

St Edmundsbury Borough  
Council

Local Development Framework

Core Strategy Document

Sustainability Appraisal Report  
Appendices

September 2010



# St Edmundsbury Borough Council Local Development Framework:

## Core Strategy Document

## Sustainability Appraisal Report

## Appendices

**September 2010**

### Notice

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

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

### Document History

JOB NUMBER: 5081433			DOCUMENT REF: Final 5081433 SEBC CS SAR Appendices.doc			
4	Final following changes from Inspector's Report	LR	CW	CW	CW	09/09/09
3	Final	CS/OP/PN	OP	CW	CW	03/08/09
2	Final	CS/OP/PN	MJ	CW	CW	14/07/09
1	1st Draft for Comment	CS/OP/PN	OP	CW	CW	23/06/09
Revision	Purpose Description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date



# Contents

## Appendices

<b>Appendix A - Baseline Data Tables</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Appendix B – Strategic Options Assessment Table</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>Appendix C – Strategic Sites Assessment Tables</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Appendix D – Assessment of Plan Policies</b>	<b>147</b>
<b>Appendix E - Consultation Comments on Scoping Report</b>	<b>204</b>
<b>Appendix F - Consultation Comments on Initial Sustainability Appraisal (Issues and Options Report)</b>	<b>213</b>
<b>Appendix G - Consultation Comments on Preferred Options and Strategic Sites Issues and Options SAR</b>	<b>235</b>

## List of Tables

Table B.1 – Scoring of Assessment	85
Table B.2 - Assessment of Strategic Options for Spatial Strategy	86
Table C.1 – Key to Strategic Sites Assessment	91
Table C.2 – Bury St. Edmunds - Site 1	92
Table C.3 - Bury St. Edmunds - Site 2	97
Table C.4 – Bury St. Edmunds - Site 3 North of Westley Road	102
Table C.5 – Bury St. Edmunds - Site 3 South of Westley Road	107
Table C.6 - Bury St. Edmunds - Site 4	112
Table C.7 - Bury St. Edmunds - Site 4a	117
Table C.8 - Bury St. Edmunds - Site 5	122
Table C.9 - Bury St. Edmunds - Site 6	127
Table C.10 - Haverhill - Site 1	132
Table C.11 - Haverhill - Site 2	137
Table C.12 - Haverhill - Site 3	142
Table D.1 - Assessment Tables – Terms and Symbols	148
Table D.2 – Policy CS1 St. Edmundsbury Spatial Strategy & Policy CS5: Settlement Hierarchy and Identity	149
Table D.3 - Policy CS2: Sustainable Development	154
Table D.4 - Policy CS3: The Natural and Built Environment	159
Table D.5 - Policy CS4: Design and Local Distinctiveness	162
Table D.6 - Policy CS6: Affordable Housing	165
Table D.7 - Policy CS7: Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation	168
Table D.8 - Policy CS8: Sustainable Transport	172
Table D.9 - Policy CS9: Strategic Transport Improvements	175
Table D.10 - Policy CS10: Employment and the Local Economy	178
Table D.11 - Policy CS11: Retail, Leisure and Office Development	181
Table D.12 - Policy CS12: Bury St Edmunds Strategic Growth	185
Table D.13 - Policy CS13: Haverhill Strategic Growth	192
Table D.14 - Policy CS14: Phasing	197
Table D.15 - Policy CS15: Infrastructure	200

Table E.1 - Summary of Comments Made by Consultees on Scoping Report and how they have been incorporated into the SA Process	205
Table F.1 - Consultation comments on St Edmundsbury Core Strategy Issues and Options Initial SAR	214
Table G.1 – Consultation comments on St Edmundsbury Core Strategy Preferred Options and Strategic Sites Issues and Options SAR	236

