%																																																																																																														
Grade C:	35.6%	6.4%																																																																																																														
Grade D:	1.2%	0%																																																																																																														
Grade E:	0%	0%																																																																																																														
Grade F:	0%	0%																																																																																																														
	Chemical	Biological																																																																																																														
Grade A:	3%	57.5%																																																																																																														
Grade B:	42%	33.3%																																																																																																														
Grade C:	451%	9.2%																																																																																																														
Grade D:	4%	0%																																																																																																														
Grade E:	0%	0%																																																																																																														
Grade F:	0%	0%																																																																																																														
	Chemical	Biological																																																																																																														
Grade A:	7.6%	55.4%																																																																																																														
Grade B:	37.2%	34.2%																																																																																																														
Grade C:	45.2%	10.4%																																																																																																														
Grade D:	10%	0%																																																																																																														
Grade E:	0%	0%																																																																																																														
Grade F:	0%	0%																																																																																																														
AN	Water quality in rivers (Data source: Environment Agency) (Data source: DEFRA: www.defra.gov.uk/environment/statistics/inlwater/iwriverquality.htm)	Suffolk	<u>Chemical water quality 2006:</u> Grade A: 5% Grade B: 33% Grade C: 36% Grade D: 15% Grade E: 11% Grade F: 0.8% <u>Biological water quality 2006:</u> Grade A: 30% Grade B: 38% Grade C: 26% Grade D: 6% Grade E: 0% Grade F: 0%	None specifically for chemical/biological water quality in Suffolk as a whole. However, River Quality Targets have been set for individual river reaches <u>Chemical water quality 2003:</u> Grade A: 2.6% Grade B: 26.1% Grade C: 37.8% Grade D: 21.2% Grade E: 11.6% Grade F: 0.8% <u>Biological water quality 2003:</u> Grade A: 32.7% Grade B: 46.9% Grade C: 17.4% Grade D: 2.3% Grade E: 0.7% Grade F: 0%	<u>Chemical water quality 2000:</u> Grade A: 4.3% Grade B: 34.5% Grade C: 32.7% Grade D: 15.8% Grade E: 12.1% Grade F: 0.5% Deterioration since 2000 - only 28.7% rated as 'very good' (A) or 'good' (B) cf 38.8% in 2003 <u>Biological water quality 2000:</u> Grade A: 24.9% Grade B: 48.9% Grade C: 14.8% Grade D: 5.7% Grade E: 0.6% Grade F: 0% Grade O (unclassified): 5.0% Improvement since 2000 -77.6% grade A or B cf 73.8%		☹️ Biological water quality seems to be declining but chemical water quality seems to remain about the same in the county as a whole. But the situation will vary considerably from river reach to river reach																																																																																																									
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality																																																																																																																
Will it improve the quality of inland waters?																																																																																																																
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS) (Data source: Environment Agency / DEFRA)	BDC	Uncertain if information is available																																																																																																													
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS) (Data source: Environment Agency /	Suffolk	Uncertain if information is available																																																																																																													

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	DEFRA)						
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?							
AN	Water quality in estuaries (Data source: Environment Agency / DEFRA)	BDC	Estuarine water quality 2006: Orwell: 17.5km Grade A and 4km Grade B Stour: 27km all Grade A and 2km Grade B				😊 Almost all estuarine water in the county is top quality, and Orwell and Stour have remained constant for 6 years
AN	Water quality in estuaries (Data source: Environment Agency / DEFRA)	Suffolk		No target. Estuarine water quality 2000: Waveney: 15km all Grade A Blyth: 7km all Grade A Alde: 26.5km all Grade A Butley: 9km all Grade A Deben: 16km all Grade A Orwell: 21.5km Grade A and 4km Grade B Stour: 27km all Grade A	Estuarine water quality 1995: Waveney: 15km all Grade A Blyth: 7km all Grade A Alde: 26.5km all Grade A Butley: 9km all Grade A Deben: 16km all Grade A Orwell: 6.5km Grade A and 6km Grade B + 9km Grade C Stour: 25km Grade A and 2km Grade B Orwell and Stour have shown improvement. All other estuaries retained good water quality.		😊 5 yearly indicator. Almost all estuarine water in the county is top quality, and Orwell and Stour have shown improvement in last 5 years. No update in 2003-4 - estuarine water quality only monitored every five years
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?							
AN	Bathing water quality (Data source: Environment Agency)	BDC	N/A				
AN	Bathing water quality (Data source: Environment Agency)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve air quality?							
2006 (recorded 2009)	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded? (Data source: Babergh DC Air Quality Annual Report)	BDC	2006: Annual mean NO ₂ conc'n: Lattinford Bridge on A12 24.7 µg/m ³ 70 Cross Street, Sudbury: 36.1 µg/m ³ 87 Cross Street, Sudbury: 59.4 µg/m ³ Hourly: Max: Highest in year 89.8 March, Lowest in year: 55.8 October Min: Highest in year 4.4 Jan, Lowest in year: 0.6 Sep Average: High: 31.7 Feb, Low: 21.6 Aug	Objectives for NO ₂ : Hourly mean 200 µg/m ³ not to be exceeded more than 18 times per year (from 31/12/05) Annual mean: 40 µg/m ³ (from 31/12/05) (National Air Quality Objective) Also: Annual mean limit value of 40 µg/m ³ by 01/01/10 1-hour limit of 200 µg/m ³ not to be exceeded more than 18 times a year by 01/01/10 (Air Quality Daughter Directive- adopted as legislation)	2005 NO ₂ mean concentration at: 1) Lattinford Bridge on the A12: 24.0 µg/m ³ 2) 70 Cross St, Sudbury: 38.4 µg/m ³ (Babergh Air Quality 2004 Annual Progress Report (April 2005)) 2003: Lattinford Bridge: 28.4 µg/m ³ (2003) 70 Cross St, Sudbury: 39.4 µg/m ³ (2003)	BDC believes that the objectives for the other six national Air Quality Objective pollutants are likely to be met, hence they are not routinely monitored. Because NO ₂ concentrations approach AQO levels at certain points in the district (principally by major roads), it is monitored at 8 locations in the district. All 8 locations use diffusion tubes to monitor NO ₂ , and a correction factor has to be applied to the results. There is one continuous monitoring station at Lattinford Bridge (no correction factor necessary)	😐 Little change in levels of either annual or hourly NO ₂ . Targets met, with no limits being exceeded
	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded? (Data source: combination of all Suffolk	Suffolk	AQMA website UK Air Quality Archive- possibly out of date (no records for Babergh) but says: Ipswich 3, Suffolk Coastal 1 (woodbridge) and no others in				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	LDCs Air Quality Reports)		Suffolk (FH 0, [cited Jan 09])				
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve air quality?							
2009	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	2008: 1- Cross Street, Sudbury new AQMA 0:(2006) 0: 2007	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	4 AQMAs covering 18 properties in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5. AQMA quite a crude measure of air pollution	☹ New AQMA identified in Sudbury may lead to long term improvements. Future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads, heatwaves can increase NO _x , fine particulates (PM ₁₀), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)
2009	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	2006: 2 2007: 4 AQMA website UK Air Quality Archive- possibly out of date (no records for Babergh) but says: Ipswich 3, Suffolk Coastal 1 (woodbridge) and no others in Suffolk (FH 0, [cited Jan 09])	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy. Approximately 210 properties were affected in 2007.	0 in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5. The air quality in certain places appears to be declining. But given the size of the County the numbers are not high.	☹ But future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads, heatwaves can increase NO _x , fine particulates (PM ₁₀), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise the loss of Greenfield land to development?							
2008	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on Greenfield land (Data source: BDC AMR)	BDC	AMR 2007/08: 106, 39% AMR 2006/07: 93, 34% 2005/6 69 32% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	The RSS requires 60% of housing development to be on PDL (i.e. no more than 40% on greenfield).	2001/02 104 43% 2002/03 311 61% 2003/04 96 45.3% 2004/05 115 59%	Seems to be increasing proportion of development on greenfield	☹ The district does meet national and regional targets, but, because it is a rural district and has had to allocate greenfield sites for development, this may change in the future.