## Appendix A - Baseline Data Tables

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
<b>SOCIAL</b>							
Population	<u>St Edmundsbury 2007</u> Mid-year population estimate: 102,900 persons	<u>East of England:</u> 2007 (mid-year population estimate): 5,661,300 persons 2006: 5,606,600 persons (2,752,700 male; 2,853,800 female)  <u>England:</u> 2006: 50,762,900 persons (24,926,400 male; 25,836,600 female)	No target identified.	<u>St Edmundsbury population 2006:</u> 102,000 persons  Between 1981 and 2006, the population of St Edmundsbury has grown by 16.9%, compared with a growth rate of 15.5% in the East of England and 8.4% in England.	The population of St Edmundsbury has grown significantly over the past two decades. This growth is expected to continue, particularly with the identification in the East of England Plan of Bury St Edmunds as a key centre for development and change (Policy BSE1) and the requirement for additional housing and employment opportunities within the Borough.	Defra East of England Factsheet, 2008  Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008	Population
Proportion of the population living in urban areas	<u>St Edmundsbury, 2007:</u> Urban population: 57,855 (57% of Borough population) Rural population: 43,645 (43% of Borough population)	<u>East of England, 2001:</u> Urban population: 62.3% of Regional population Rural population: 37.7% of Regional population  <u>England, 2001:</u> Urban population: 76.7% of country population Rural population: 23.3% of	No targets identified	No trends identified	The proportion of St Edmundsbury's population that lives in rural areas is higher than that for both the East of England and England.	SEBC Recycling Plan 2006 – 2012	Population



Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		country population`					
Age structure	<p><u>St Edmundsbury</u></p> <p>2007 Mid-year population estimate number and percentage of total population within different age bands:</p> <p>0-15 years: 17,900 (17.3%) 16-24 years: 11,500 (11.1%) 25-44 years: 28,200 (27.4%) 45-64 years: 27,100 (26.3%) 65-74 years: 9,600 (9.3%) 75+ years: 8,600 (8.3%)</p> <p>In the rural areas of St Edmundsbury, the proportion of the population aged 0-24 years is lower than that for the Borough as a whole; the proportion of the population aged 65+ is higher than that for the Borough as a whole.</p>	<p><u>East of England:</u></p> <p>2007 Mid-year population estimate number and percentage of total population within different age bands:</p> <p>0-15 years: 1,007,900 (17.8%) 16-24 years: 700,600 (12.3%) 25-44 years: 1,555,600 (27.4%) 45-64 years: 1,477,200 (25.5%) 65-74 years: 484,800 (8.5%) 75+ years: 465,200 (8.2%)</p> <p><u>East of England:</u></p> <p>Change in population (as a % of total population) between 2002 and 2007:</p> <p>All ages:+4.2% Children and young people: -0.2% Working age: +4.2% Older people:+8.8%</p>	No target identified.	<p><u>St Edmundsbury</u></p> <p>change in population (as a % of total population) between 2002 and 2007:</p> <p>All ages:+4.4% Children and young people: +1.6% Working age: +2.1% Older people: +14.7%</p>	The age profile of St Edmundsbury broadly reflects that of the East of England. However, the growth in the number of older people in the Borough is almost double that experienced in the East of England as a whole.	ONS, reported in SEBC LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007-08	Population
Ethnicity	<p><u>St Edmundsbury</u></p> <p>2007 (% of total population):</p>	<p><u>East of England:</u></p> <p>2007 (% of total population)</p>	No target identified.	<p><u>St Edmundsbury</u></p> <p>2001 (% of total population):</p>	The proportion of St Edmundsbury's population who are	ONS, reported in SEBC LDF Annual	Population

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	White: 96.1% Mixed: 1.0% Asian or Asian British: 1.0% Black or Black British: 0.9% Chinese or Other Ethnic Group: 1.0%	White: 92.2% Mixed: 1.5% Asian or Asian British: 3.3% Black or Black British: 1.8% Chinese or Other Ethnic Group: 1.2%  <u>England:</u> 2007 (% of total population) White: 88.6% Mixed: 1.6% Asian or Asian British: 5.5% Black or Black British: 2.8% Chinese or Other Ethnic Group: 1.4%		White: 98.03% Mixed: 0.73% Asian or Asian British: 0.47% Black or Black British: 0.35% Chinese or Other Ethnic Group: 0.42%	white is higher than that of both the East of England region and England as a whole. However, the proportion of white residents in St Edmundsbury has decreased since 2001, with a growth in the number of black and minority ethnic groups.	Monitoring Report 2007-08	
Gender	<u>St Edmundsbury</u> 2001 Census: Females: 49,507 persons (50.42% of total population) Males: 48,686 persons (49.58% of total population)	<u>East of England</u> 2001 Census: Females: 2,749,805 persons (51.03% of total population) Males: 2,638,335 persons (48.97% of total population)  <u>England</u> 2001 Census: Females: 25,216,687 persons (51.32% of total population) Males: 23,922,144 persons	No target set	No trend data is available	The gender split in St Edmundsbury is more even than that in East of England and England.	2001 Census data	Population

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		(48.68% of total population)					
Proportion of population stating their religion	<u>St Edmundsbury</u> 2001 Census: Christian: 74.26 % Buddhist: 0.17% Hindu: 0.10% Jewish: 0.12% Muslim: 0.28% Sikh: 0.02% Other Religion: 0.25% No Religion: 16.77%	<u>East of England</u> 2001 Census: Christian: 72.14% Buddhist: 0.22% Hindu: 0.58% Jewish: 0.56% Muslim: 1.46% Sikh: 0.25% Other Religion: 0.29% No Religion: 16.74%  <u>England</u> 2001 Census: Christian: 71.74% Buddhist: 0.28% Hindu: 1.11% Jewish: 0.52% Muslim: 3.1% Sikh: 0.67% Other Religion: 0.29% No Religion: 14.59%	No target set	No trend data available.	The religious profile of St Edmundsbury is broadly similar to that of the East of England and England, with a slightly higher proportion of Christians and slightly lower proportion of Muslims.	2001 Census	Population
Proportion of the population with limiting long term	<u>St Edmundsbury</u> 2001 Census: 11,846 persons with limiting long term illness. This is 29.91% of the population of	<u>East of England</u> 2001 Census: 686,737 persons with limiting long term illness. This is 30.77% of the	No target identified	No trend data available	The proportion of the Borough's population with a limiting long term illness is similar to that for the East of	Census 2001	Population, Human Health

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
illness	the Borough.	population of the region. <u>England</u> 2001 Census: 6,862,037 persons with limiting long term illness. This is 33.55% of the population of the country.			England and lower than that for the Country.		
Self assessed health	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Proportion of the population who in 2001 assessed themselves as being in: Good Health: 70.87% Fairly Good Health: 22.09% Not Good Health: 7.04%	<u>East of England:</u> Proportion of the population who in 2001 assessed themselves as being in: Good Health: 70.35% Fairly Good Health: 22.05% Not Good Health: 7.60%  <u>England:</u> Proportion of the population who in 2001 assessed themselves as being in: Good Health: 68.76% Fairly Good Health: 22.21% Not Good Health: 9.03%	No target identified	No trend data available	The self-assessed health of residents of St Edmundsbury is similar to that of the East of England and better than that of England as a whole.	2001 Census	Population, Human Health
Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Total Rural Population: 2004/05: 41,136  Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities:	<u>Suffolk:</u> Total rural population: 2004/05: 217,776  Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities:	To increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services.	The proportion of rural population with access to all five listed services appears to be relatively stable. With 47.8% of the rural population having access in 2003/04. However, access is expected to decrease as a result of	The percentage of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 04/05 in St Edmundsbury is significantly above the figure for	Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2004/5  St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring	Population

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place	2004/05: 20,465  % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities: 2004/05: 47.71%	2004/05: 71,883  % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities: 2004/05: 33%		likely forthcoming closures of 4 post offices and 1 food shop.	Suffolk. St Edmundsbury figure for 04/05 remains higher than the baseline for 2001/02. The rural population of St Edmundsbury is relatively well provided with facilities.	Report 2007/08	
Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2005/06: 35.8%	<u>Suffolk:</u> 2005/06: 42.5% 2004/05: 37.2% 2003/04: 26% 2002/03: 22.7% 2001/02: 23%	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).	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2004/05: 32% 2003/04: 24.3% 2002/03: 22.7% 2001/02: 23%	The percentage has increased so that over one third of rural households are within 13 minutes walk of an hourly bus service. However, in recent years the percentage in St Edmundsbury has fallen below that of Suffolk as a whole.	Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2005/06	Population
Proportion of population with access to a food shop	<u>St Edmundsbury</u> Households (2004) within 15 or 30 minutes of a food shop by public transport:	No comparator data available.	No target identified.	No trend data available.	A high percentage of the borough's households have access to a food shop within 15 or	Suffolk County Council - DfT accessibility	Population