2008	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on Greenfield land (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	2006/07: 1416, 39% 2005/06: 1476, 44% 2004/05 916 36.9% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 1292 57.7% 2002/03 1358 48.4% 2003/04 1283 46.4% Overall trend is towards a reduction in completions on Greenfield sites.		😊 There is a reducing trend and the county meets regional and national targets.
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise the loss of Greenfield land to development?							
2007	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on Greenfield land (Data source: BDC AMR)	BDC	2006/07: 1259 36% 2005/06: 2168 59.8% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	2004/05 1912 57.8% 2003/04 1832 55.3% Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 N/R 2002/03 3569 94.8%	The LDF is at an early stage and BDC will be allocating further sites- due to rural nature some of these may be greenfield.	☹ Decrease in commitments on greenfield for 2006/07 but difficult to tell whether this is a one off.
2007	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on Greenfield land (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	2006/07: 13,258 47% 2005/06: 15277 55% 2004/05 13,294 49.3% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	60% PDL	2001/02 7765 52.7% 2002/03 9008 49.9% 2003/04 13,682 49.8% Overall downward trend		☹ No obvious pattern emerging as figures seem to fluctuate.
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise the loss of Greenfield land to development?							
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area	BDC	Dwellings per hectare 2005/6: 46	Dwellings per hectare 2004/5: 42.17 Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 34.96	Not recorded for 2001/2 or 2002/3.		😊 Currently 2 nd highest density in

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	(Data source: BDC AMR)			"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. 2 nd highest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.			Suffolk, but no past trend data for comparison
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	2004/05: 33	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare.	Excluding BDC: Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 30.39 Combined density in Suffolk meets the recommended guideline. County totals do not include all districts in previous years so trends are difficult to discern.		😊 Housing meets the recommended guideline for the county as a whole. Varies between districts and data for previous years are incomplete. Density is also increasing over time slowly.
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land to development?							
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a) (Data source: BDC Local Plan & AMR)	BDC	2005 Local Plan Grade 2: 1.8 Ha Grade 3: 140.43 Ha	No direct indicator although best and most versatile agricultural land should not be allocated for development, brown field land should be used first.			😞 There has been a need to allocate substantial areas of agricultural land following an urban capacity study, to meet the housing needs of the District.
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	This indicator needs developing for the 05/06 financial year. E.g. need to identify all allocations on agricultural land and grade if possible with hectareage. Could look at as a percentage of total allocations. Need to consider whether the sub objective and indicator should just relate to ag land and not grade as well?				No data available
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it maintain and enhance soil quality?							
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use (Data source: BDC Environmental Health / Environment Agency)	BDC	Potentially contaminated sites: 489 Need to set a baseline - number and area of potentially/declared contaminated sites.	No target			This indicator includes potentially contaminated land sites and sites defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e. declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. If a site is Declared Contaminated, then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use	Suffolk	Need to set a baseline - number and area of potentially/declared contaminated sites.	No target			This indicator includes potentially contaminated land sites and sites defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	(Data source: LDCs Environmental Health / Environment Agency)						declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. If a site is Declared Contaminated, then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it maintain and enhance soil quality?							
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Data source: Soil Association) (Data source: DEFRA: David.Rimmer@defra.gsi.gov.uk)	BDC	2009: no data 4 farms 41.4 ha	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Data source: Soil Association) (Data source: DEFRA: David.Rimmer@defra.gsi.gov.uk)	Suffolk	Jan 2009: 82 farms 27 farms 3059.7 ha	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
Headline Objective: To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible							
Will it promote sustainable use of minerals?							
SSAG	Recycled aggregate production (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2005 / 2006)	Suffolk	2003: 480,000 tonnes 2004: 500,000 tonnes (estimated) (annual average 1996-2003: 330,918 tonnes)	The Waste Local Plan calculates that, over the period 1995-2006, an annual average of 347,000 tonnes or recycled aggregates should be produced (an annual average of 347,000 tonnes)	1996: 101,938 1997: 157,000 1998: 150,000 1999: 320,000 2000: 418,000 2001: 505,786 2002: 514,622	Despite the decline in 2003, the annual average of 347,000 tonnes between 1995-2006 is still expected to be met. However, production is dependent on the fiscal attractiveness of secondary aggregates relative to primary aggregates, and also depends on the raw supply of secondary aggregate material	😊 Although the 2003 figure shows a 6% reduction on 2002 levels, recycled aggregates as a percentage of total mineral sales continued to rise in 2003
Headline Objective: To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible							
Will it promote sustainable use of water?							
AH	Daily domestic water use (per capita consumption, litres) (Data source: Audit commission: www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk)	BDC	2004 Daily per capita 145 litres	National mean figure 151 litres			😊 Consumption figure is below national level. CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in Suffolk.
AH	Daily domestic water use (per capita consumption, litres) (Data source: Audit commission:	Suffolk	No data available.				CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk)						Suffolk.
Headline Objective: To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible							
Will it maintain water availability for water dependant habitats?							
AH	% of river length assessed as good biological quality (Data source: DEFRA: www.defra.gov.uk)	BDC	Investigate.				No information available yet.
AH	% of river length assessed as good biological quality (Data source: DEFRA: www.defra.gov.uk)	Suffolk	Investigate.				
Headline Objective: To reduce waste							
Will it reduce household waste?							
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (Data source: SSAG / Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2005 / 2006)	BDC	Per head 2006/07: 404 kg Per head 2007/08: 388 kg	Per head 2004/05: 396.4 kg Per head 2005/06: 405 kg	Slight increase per household is due in part to garden waste recycling. These figures seem low relative to the county level. 07/08 figures show a decrease as more is recycled.		😊 The amount of waste produced is now decreasing 2007/08
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (Data source: SSAG / Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2005 / 2006)	Suffolk	Per head 2005/06: 539 kg Per head 2006/07: 556 kg	Per head 2004/05: 552 kg Per head 2003/04: 535 kg	Difficult to say we have a trend at present. More green garden waste is being collected so this will increase the figures		😐 There appears to no obvious trend at present.
Headline Objective: To reduce waste							
Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?							
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (Data source: SSAG / BVPI / Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2005 / 2006)	BDC	% recycled: 2005/6: 33.3% % recycled: 2006/7: 36.3% % recycled: 2007/8: 39%	% recycled: 2004/5: 34.74% % recycled: 2003/4: 25.8% BVPI targets: 2003-4: 14% 2005-6: 21%	A huge increase on the 2002/3 figure of 11.0%		😊 Already beyond the targets. 2007/08
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (Data source: SSAG / BVPI / Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2005 / 2006)	Suffolk	% recycled: 2004/5: 30.5% % recycled: 2005/6: 41% % recycled: 2006/7: 43%	% recycled: 2003/4: 24.79% % recycled: 2002/3: 11.32% % recycled: 2001/2: 11.1% BVPI targets: 2003-4: 28% 2004-5: 35% 2005-6: 38%	There have been very marked improvements and the BVPI targets are now being met.		😊 The 2002-3 and 2004-5 BVPI target has not been met, mainly due to a slower-than-anticipated rollout of the three-bin collection system, and lower-than-expected recycling levels at Household Waste & Recycling sites. Targets for future years remain challenging.
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it effect traffic volumes?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (Data source: Suffolk County Council)	BDC	2005: 7 day annual average flows - all traffic = 283,772. 46 sites (Suffolk CC)		2000: 270,760 2001: 275,641 2002: 280,079 2003: 284,866 2004: 279,924	Traffic levels have increased in the last 2 years.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes.
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (Data source: Suffolk County Council)	Suffolk total	2003: 7 day annual average flows - all traffic = 2,232,866. 283 sites (Suffolk CC)		1999: 2,067,679 2000: 2,088,699 2001: 2,109,313 2002: 2,166,875	Traffic levels have increased each year since 1999.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes.