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>15mins: 26,295 (64.8%) 30mins: 36,086 (88.9%)</p> <p>Households (2004) without access to a car within 15 or 30 minutes of a food shop by public transport: 15mins: 5,352 (78.5%) 30mins: 6,452 (94.7%)</p>				30 minutes by public transport.		
Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Households (2005) within 30 and 60 minutes of a hospital by public transport: 30mins: 38,729 (92.3%) 60mins: 41,983 (100%)</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Households (2005) without access to a car within 30 and 60 minutes of a hospital by public transport: 30mins: 6,541 (93.07%) 60mins: 7,028 (100%)</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Households (2005) within 15 and 30 minutes of a GP surgery by public transport: 15mins: 35,190 (83.8%)</p>	<p><u>East of England:</u> Households (2005) within 30 and 60 minutes of a hospital by public transport: 30mins: 1917158 (83.3%) 60mins: 2290021(99.6%)</p> <p><u>East of England:</u> Households (2005) without access to a car within 30 and 60 minutes of a hospital by public transport: 30mins: 387922 (85.4%) 60mins: 452876 (99.7%)</p> <p><u>East of England:</u> Households (2005) within 15 and 30 minutes of a GP surgery by public transport: 15mins: 1957,284 (85.1%)</p>	None identified	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Households (2004) within 30 and 60 minutes of a hospital by public transport: 30mins: 23,849 (58.8%) 60mins: 38,666 (95.3%)</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Households (2004) without access to a car within 30 and 60 minutes of a hospital by public transport: 30mins: 5,030 (73.8%) 60mins: 6,657 (97.7%)</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Households (2004) within 15 and 30 minutes of a GP surgery by public transport: 15mins: 27,912 (68.8%)</p>	<p>A relatively high proportion of households in the borough appear to have reasonable access to hospitals and GP surgeries. Generally figures for access in St Edmundsbury compare favourably to data available for the East of England, with marginally better access to a hospital but marginally worse access to a GP.</p> <p>Accessibility to GP and Hospitals in St Edmundsbury improved between</p>	<p>Suffolk County Council DfT accessibility indicators SCC local Transport Plan 2016 – 2011</p>	Population, Human Health

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>30mins: 41,983 (100%)</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Households (2005) without access to a car within 15 and 30 minutes of a GP surgery by public transport: 15mins: 6,002 (85.4%) 30mins: 7,028 (100%)</p> <p>No data is currently available for access to dentist surgery.</p>	<p>30mins: 2293,449 (99.7%)</p> <p><u>East of England:</u> Households (2005) without access to a car within 15 and 30 minutes of a GP surgery by public transport: 15mins: 399,080 (87.9%) 30mins: 453,601 (99.9%)</p> <p>No data is currently available for access to dentist surgery.</p>		<p>30mins: 38,339 (94.5%)</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Households (2004) without access to a car within 15 and 30 minutes of a GP surgery by public transport: 15mins: 5,563 (81.6%) 30mins: 6,676 (97.9%)</p>	2004 and 2005.		
Overall death rate by all causes per 100,000 population	<p>Suffolk West Primary Care Trust* crude mortality rates (deaths per 100,000 residents) from all causes: 2005: 951.9</p> <p>*Data not available for just St Edmundsbury as health care in St Edmundsbury is provided as part of the Suffolk West Primary Care Trust.</p> <p>Standardised mortality ratio (UK=100) in 2005: St Edmundsbury: 94</p>	<p><u>East of England:</u> Crude mortality rate from all causes in 2005: 940</p> <p>Standardised mortality ratio (UK=100): 2005: 93 2002: 92</p> <p><u>England:</u> Crude mortality rate from all causes in 2005: 950 Standardised mortality ratio in 2005: 98</p>	Reduce the number of early deaths	<p>Suffolk West Primary Care Trust* crude mortality rates (deaths per 100,000 residents) all causes 2004: 922.1 2003: 979.0 2002: 1004.6 2001: 984.1 Standardised mortality ratio (UK=100) in 2002: St Edmundsbury: 91</p>	Crude mortality rates for West Suffolk PCT and standardised mortality rates for St Edmundsbury are comparable with those for East of England and England. Mortality rates fluctuate but can be seen to have decreased on the whole between 2001 and 2005.	NHS Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008 Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2004	Population, Human Health
Number of people killed	St Edmundsbury RTA casualties:	2006 fatal and serious accidents on all roads per	Reduce the number of	St Edmundsbury_2004:	Decrease in the number of people	Suffolk County Council	Population,