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it reduce the need for local travel?							
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere (Data source: BDC AMR)	BDC	2005/6: Major towns: % Other towns: 38% Elsewhere: 62%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for sustainable development (Structure Plan Policy CS3(a)). 2003/4: Major towns: 9% Other towns: 34% Elsewhere: 58% 2004/5: Major towns: % Other towns: 47% Elsewhere: 53%	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 21.5% (43%) Other towns: 55% (26%) Elsewhere: 23.5% (31%) 5-yearly data for 1991-96 and 1996-01 show that development in major towns increased (from 13% to 35%), while in other towns and elsewhere it decreased. From 2001/2 to 2003/4 development in major towns decreased each year but figures for other towns and elsewhere showed fluctuation.	Amount of development taking place in major towns in decreasing, while development elsewhere is higher than last 2 years.	☹ Amount of development taking place in major towns has decreased in recent years, and in 2003/4 most took place elsewhere.
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	2003/4: Major towns: 39% Other towns: 31% Elsewhere: 30%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for sustainable development (Structure Plan Policy CS3(a)).	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 46% (44.5%) Other towns: 34% (37%) Elsewhere: 20% (18.5%) 5-yearly data for 1991-96 and 1996-01 show that development in major towns dropped from 42 to 37%, with slightly more in other towns and elsewhere. In 2001/2 to 2002/3 increased development has taken place in major towns, with less elsewhere. 2002/3 figures show more development in major towns and less elsewhere, compared to the historical data.		😊 Development is increasingly being directed away from elsewhere to major and other towns, in accordance with the structure plan.
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it reduce the need for local travel?							
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	BDC	Total Rural Population 45,557 Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 13,296 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 29.2% in 2004/5	Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 18,921 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 41.5 in 2003/4 Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	% of rural population with access to all five listed facilities has halved - 64% recorded in 2002/3 (no data for 2001/2) .	Rapid loss of rural services during last 2 years is a concern.	☹ There has been a significant decrease this year indicating a rapid decrease in rural service provision. Does not meet target. Needs to be monitored and improved in the future.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place	Suffolk	Total Rural Population 217,716 Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 71,883 % of rural population with access to all	Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 87,505 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 42.0 (2003/4)	Rural population with access to 5 services 2003/4: 42% 2002/3: 43.2% 2001/2: 41.0%		☹ The source of population data has changed and so figures are not directly comparable.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	(Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)		five listed facilities 33.0 (2004/5)	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Appears to have been a big decrease in provision of rural services over the past year. ONS have updated their population figures which may have affected this indicator this year.		Not all districts returned data for each year, therefore it is not accurate to compare. However there is a general trend towards fewer facilities with reduced numbers and % of people with access to these facilities in rural areas.
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it reduce the need for local travel?							
SB/BG	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT) (Data source: Suffolk County Council)	BDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB/BG	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT) (Data source: Suffolk County Council)	Suffolk	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it increase the proportion of journeys made using modes other than the private car?							
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG) (Data source: 2001 Census)	BDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 30% this covered, working at home, by train, cycle, bus, walking % sustainable 2001 Census: 18.3% Babergh DC employees 2005: 18.24 % 2006: 18.18 % Does not include those working at home	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. Not include were car or van passengers at 5.89%	No other comparable data recorded.		☹ There appears to be little change.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG) (Data source: 2001 Census)	Suffolk	% sustainable 2001 Census: 21.2% Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2004: 28.0%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2003: 25.2% No other comparable data recorded.		☹ Limited trend information. An increase has been recorded in use of sustainable modes by Suffolk employees but is this representative of the wider population?
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it increase the proportion of journeys made using modes other than the private car?							
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	BDC	2005 survey 35.2% walk, 22.3% bus, 3.2% cycle, 39.3% car	2004 survey 36.7 walk, 25.6% bus, 2.5% cycle, 35.2% car 2003 survey 44.2 walk, 16.7% bus, 1.8% cycle, 37.3% car	The trend in Babergh seems to be slightly towards to more car use. This perhaps reflects the rural nature of the district.	To reduce the use of the car on the school run.	☹ Babergh appears to be going in the opposite direction to the County.
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	Suffolk	2005 survey: 41% walk, 19% bus, 7.4% cycle, 32.4% car	Suffolk target of 23% by bus in 2004 2004 survey: Now target for car is 31% 41% walk, 18% bus, 5.9% cycle, 35% car. 2003 Survey: 41.6% walk, 17.1% bus, 6% cycle, 35.3% car	The split of transport uses varies slightly year to year but the trend is towards more sustainable forms of transport. The county may have reached the limit for reducing car use because of it's rural nature and parental choice.	To reduce further the use of the car on the school run.	😊 There has been steady progress to reduce the use of the car and encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport.
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it increase the proportion of journeys made using modes other than the private car?							


Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	BDC		For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No other data collected to date. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.		☹ There is a need to develop monitoring systems that allows the collection of data for this revised indicator.
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	Suffolk	Data from Ipswich only 2003/4: Number of commercial developments >1,000sq m: 3 (total area: 41366sq m) Number of these developments complying with PPG13 parking standard: 0 (total area: 0 sq m)	For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No other data collected to date. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.	Developments in 2003/4 did not meet PPG13 parking standards.	☹ In Ipswich, standards were adopted in 2001, but developments in 2003/4 did not meet PPG13 parking standards. Monitoring systems have yet to be implemented in many authorities
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it reduce emissions of green house gases by reducing energy consumption?							
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial / industrial use (Data source: DTI: www.dti.gov.uk) (Data source: www.berr.gov.uk/whatwedo/energy/statistics/regional/regional-local-electricity/page36213.html)	BDC	2007 Domestic use per consumer: 5,392 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 221.3 GWh	2006 Domestic use per consumer: 5,457 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 245 GWh 2005: Domestic use per consumer: 5,572 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 241 GWh	2 nd lowest industrial use in Suffolk. 2004 Domestic use per consumer: 5,763 kWh 2003: Domestic use per consumer: 5,668 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 210 GWh		
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial / industrial use (Data source: DTI: www.dti.gov.uk)	Suffolk	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 5,337 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 2003 GWh		No trend data available to date.		
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it reduce emissions of green house gases by reducing energy consumption?							
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial / industrial use (Data source: DTI: www.dti.gov.uk) (Data source: www.berr.gov.uk/whatwedo/energy/statistics/regional/regional-local-gas/page36200.html)	BDC	2006 Domestic use per consumer: 17000kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 146.5 GWh 2006 Domestic use per consumer: 17,584 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 178 GWh	2005: Domestic use per consumer: 18,267 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 191 GWh 2004 Domestic use per consumer: 19,104 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 215 GWh	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 19,072 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 344 GWh 2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 18,926 kWh (18,536 kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 369 GWh (336GWh) Domestic gas use is decreasing annually, and while industrial use has decreased since 2002.	Increasing use of gas in the District.	
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial / industrial use (Data source: DTI: www.dti.gov.uk)	Suffolk	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 19,028 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 3502 GWh		2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 19,043 kWh (18,688 kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 2701 GWh (3064 GWh)	Increase in gas use in county since 2001 (although domestic use has decreased slightly this year).	

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					Domestic use has decreased slightly this year, but remains above 2001 figures. Industrial use has increased.		
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it reduce emissions of green house gases by reducing energy consumption?							
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns) (Data source: BVPI: www.bvpi.gov.uk) (Data source: DEFRA: www.defra.gov.uk) (Data source: Carbon Action Network (CAN) (Formally: Home Energy Conservation Association (HECA)): www.carbonactionnetwork.org.uk) (Data source: www.audit-commission.gov.uk/performance/dataprovision.asp)	BDC	HECA (% improvement in domestic energy efficiency since 1996) 2006/07: 22.4 2005/06: 18.8 2004/05: 17.0 2003/04: 14.2 2002/03: 11.1 BV63: 2007/08: 64 2006/07: 63	63 in 2004/05 58 (BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA overall figure for improvement in total district stock since 1996 is 14.2% (HECA Progress Report) BVPI Target for 2004/05 59.7 HECA Strategy target 19% by 2006	BVPI 63 2001/02 2002/03 HECA (% improvement in domestic energy efficiency since 1996) 2001 6.41% 2002 8.3% 2003 11.1%		😊 There has been a steady increase in the score and the target for 2004/5 has been met. BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1 st April 1996. The DEFRA website advises that because HECA Strategies and monitoring techniques differ, the information should not be used to compare the performance of LAs.