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
and seriously injured (KSI) in road traffic accidents (RTA) per 100,000 population	2005: Fatal: 7 Serious: 45 KSI / 100,000 pop: 51.77	100,000 population: East of England: 51.9 England: 47.7	people killed or seriously injured in road accidents in Suffolk	Fatal: 8 Serious: 60 KSI / 100,000 pop: 67.7	killed or seriously injured was observed between 2004 and 2005. The KSI in RTAs rate for St Edmundsbury is comparable to that of the East for England but higher than that for England.	Defra East of England Factsheet, 2008  Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008	Human Health
Life expectancy (years)	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2004 – 2006: Male: 78.6 years Female: 82.7 years	<u>East of England:</u> Average 2006: Male 77.3 years Female 81.4 years  <u>East of England</u> 2002 – 2004: Male: 77.6 years Female: 81.6 years  <u>England:</u> 2002 – 2004 Male: 76.4 years Female: 80.8 years	None identified.	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2002 – 2004: Male: 77.5 years Female: 81.9 years  2001-2003: Male 77.3 years Female 81.7 years  Data indicates that life expectancy for both sexes has been increasing in each monitoring period.	The average life expectancy of males and females in the borough compares very favourably to that for the East of England and England with consistently above average life expectancies for both male and female residents.	Suffolk Observatory Defra East of England Factsheet, 2008 St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08	Population, Human Health
Change in amount of accessible natural green	St Edmundsbury accessible natural green space* (Aug 2006): 3375.2 ha	No comparator data available.	Increase in the amount of accessible	Limited data currently available.	Whilst limited data is available, SEBC are committed to increasing the	Suffolk Biological Records Office	Population, Human Health,



Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
space (Districts)	*Accessible Natural Green Space = Publicly accessible site greater than 2ha in area and managed with wildlife as a key element.		natural green space by 5% by 2010		amount of accessible greenspace within the Borough.		Biodiversity, Flora, Fauna
% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2007: 70.7%	<u>East of England:</u> 2007: 64.8% 2005/06: 59.3%  <u>England:</u> 2007: 62.0% 2005/06: 59.2	None identified	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2005: 67.4% 2004: 65.0%	Performance in St Edmundsbury is improving each year and is above regional and national figures.	Suffolk Observatory Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008 St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08	Population
Proportion of the population with no qualifications	St Edmundsbury % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications, 2007: 36.3%	% of population aged 16-64 (male) and 16 to 59 (female) with no qualifications in 2007: East of England: 12.4% England: 13.2%  % of population in 2001 aged 16-74 with no qualifications: England: 28.9%	None identified.	% of population in 2001 aged 16-74 with no qualifications: St Edmundsbury: 28.1%	The percentage of the population with no qualifications increased between 2001 and 2007 and is significantly higher than figures for the East of England and England.	Suffolk Observatory Census 2001 St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08	Population
Working age population with NVQ level 4 or higher	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Number (%) 2007: 14,900 (24.7%)	National mean % of the working age population who are qualified to NVQ4 and above:	None identified.	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2006: 29% 2005: 24.8%	The proportion of the working age population with NVQ level 4+ qualifications in St	Suffolk Observatory St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring	Population

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		2006: 30.72%		2004: 15.4% Feb 2003 - 04: 9000 (15.4%) Feb 2002 - 03: 12000 (20.4%) Feb 2001 - 02: 14000 (23.6%)	Edmundsbury can be seen to fluctuate. The proportion is slightly lower than the national average.	Report 2007/08 Audit Commission - <a href="http://www.areaprofile.s.audit-commission.gov.uk">www.areaprofile.s.audit-commission.gov.uk</a>	
Crime rate per 1000 population	<u>St Edmundsbury</u> Number of crimes per 1,000 population: 2007 – 08: 69.2	<u>East of England:</u> Recorded crime rate/1,000 population: 2007/08: 75 2005/06: 85.90  <u>England:</u> Recorded crime rate/1,000 population: 2007/08: 91 2005/06: 104.24	None identified.	<u>St Edmundsbury</u> Number of crimes per 1,000 population: 2005 - 06: 81.1 2004 - 05: 76.8 2003 - 04: 69.6 2002 - 03: 73.3 2001 - 02: 70.7 2000 - 01: 67.4	Trend data shows a fluctuating crime rate in the borough with a significant reduction in crime between 2005/06 and 2007/08 reversing the previously observed increasing crime rate trend. Crime rates in St Edmundsbury are lower than those for East of England and England.	Suffolk Observatory Defra East of England Factsheet, 2008  Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008  St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08  Home Office Crime in England and Wales Report 2007/08	Population, Human Health
Fear of Crime	Percentage of residents surveyed who say that they feel fairly safe or very safe outside during the day 2006/07: 98.32%	National mean percentage of residents surveyed who say that they feel fairly safe or very safe outside during the day	To reduce the number of recorded incidents of anti-social behaviour	Percentage of residents surveyed who say that they feel fairly safe or very safe outside during the day 2005/06: 98.3%	The proportion of residents who feel safe or very safe in St Edmundsbury during the day is above the national	Suffolk Speaks, British Crime Survey  Audit Commission - <a href="http://www.areaprofile">www.areaprofile</a>	Population, Human Health

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>Percentage of residents surveyed who say that they feel fairly safe or very safe outside after dark</p> <p>2006/07: 73.64%</p> <p>St Edmundsbury 2005: % of respondents who feel safe in the area where they live: 91%</p> <p>% of respondents who feel their area is safe with low levels of crime and disorder: 65%</p>	<p>2006/07: 97.38%</p> <p>Percentage of residents surveyed who say that they feel fairly safe or very safe outside after dark</p> <p>2006/07: 71.02%</p>	<p>by 5% by 2008 (Suffolk LAA 2005 – 2008)</p>	<p>2004/05: 98.2%</p> <p>Percentage of residents surveyed who say that they feel fairly safe or very safe outside after dark</p> <p>2005/06: 70.4%</p> <p>2004/05: 75.6%</p>	<p>mean and is increasing. The proportion of residents who feel safe after dark fluctuates but is broadly comparable to the national mean.</p>	<p>s.audit-commission.gov.uk</p>	
Number / rate of racist incidents	<p><u>St Edmundsbury</u></p> <p>Racial incidents: April 2006 – March 2007: 60 incidents</p> <p>Proportion per 1,000 population: 0.6</p>	<p><u>Suffolk:</u></p> <p>April 2006 – March 2007: 445 incidents</p> <p>Proportion per 1,000 population: 0.7 (based on mid-2005 population estimates)</p>	<p>None identified.</p>	<p><u>St Edmundsbury</u></p> <p>April – Dec 2004: 56 incidents</p> <p>Proportion per 1,000 population: 0.5</p>	<p>Limited information available. The rate of racist incidents in St Edmundsbury increased between 2004 and 2007 but is lower than that for Suffolk.</p>	<p>SCC Racial Harassment Initiative www.suffolk.gov.uk</p>	<p>Population, Human Health</p>
Number of domestic and commercial noise complaints	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u></p> <p>2005/06: 465</p>	<p>No comparator data available</p>	<p>None identified</p>	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u></p> <p>2004/5: 419</p> <p>2003/4: 483</p> <p>2002/3: 411</p>	<p>The number of noise complaints, particularly domestic complaints fluctuates but can be seen to have increased overall between 2002 and</p>	<p>SEBC Environmental Health Department</p>	<p>Human Health</p>