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns) (Data source: BVPI: www.bvpi.gov.uk) (Data source: DEFRA: www.defra.gov.uk) (Data source: Carbon Action Network (CAN) (Formally: Home Energy Conservation Association (HECA)): www.carbonactionnetwork.org.uk) (Data source: www.audit-commission.gov.uk/performance/dataprovision.asp)	Suffolk	?	(BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA - DEFRA website advises that 'HECA strategies and monitoring techniques differ, therefore the information should not be used to compare the performance of authorities.' This suggests that to aggregate the figures and find an average for Suffolk may also not be appropriate.	BVPI 63 2001/02 ? 2002/03 ?		BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1 st April 1996.
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it increase the proportion of energy needs being met by renewable sources?							
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	BDC	2004/5: 0 2003/4: 0	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	None since at least 1996/7 There are small schemes for individual properties being developed in the district but the capacity is small.		☹ No schemes in the pipeline

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	Suffolk	2004/5: 22.25 MWh 2003/4: 19.5 MWh	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	Mid Suffolk and Waveney now have plants; with the largest wind turbine in the UK built at Lowestoft.		😊 Things are improving but the targets will be difficult to meet.
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property from rivers and watercourses?							
SSAG	Flood Risk - Planning Applications Approved Against Environment Agency Advice (SSAG) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	BDC	2005/6:1 2004/5:0 2003/4: 0 (data from Environment Agency High Level Target 12 report to DEFRA)	2002/3: 1 Target is 0	Reduction to zero from 2002/3		😞 But conflicting priorities between PPG3 and PPG25 may impact on future 'inappropriate' approval figures
SSAG	Flood Risk - Planning Applications Approved Against Environment Agency Advice (SSAG) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	Suffolk	2003-4: 8	2002/3: 8 Target is 0	No change on 2002/3 figures.		😞 Mid-Suffolk figures are of concern, but other districts seem to be moving towards sustainability in this area
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property from rivers and watercourses?							
RC	Properties at risk of flooding (Data source: Environment Agency)	BDC					
RC	Properties at risk of flooding (Data source: Environment Agency)	Suffolk	11,943* *note this excludes FHDC.				
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property from rivers and watercourses?							
RC	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected) (Data source: Environment Agency)	BDC	4 properties Suffolk wide* Many events go unreported.				
RC	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected) (Data source: Environment Agency)	Suffolk	4 properties Suffolk wide* Many events go unreported.				
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property on the coast?							
RC	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected) (Data source: Environment Agency)	BDC	3 properties Suffolk wide* Many events go unreported.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
RC	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected) (Data source: Environment Agency)	Suffolk	3 properties Suffolk wide* Many events go unreported.				
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it reduce the risk of coastal erosion?							
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	BDC	N/A				No coastal areas.
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	Suffolk	Totals from the 2 coastal districts: 0				☹ Policies apply in both coastal Districts, and whilst there will always be some pressure the number of applications is likely to remain very low.
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it reduce the risk of damage to people and property from storm events?							
RC	Incidence of storm events (properties affected) (Data source: Environment Agency)	BDC	Data has been received from EA - still to add				
RC	Incidence of storm events (properties affected) (Data source: Environment Agency)	Suffolk	Data has been received from EA - still to add				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?							
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	BDC	RAMSAR 1(part) SPA 1(part) SAC 0 0ha SSSI 17 2573ha CWS 164 1574ha LNR 8 142.23 [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	Gained 1 SSSI and 14 CWS since 2003. LNRs appear to have decreased but probably due to miscount previously		😊 Increase in SSSIs and CWS is promising. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are baseline data. 5 yearly indicator
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	Suffolk	RAMSAR 6 8141ha SPA 7 18227.5ha SAC 11 2542.9ha SSSI 142 31341ha CWS 875 19509ha LNR 25 377.84ha [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	Gained 42 CWS since 2003. Decrease in LNRs due to miscount previously. Apparent changes in hectareage due to changes in method - only including Suffolk area this year.		😊 Increase in CWS is promising. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are baseline data. 5 yearly indicator
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?							
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (Data source: English Nature & Suffolk)	BDC	2006 Favourable: 24.6% Unfavourable Recovering: 12.3%	No trend data but they appear to be generally less than in good condition.	The overall condition of the SSSIs is affected by the scale of the Stour and Orwell estuaries which are generally not		☹ Only a quarter of SSSIs are in a favourable condition.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	Wildlife Trust)		Unfavourable No Change: 10.7% Unfavourable Declining: 52.5%		in a favourable condition.		
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (Data source: English Nature & Suffolk Wildlife Trust)	Suffolk	Investigate				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it help deliver targets and action for habitats and species within the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan?							
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (Data source: Suffolk Biological Records Centre (SBRC)) (Data source: Suffolk Biodiversity Partnership(SBP))	BDC	Data is not available yet but this should be available in the next year				Data available in Oct 2006
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (Data source: Suffolk Biological Records Centre (SBRC)) (Data source: Suffolk Biodiversity Partnership(SBP))	Suffolk	Data is not available yet but this should be available in the next year				Data available in Oct 2006
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it help deliver targets and action for habitats and species within the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan?							
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (Data source: Suffolk Wildlife Trust)	BDC	Habitat Action Plan Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland total 1 Condition - 1 (100%) Reason N/T Ponds total 1 Condition - 1 (100%) Reason N/T Species Action Plan Bats known roosts N/A Bats potential roosts total 26 Survey prior to decision - 26 (100%) Condition - 26 (100%) Reason - N/T Great Crested Newts N/A [Suffolk Wildlife Trust]	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.	Number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to planning decisions has increased since 2001/2.		☹ Data limited but number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to potential bat roosts has increased.
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (Data source: Suffolk Wildlife Trust)	Suffolk	Habitat Action Plan Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland total 1 Safeguarding Condition - 1 (100%) Reason for refusal - N/T Ponds total 17 Safeguarding Condition - 2 (12%) Reason for refusal - 1 (6%)	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.	Number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to planning decisions have increased since 2001/2.		☹ Data limited but number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to bat roosts have increased.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
			Species Action Plan Bats all roosts total 321 Survey prior to decision - 41 (13%) Safeguarding Condition - 153 (48%) Reason for Refusal - 2 (1%) Great Crested Newts total 19 Survey prior to decision - 1 (5%) Safeguarding Condition - 5 (26%) Reason for refusal - 0 (0%) [Suffolk Wildlife Trust]				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity Will it help to reverse the national decline in farmland birds?							
ME	Bird survey results (Data source: British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) & The RSPB)	BDC		The survey sample size for Babergh is too small to provide a sound basis for a reliable conclusion. 2006			
ME	Bird survey results (Data source: British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) & The RSPB)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (Data source: SSAG & English Heritage)	BDC	2009 Grade 1 97 Grade 11* 230 Grade 11 3586 Total 3913 Buildings at Risk in 2009: 18 This includes both locally identified buildings and English Heritage's list.	Grade 1 97 Grade 11* 230 Grade 11 3588 Total 3915 Year 2007 Buildings at Risk in 2006 24 (0.6%) This includes both locally identified buildings and English Heritage's list. Over the last 2 years 8 buildings have been removed from the buildings at risk register. (2006) Grade 1 88 Grade 11* 219 Grade 11 3403 Total 3710 Buildings at Risk in 2003 11 (0.3%) 2 nd highest number of LBs in Suffolk. No target. Lowest percentage of Buildings at Risk in Suffolk. Suffolk target is 0.7% by 2006.	Total LBs in 1995 was 3673, increasing to 3709 as of 2003. Reveals a gradual increase over time. % at risk has remained fairly constant and is within target.		 The increasing number of listed buildings is positive and the 2006 target for buildings at risk has been met.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (Data source: SSAG & English Heritage)	Suffolk	2009 Grade 1 411 Grade 11* 797 Grade 11 12,067 Total 13,275 Buildings at Risk in 2009: 114 This includes both locally identified buildings and English Heritage's list.	2006 Grade 1 404 Grade 11* 867 Grade 11 15,184 Total 16,446 Just above the county target of 0.7% by 2006. Buildings at Risk in 2003: 134 (0.8%)	MSDC did not start reporting 'buildings' as opposed to 'listing entries' until 2003 therefore it is difficult to assess trends. However, taking into account the approximate difference in the figures for MSDC, and that no district or borough has shown a decrease in the number of LBs, in Suffolk the general trend has been a gradual increase in LBs since 1995. The overall number of listed building increased by 9 over the last financial year.		😊 Number of listed buildings has increased gradually since 1995. Number at risk has decreased this year and is moving towards the 2006 target.
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	AONB (Ha) <u>9191</u> Special Landscape area (Ha) <u>19764</u> National designated historic parkland (Ha) <u>229.0 (5 parks)</u> County designated historic parkland (Ha) <u>Not applicable 2004/05</u>	To ensure that 100% of historic parks and gardens are maintained and enhanced.	Overall drop in National Designated Parkland by 564.8 Ha since 2001, although number of parks has increased by one.		😐 Not measured annually. Number of parks has increased but area designated has dropped.
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	28 CAs (1816 ha) 2006 4 Article 4 directions	Largest hectareage in Suffolk. 3 rd highest number in Suffolk. No target. Sudbury CA has been extended.	Number remained constant since 1996. Since monitoring in 2000, the number of Article 4 directions has remained fairly constant. Article 4 for Glemsford covers approx 400 properties.		😊 The number and area covered by Conservation Areas helps safeguard the quality of the environment of the district.
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	170 CAs (6320 ha) 22 Article 4 Directions (covering approx 6934 properties)	No target.	157 in 1996 163 in 2001 165 in 2002 168 in 2003 At start of monitoring in 2000, 21 Article 4 Directions covering approx 7153 properties)		😊 The increasing number of conservation areas each year is positive. Data on number of properties covered by Article 4s is not complete but is improving. Improved accuracy has result in a reduced number.
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	5 Appraisals as of 04 18% of all conservation areas 1 Appraisal completed within the last 5 years. 2006 1 enhancement schemes completed 03/04 2 enhancement schemes completed 04/05 2 enhancement schemes completed 05/06	2 nd lowest percentage coverage in Suffolk. No target. Similar to other Suffolk Authorities. No target.	Increase of 2 since 1996. 8 schemes completed in 1995/96 3 in 1996/97 3 in 1997/98 3 in 1998/99 1 in 1999/00 1 in 2000/01 0 in 2001/02 0 in 2002/03		😐 Steady progress

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
					Total 24 - downward trend		
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	56 Appraisals 33% of conservation areas 7 enhancement schemes completed 03/04 6 in SCDC and 1 in BDC	No target. No target.	29 completed since the baseline figure of 24 in 1996. 53 as of 2003 27 schemes completed in 1995/96 21 in 1996/97 16 in 1997/98 9 in 1998/99 11 in 1999/00 9 in 2000/01 1 in 2001/02 0 in 2002/03 Total 101 incl. 03/04 - downward trend		☹ Slow progress. Number of schemes completed shows downward trend to 0 in 2002/3 but a significant increase in 2003/04, albeit primarily down to SCDC. Monitoring of enhancement schemes needs revisiting.
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of archaeological value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	Figure has been 0 for all years since 1997-8		😊 None damaged since at least 1997-8
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	1997-8: 0 1998-9: 2 1999-0: 0 2000-1: 1 (+1, SCDC, see above) 2001-2: 0 2002-3 0 (+1, SCDC, see above) Figure is 0 for all years apart from 1998-9 and 2000-1. Figures are so low that this cannot count as a proper 'trend'		😊 No SAMs have been damaged since 2000-1
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of archaeological value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Planning permissions affecting known or potential archaeological sites (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	2003-4: 2	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1998-9: 1 1999-0: 0 2000-1: 0 2001-2: 0 2002-3: 0	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	😊 This is largely dependent on the location of development, but the 2003-4 figure is the highest since the start of <i>Suffolk's Environment</i>
SSAG	Number of applications affecting no known archaeological site but judged of high potential and approved with conditions requiring prior excavation or recording during development (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	2003-4: 26	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1997-8: 6 1998-9: 11 1999-0: 17 2000-1: 22 2001-2: 11 2002-3: 1	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	😊 This is triggered only rarely, for few SCC applications affect areas of high archaeological potential
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of geological value in both urban and rural areas?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (Data source: English Nature 1990-2006 (Now Natural England: www.naturalengland.org.uk))	BDC	2003/04 baseline Bobbithole, Belstead 1.8ha on citation	No target	Notified under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act in 1987. No change since then.		😊 No loss
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (Data source: English Nature 1990-2006 (Now Natural England: www.naturalengland.org.uk))	Suffolk	2003/04 baseline 29 sites 21484.849ha (includes parts of Breckland forest and Thetford Heaths in Norfolk)	No target	All notified under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act prior to 2000, apart from Thetford Heaths (15 Nov 2000). No change since 2000.		😊 No loss
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of geological value in both urban and rural areas?							
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (Data source: English Nature 1990-2006 (Now Natural England: www.naturalengland.org.uk))	BDC	Favourable 1.67 Ha from English Nature GIS measurement 2006.				😊 Favourable condition
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (Data source: English Nature 1990-2006 (Now Natural England: www.naturalengland.org.uk))	Suffolk	Favourable 70.31 Ha Unfavourable No Change 0.33 Ha Unfavourable Declining 1.25 Ha Total 71.89 Ha				😊 Favourable condition for most sites
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?							
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	Net completions on PDL 2005/6: 147 (= 67.7 % of total completions) Net completions on PDL 2004/5: 80 (= 42.7% of total completions) Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 116 (= 54.7% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk.	% PDL completions in 2006 is higher than recorded in previous year, but indicator has fluctuated within range 39% to 65%, 1999/0 to 2002/3.		😐 Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	Net completions on PDL 2004/5: 1567 (= 63.0% of total completions) Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 1483 (= 53.6% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Suffolk meets regional target 2002/3.	% PDL has varied between 42%-63% since 1998/9. This year recorded the highest % since 1998/9 and % has increased for past 3 years.		😊 Suffolk total is currently above the regional target, and highest since 1998/9. However the indicator fluctuates, and % of completions on PDL has varied year on year.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?							
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	Net commitments on PDL 2005/6: 1,455 (= 40 % of total commitments) Net commitments on PDL 2004/5: 1,395 (= 42.2% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 1,478 (= 44.7% of total commitments)	Net commitments on PDL not recorded in previous years.		😐 Lower than last year, but indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	Net commitments on PDL 2004/5: 13,294 (= 49.3% of total commitments) Excludes St Edmundsbury Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 13,790 (= 50.2% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Suffolk meets regional target, 2002/3, for first time since mid 1999.	Net commitments on PDL for Suffolk as a whole showed minimal change compared to last year (50.1%) % PDL has risen from values of 34% and 33% recorded in mid 1999 and 2000 (NB data was not available for all authorities in these years).		☹ Suffolk total nearly meets the regional target. However the situation varies considerably between districts.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?							
HH	Number of vacant dwellings (Data source - Babergh Council Tax Records)	BDC	2005: 76 uninhabitable, 325 long term empty and 428 2 nd homes Number of long-term vacant dwellings (empty more than 6 months)	2004: 37 uninhabitable 343 long term empty and 537 2 nd homes 2003: 68 uninhabitable 979 long term empty or 2 nd homes 2002: 61 uninhabitable 898 long term empty or 2 nd homes 2001: 64 uninhabitable 894 long term empty or 2 nd homes 2000: 38 uninhabitable 868 long term empty or 2 nd homes	The number of uninhabitable dwellings fluctuates and it is difficult to detect a trend. There appears to be a steady decline in the number of long term empty dwellings over the last 3 years.		☹/☺ Difficult to discern a trend for the uninhabitable data, however there has been a decline in recent years of the number of long term empty and second homes.
HH	Number of vacant dwellings (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	Number of long-term vacant dwellings 2004 - 3067		No trend data available from this source		☹ No trend data.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and character of the countryside?							
SSAG	Landscape Character Areas and the influence of planning (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	Babergh is part of 2 landscape character areas Suffolk Coastal and the South Suffolk and North Essex Claylands.	The areas have been resurveyed in 2005 and there has been an improvement in these two areas, with an increase in the quantity of important features	These character areas are larger than the area of the district. The full details of the changes are contained in 2005 Suffolk's Environment produced by SCC		☺ There has been an improvement in key landscape features affecting the district.
SSAG	Landscape Character Areas and the influence of planning (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	Original survey 1999. Reports % land use (6 categories), km length of linear features (4 types) and number of point features (3 types) for each of the 7 landscape character areas in Suffolk: Breckland, East Anglia Chalk, High Suffolk Claylands, Broads, Fens, South Suffolk Claylands, Suffolk Coast and Heaths	To ensure that the character areas in Suffolk preserve their distinctive features.	Only 2 areas have been resurveyed, in 2001. Most significant change observed is more use of fencing as a boundary treatment, rather than traditional hedging. In 2005 4 areas resurveyed so no complete picture.		☺/☹ Not measured annually. Limited data available so far, so trends cannot be ascertained, but part of the County has been resurveyed in 2005 with significant improvements in 4 of the 7 landscape character areas.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and character of the countryside?							
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons (Data source: Suffolk County Council)	BDC	Waiting info from County				Information not available yet.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons (Data source: Suffolk County Council)	Suffolk	Waiting info from County				Information not available yet.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and character of the countryside?							
HH	Area of designated landscapes - AONB, Environmentally Sensitive Areas (Data source: Countryside Agency 1999-2006 (Now Natural England: www.naturalengland.org.uk)) (Data source: DEFRA: www.defra.gov.uk)	BDC	ESA's are now joined with Countryside Stewardship Schemes. CSS area - 1341 ha 2006 ESA area - 4098 ha 2006 CSS area - 1172 ha 2004 ESA area - 3270 ha 2004 AONB - 9,191.20 ha 2004	No target.	2002/3 9487 ha 2001 9172 ha 1996 9172 ha		😊 There has been an increase in area since 2004
HH	Area of designated landscapes - AONB, Environmentally Sensitive Areas (Data source: Countryside Agency 1999-2006 (Now Natural England: www.naturalengland.org.uk)) (Data source: DEFRA: www.defra.gov.uk)	Suffolk total	ESA's are now joined with Countryside Stewardship Schemes. CSS area - 11,191 ha 2006 ESA area - 25,380 ha 2006 CSS area - 9,388 ha 2004 ESA area - 21,179 ha 2004 AONB - 46220.57 ha 2004	No target	2002/3 46516 ha 2001 46126 ha 1996 46126 ha		😊 There has been an increase in area since 2004
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and character of the countryside?							
HH	Number of Environmentally Sensitive Area / Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (Data source: DEFRA: www.defra.gov.uk)	BDC	ESA's 167 in 2006 CSS,s 78 in 2006 ELS's 151 in 2006	No Target ESA's 168 in 2004 CSS's 83 in 2004 ELS's 55 in 2005	The CSS and ESA schemes are now not accepting new applicants so they will diminish over time as the agreements expire.		😊 There has been an increase in the number of schemes for all schemes overall and total area since 2002/3
HH	Number of Environmentally Sensitive Area / Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (Data source: DEFRA: www.defra.gov.uk)	Suffolk	ESA's 708 in 2006 CSS,s 408 in 2006 ELS's 767 in 2006 HLS's 3 in 2006	No Target ESA's 726 in 2004 CSS's 430 in 2004 ELS's 272 in 2005	The CSS and ESA schemes are now not accepting new applicants so they will diminish over time as the agreements expire.		😊 There has been an increase in the number of schemes and area since 2002/3
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and character of the countryside?							
HH	Light pollution / tranquil areas? (Data source: CPRE)	BDC	Can not find data.		The data source is not detailed enough to see Babergh as a separate area.		
HH	Light pollution / tranquil areas? (Data source: CPRE)	Suffolk	% of area in each of the 5 light pollution bands Dark Blue 0-1.70 Blue 1.71-50 Light blue - 50.01-150 Yellow - 150.01-240 Red 240.01-255 (Source CPRE)		2000 Dark Blue - 7% Blue - 25% Light Blue - 59% Yellow - 8% Red - 1% 1993 Dark Blue - 5%		☹ Overall levels of Light pollution has increased.

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

ECONOMIC BASELINE DATA

Collected by?	Indicator	Distri ct or Borou gh	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	2005/06; 5801 sq m (B1-B8) 2004/05; 6323 sq m (B1-B8) 2003/04; 2048 sq m (B1-B8)	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	There has been a recent increase in the take up of business floorspace but it can vary from year to year depending on the size of units available and what is completed.		😊 New business floorspace is being built.
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	Too much data missing to calculate a meaningful county total.	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too much data missing to evaluate a meaningful county trend.		😞 Gaps in information means overall and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2006(m ²) 0.0, 2004 (m ²) Not recorded Outstanding permissions March 2006 (m ²) 0.0 on PDL, March 2004 on PDL (m ²) Not recorded Total outstanding allocations at March 2006 (Ha) 32.9, 2004 (Ha) 9 Outstanding allocations at March 2006 on PDL (Ha) 24, 2004 on PDL (Ha) 0	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		😊 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make, but large areas of land have been allocated through the Local Plan process.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2006(m ²) 26,715, 2004 (m ²) 33000 Outstanding permissions March 2006 (m ²) 9,256 on PDL, 2004 on PDL (m ²) 14017 Total outstanding allocations at March 2006 (Ha) 36.2, 2004 (Ha) 1.8 Outstanding allocations at March 2006 (Ha) 14.12, 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1.4	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		😊 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make, but large areas of land have been allocated through the Local Plan process.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m ²) Data missing from 3 authorities Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m ²) Data missing from 3 authorities Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) Total 147.64 (excluding MSDC) Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) Total 51.86 (excluding MSDC)	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too many values missing this year to look at county trends in outstanding permissions. Outstanding land allocations (total and on PDL) have both decreased from March 2003.		😞 Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
AMcC	Percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (Data source: AC voluntary QOL / SDA / Suffolk Observatory)	BDC	2004: 0.15%	There were 285 registrations and 280 deregistrations, with 3420 VAT registered companies. 2003: 0.9% 2002: 1.0% 2001: 0.9%			😞 Low and decreasing rate of busines formation

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
AMcC	Percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (Data source: AC voluntary QOL / SDA / Suffolk Observatory)	Suffolk	2004: 0.35%	2003: 1.2% 2002: 1.6% 2001: 0.7%			☹ Low and decreasing rate of business formation
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
AMcC	Change in number of businesses paying business rates (Data source: National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR))	BDC	2005(Dec): 2820 business premises Change from previous year: +39 Vacant 2005: 352 2006: 341	2004: 2781 Change: +84 2003: 2697 Change: +12 2002: 2685 Vacant: 2004: 369, 2003: 322 2002: 310 The normal range for vacant premises is 330 to 360 with current figure at the lower end of the range. A property may be vacant for a few days or several years.			😊 Steady increase in the number of business units
AMcC	Change in number of businesses paying business rates (Data source: National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR))	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve the resilience of business and the economy?							
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	% all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 2.8 energy and water - 1.3 manufacturing 18.2 construction 5.2 distribution, hotels and restaurants 26.5 transport 3.7 banking, finance and insurance 18.6 public admin., 20.3 other services 9.2 total services 69 (Suffolk Observatory 2006)	No specific target % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 2.3 energy and water - manufacturing 15.9 construction 12.1 distribution, hotels and restaurants 12.3 transport and communications 8.9 banking, finance and insurance 9.1 public admin., education and health 29.4 other services 9.2 total services 69	Comments given on countywide basis only. Source- ONS - Local Area Labour Force Survey [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]		☹ Baseline Data
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	(2005) % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 2.5 energy and water 1.2 manufacturing 16.3 construction 8 distribution, hotels and restaurants 19.4 transport and communications 9.9 banking, finance and insurance 12.3 public admin., education and health 25.1 other services 5 total services 71.8	No specific target East of England % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 1.6 energy and water 0.7 manufacturing 14.1 construction 8.2 distribution, hotels and restaurants 19.9 transport and communications 7.2 banking, finance and insurance 17.6 public admin., education and health 24.6	As an essentially contextual indicator, the scope for informative commentary here is limited. However, this is useful as a possible measure of diversity in the local employment base. Caution is needed in making comparisons due to uncertainties in continuity of data. Leaving aside what generally seem to be relatively minor fluctuations, trends include an apparent large decline in the distribution, hotels and restaurants employment sector (from 28.2% to		☹ Baseline Data

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
			2006 Suffolk Observatory : % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 0.5 energy 0.9 manufacturing 12.6 construction 5.5 distribution, hotels and restaurants 24.7 transport 8.1 banking, finance and insurance 15.9 Public admin. 26.4 other 5.4 total services 72.4	other services 6 total services 75.3 <u>Great Britain</u> % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 1.2 energy and water 1 manufacturing 14.3 construction 7.5 distribution, hotels and restaurants 20.1 transport and communications 6.8 banking, finance and insurance 15.6 public admin., education and health 27.1 other services 6.1 total services 75.7 Source- ONS [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]	19.4%). The public admin. / education & health sector shows an apparent rise from 21.6% to 25.1%, as the 2 nd largest change.		
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve the resilience of business and the economy?							
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (Data source: BDC AMR)	BDC	Agriculture 405 Production 285 Construction 405 Motor Trades 125 Wholesale 210 Retail 265 Hotels and catering 185 Transport 120 Post & Telecoms 20 Finance 15 Property & Business Services 815 Education 15 Health 20 Public Admin & Other Services 195 Neighbourhood Statistics 2007	Agriculture 400 13% Production 320 10.4% Construction 395 12.8% Motor Trades 130 4.2% Wholesale 205 6.7% Retail 285 9.2% Hotels and catering 185 6% Transport 135 4.4% Post & Telecoms 15 0.5% Finance 20 0.7% Property & Business Services 750 24.4% Education 15 0.5% Health 15 0.5% Public Admin & Other Services 215 6.9% Neighbourhood Statistics 2004			☹ Baseline Data, setting contextual framework although over time will show changes.
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve the resilience of business and the economy?							
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (Data source: BDC AMR)	BDC	0 - 4 Persons 2,930 74.8% 5 - 24 Persons 760 19.4% 25 - 199 Persons 228 5.8% 200 + Persons 0 0% Suffolk Observatory 2006	0 - 4 Persons 2405 78.1% 5 - 9 Persons 390 12.7% 10 - 19 Persons 150 4.9% 20 + Persons 135 4.4% Neighbourhood Statistics 2005			😊 Steady increase in the number of businesses
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (Data source: Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report)	Suffolk	0 - 4 Persons 20,532 69.7% 5 - 24 Persons 6815 23.1% 25 - 199 Persons 1968 6.7% 200 + Persons 151 0.5% Suffolk Observatory 2006				☹ Baseline Data, setting contextual frame work although over time will show changes
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Will it promote growth in key sectors?							
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local authority to specify key sectors) (Data source: SSAG / AMR)	BDC					
AMcC	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local authority to specify key sectors) (Data source: SSAG / AMR)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve economic performance in advantaged and disadvantaged areas?							
AMcC	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (Data source: local agents)	BDC	2003/6 Office: £ 6.00 to £ 9.00 per sq ft There is limited demand for offices at present (2006) Industrial: £ 3 to £ 6.50 per sq ft There is buoyant demand for industrial premises, particularly for purchase and very few are vacant.		The local market has only seen a slight increase in rents over the last 3 years		☹️ Baseline Data, setting contextual frame work
AMcC	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (Data source: local agents)	Suffolk	2003/6 Office: £ 6.50 to £ 14.00 per sq ft Industrial: £ 3 to £ 6.00 per sq ft	There is a wide range of premises available in Suffolk in different locations and on a variety of terms.	The local market has only seen a slight increase in rents over the last 3 years		☹️ Baseline Data, setting contextual frame work
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it encourage rural diversification?							
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2006(m ²) 26,715, 2004 (m ²) 33000 Outstanding permissions March 2006 (m ²) 9,256 on PDL, March 2004 on PDL (m ²) 14017 Total outstanding allocations at March 2006 (Ha) 36.2, 2004 (Ha) 1.8 Outstanding allocations at March 2006 on PDL (Ha) 14.12, 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1.4	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		😊 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make, but large areas of land have been allocated through the Local Plan process.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m ²) Data missing from 3 authorities Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m ²) Data missing from 3 authorities Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) Total 147.64 (excluding MSDC) Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) Total 51.86 (excluding MSDC)	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too many values missing this year to look at county trends in outstanding permissions. Outstanding land allocations (total and on PDL) have both decreased from March 2003.		☹️ Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it encourage rural diversification?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
AMcC	Planning consents for B1, B2 and B8 in rural areas (part of employment land availability for regional level). Could be expanded to include additional uses such as retail (Data source: BDC Planning DC)	BDC	2005: 31,591 sq m 2006: 26,715 sq m	Limited information makes time series comparisons difficult. However when this information is considered along with the new allocations then this must be considered as beneficial for the economy of the district.			😊 Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make, but there is a good supply of sites in the form of allocations and consents.
AMcC	Planning consents for B1, B2 and B8 in rural areas (part of employment land availability for regional level). Could be expanded to include additional uses such as retail (Data source: LDCs Planning DC)	Suffolk	2005: 292,020 sq m				😞 Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To revitalise town centres							
Will it increase the range of employment opportunities, shops and services available in town centres?							
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	2006/07 A1 uses 55% (Hadleigh = 54% Sudbury = 55%) 2006 A1 uses 53.5% (Hadleigh = 50% Sudbury = 58%)	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre. Lowest % of districts to return data in 2003/4.	53.5% A1 uses 2004/05 52% A1 uses, 2003/4 61.0% A1 uses, 2002/3 61.5% A1 uses, 2001/2. 9.5% decrease since 2001/2.	A1 uses match the national average in Hadleigh, and have decreased in both towns. Decrease needs to be monitored and addressed.	😞 Relatively low A1 uses and decreasing trend. Decrease needs to be monitored and addressed. Local authorities will continue to come under pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises.
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	55% A1 uses, 2003/4	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre. There is an above average number of A1 units in Suffolk's town centres (55%).	62.9% A1 uses, 2002/3 62.3% A1 uses, 2001/2 7% decrease since 2001/2, following a slight increase last year.	Average % of A1 uses across county has decreased this year, though is still above national average. A number of individual towns are below it, and should be monitored.	😊/😞 County total is still above average but has decreased this year. A number of towns are below national average. Local authorities will continue to come under pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises.
Headline Objective: To revitalise town centres							
Will it decrease the number of vacant units in town centres?							
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	7% vacant 2006/07 7.5% vacant 2005/6 5% vacant 2003/4	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%) 2 nd lowest % of districts to return data in 2003/4.	7.1% vacant 2002/3 Decreased by 2% from 03 to 04, but has increased again in 2005/06		😊 Relatively low percentage. The low percentage is some indication of healthy town centres
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	6% vacant 2002/3	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%)	6.7% vacant 2002/3 Small decrease since last year of less than 1%.		😊 Overall the % of vacant units is low and decreasing. The low percentage is some indication of healthy town centres, with Brandon and Debenham the main concerns.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce commuting?							
AMcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census). Can also look at import/export of workers in plan area. (Data source 2001 Census & BDC travel	BDC	< 2 km: 20% 2-5 km: 12.4% 5 - 10 km: 13.3 10 - 20 km: 18.7% 20 - 30 km: 7.2% 30 - 40 km: 2.3%	Average distance travelled to work = 17.45 km Babergh DC 2006 travel to work survey Less than 1 mile: 11.19% 1-3 miles: 14.69% 3-5 miles: 5.59%	No trend data, Babergh travel to work survey may well not be representative of the district.		😞 Baseline Data

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
	to work survey 2006)		40 - 60 km: 2% >60 km: 6% Census 2001	5-10 miles: 15.38% 10-20 miles: 37.76% over 20 miles; 15.38%			
AMcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census). Can also look at import/export of workers in plan area. (Data source 2001 Census & SCC travel to work survey 2006)	Suffolk	SCC 2006 travel to work survey, all surveys :- Less than 1 mile: 5.7% 1-3 miles: 19.8% 3-5 miles: 15.2% 5-10 miles: 23.5% 10-20 miles: 21.5% over 20 miles; 14.3%				☹ Baseline Data
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce commuting?							
AMcC	Planning consents for B1, B2 and B8 in urban areas (part of employment land availability for regional level). Could be expanded to include additional uses such as retail (Data source: BDC Planning DC)	BDC	Urban is taken as the EERA definition of over 25,000 population. So from an EERA monitoring point of view there are no planning consents in or adjacent to urban areas in Babergh				
AMcC	Planning consents for B1, B2 and B8 in urban areas (part of employment land availability for regional level). Could be expanded to include additional uses such as retail (Data source: LDCs Planning DC)	Suffolk	At least 166,000 sq m in 2005	This does not include all authorities.			☹ Baseline Data
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce commuting?							
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home (Data source: 2001 Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home indicate trends - this is subset of the above indicator plus rural working from home)	BDC	2001: 4888 = 12.13%				☹ Baseline Data, it is difficult to obtain similar data to establish a trend.
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home (Data source: 2001 Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home indicate trends - this is subset of the above indicator plus rural working from home)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it improve accessibility to work by public transport, walking and cycling?							
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 0	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	Not recorded in previous years.		☹ Historical data for this indicator is limited (few if any submissions annually) and therefore trends are difficult to discern.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 3 (2003/4 total based on SCDC and WDC only.)	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	2002/3 (2001/2) Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 (0) 2002/3 (2001/2) Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 3 (2)		☹️ Historical data for this indicator is limited (few if any submissions annually) and therefore trends are difficult to discern.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it improve accessibility to work by public transport, walking and cycling?							
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	BDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.3% Babergh DC employees 2005: 18.24 % 2006: 18.18 % Does not include those working at home	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	No other comparable data recorded.		☹️ No trend information.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	Suffolk	% sustainable 2001 Census: 21.2% SCC surveys 2005: 23.41 % 2006: 26.19% Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2004: 28.0%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. 2004: 25.24 % SCC sample survey	Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2003: 25.2% No other comparable data recorded.		☹️/😊 Limited trend information. An increase has been recorded in use of sustainable modes in sample surveys carried out by Suffolk CC but is this representative of the wider population?
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce journey times between key employment areas and key transport interchanges?							
AMcC	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	BDC					
AMcC	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it increase the proportion of freight transported by rail or other sustainable modes?							
AMcC	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Data source: Port Authorities / AMR)	BDC	22% from Felixstowe but 0% from Harwich This represents 300,000 containers per annum.				☹️ Baseline Data
AMcC	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Data source: Port Authorities / AMR)	Suffolk	22% from Felixstowe but 0% from Harwich				☹️ Baseline Data
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it increase the consumption of locally produced food and goods?							
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (Data source: LAs)	BDC	4 Farmers Markets 5 Farm shops	These may encourage the sale of farm produce locally but can be in unsustainable locations.			☹️ No trend information.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (Data source: LAs)	Suffolk					☹ No information.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it increase the consumption of locally produced food and goods?							
AMcC	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (Data source: contact supermarkets directly)	BDC					No data source
AMcC	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (Data source: contact supermarkets directly)	Suffolk					No data source
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it encourage indigenous business?							
AMcC	Number of enquiries to business advice services (Data source: business link, LAs)	BDC	2006 approx 30 per quarter for small businesses		Not monitored in detail so it is difficult to get a trend.		☹ No trend information.
AMcC	Number of enquiries to business advice services (Data source: business link, LAs)	Suffolk	2006 approx 320 per month				☹ No trend information.
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it encourage indigenous business?							
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Data source: Suffolk for managed workspaces? Wider source?)	BDC	2006: 245 registrations and 240 deregistrations Net change: 5 2004: 285 registrations and 280 deregistrations Net change: 5	2003: 300 registrations and 270 deregistrations. Net change: 30 2002: 280 registrations and 245 deregistrations. Net change: 35 2001: 255 registrations and 225 deregistrations. Net change: 30	This indicator is for VAT registrations and does not pick up companies below £50,000 turnover or those who have not voluntarily registered, but is an indicator of new companies forming. The formation rates are:- 2004: 8.3, 2003: 8.7, 2002: 8.2, 2001: 7.6		☹ Relatively low formation rates for new companies and the net change is at a 3 or 4 year low.
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Data source: Suffolk for managed workspaces? Wider source?)	Suffolk	2006: 1885 registrations and 1630 deregistrations Net change: 255 2004: 2045 registrations and 1965 deregistrations Net change: 80	2003: 2130 registrations and 1860 deregistrations. Net change: 270 2002: 2075 registrations and 1720 deregistrations. Net change: 355 2001: 1850 registrations and 1695 deregistrations. Net change: 155	The formation rates are:- 2004: 8.9, 2003: 9.3, 2002: 9.1, 2001: 8.3		☹ Limited trend information and these start up rates are lower than the regional or national average.
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it encourage inward investment?							
AMcC	Number of enquiries to Suffolk Development Agency / LA / Suffolk	BDC	566 Inquiries to Suffolk Development Agency in the first half of 2006				
AMcC	Number of enquiries to Suffolk Development Agency / LA / Suffolk	Suffolk	6151 Inquiries to Suffolk Development Agency in the first half of 2006				
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/issues for SA
Will it make land available for business development?							
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC	69.1 ha 2006	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns			😊 There is a good range of planning consents and with the new local plan there are new land allocations.
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	Too much data missing to calculate a meaningful county total.	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too much data missing to evaluate a meaningful county trend.		😞 Gaps in information means overall and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it make land available for business development?							
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m ²) Not recorded Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m ²) Not recorded Total outstanding allocations at March 2006: (Ha) 32.9, 2004 (Ha) 9 Outstanding allocations at March 2006 on PDL (Ha) 24, 2004 on PDL (Ha) 0	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		😊 There is a good range of planning consents and with the new local plan there are new land allocations.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	BDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m ²) 33000 2006 (m²) 26,715 Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m ²) 14017 2006 (m²) 9256 Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) 1.8 2006 (Ha) 36.2 Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1.4 2006 (Ha) 14.2	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	There is still a good supply of employment consents and allocations have increased		😊 There is a good range of planning consents and with the new local plan there are new land allocations.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG) (Data source: SSAG)	Suffolk	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m ²) Data missing from 3 authorities Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m ²) Data missing from 3 authorities Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) Total 147.64 (excluding MSDC) Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) Total 51.86 (excluding MSDC)	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too many values missing this year to look at county trends in outstanding permissions. Outstanding land allocations (total and on PDL) have both decreased from March 2003.		😞 Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.