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
					2006.		
Proportion of Lower Super Output Areas assessed as being the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2007 IMD: Most deprived 10% = 0% Most deprived 25% = 0% Most deprived 40% = 11.7%</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2007 IMD Rank: 260</p>	<p><u>Suffolk:</u> 2007 IMD: Most deprived 10% = 3.06% Most deprived 25% = 3.06% Most deprived 40% = 10.35%</p>	None identified.	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2004 IMD: Most deprived 10% = 0% Most deprived 25% = 0%</p> <p>Whilst the overall rank of St Edmundsbury is good, both the borough's score and ranking has declined since the last Index of Deprivation in 2004.</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2004 IMD Rank: 267</p>	Low levels of deprivation in comparison with Suffolk. However, the rankings show that LSOAs in Haverhill are more consistently deprived; suggesting that deprivation in Haverhill is more widespread rather than just concentrated in small pockets. Furthermore, the borough's IMD rank decreased from 2004 to 2007, meaning that St Edmundsbury became more deprived in comparison with the rest of the nation during this period. Policy SS11 requires that Local Development documents set out policies to tackle the problem of economic, social and environmental	<p>Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) – Data available from Department for Communities and Local Government and Suffolk County Council</p> <p>St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08</p> <p>Suffolk County Council Index of Multiple Deprivation Results 2008</p>	Population, Human Health

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
					deprivation in these areas.  Of particular note are the large rural hinterlands, including those in St Edmundsbury, where the levels of deprivation have increased both relative to elsewhere in England and in terms of actual scores.		
Number of housing benefit recipients	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> March 2008: 4936 (approx. 11% of all households <sup>1</sup> )	Percentage of all households claiming housing benefit in 2005.06: East of England: 12% England: 14%	None identified	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> March 2007: 4814 May 2006: 4760 May 2005: 4530 May 2004: 4387 May 2003: 4210	The uptake of housing benefits has steadily increased since 2003, suggesting that there is insufficient affordable housing available within St Edmundsbury.	SEBC Housing Benefit Department  Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008  St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08	Population
Unemployment rate – (%) unemployed persons	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> July 2008 – 1.6%	<u>East of England:</u> May 2007: 4.8% May 2006: 5.2%	None identified.	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> May 2006: 1.7% May 2005: 1.3%	Despite an increase in recent years, unemployment	Suffolk Observatory  Office for National	Population, Material

<sup>1</sup> Atkins' calculation of a proportion of housing benefit recipients based on the assumption that there are 46,099 households in St Edmundsbury according to the most recent Council Tax figures.

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		<p>May 2005: 4.0%</p> <p>May 2004: 3.8%</p> <p>May 2003: 4.0%</p> <p><u>England:</u></p> <p>May 2007: 5.5%</p> <p>May 2006: 5.7%</p> <p>May 2005: 4.8%</p> <p>May 2004: 4.8%</p> <p>May 2003: 5.0%</p>		<p>May 2004: 1.2%</p> <p>May 2003: 1.3%</p>	<p>levels for St Edmundsbury remain well below regional and national levels.</p> <p>In 2008, St Edmundsbury was the local authority with the highest employment rate in Great Britain outside London.</p>	<p>Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008</p> <p>St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08</p>	Assets
Long-term unemployment	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u></p> <p><u>&lt; 6 months:</u></p> <p>March 2006: 75.6%</p> <p><u>6 - 12 months:</u></p> <p>March 2006: 13.2%</p> <p><u>12 - 24 months:</u></p> <p>March 2006: 7.8%</p> <p><u>24&gt; months:</u></p> <p>March 2006: 3.4%</p>	<p><u>Suffolk unemployment by duration:</u></p> <p><u>&lt; 6 months:</u></p> <p>March 2006: 71.7%</p> <p>March 2005: 70.7%</p> <p>March 2004: 67.2%</p> <p>March 2003: 69.9%</p> <p><u>6 - 12 months:</u></p> <p>March 2006: 15.4%</p> <p>March 2005: 14.2%</p> <p>March 2004: 15.9%</p> <p>March 2003: 16.3%</p> <p><u>12 - 24 months:</u></p> <p>March 2006: 8.9%</p> <p>March 2005: 8.8%</p> <p>March 2004: 11.7%</p> <p>March 2003: 9.1%</p>	None identified.	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u></p> <p>unemployment by duration:</p> <p><u>&lt; 6 months:</u></p> <p>March 2005: 76.8%</p> <p>March 2004: 76.2%</p> <p>March 2003: 77.5%</p> <p><u>6 - 12 months:</u></p> <p>March 2005: 12.9%</p> <p>March 2004: 12.5%</p> <p>March 2003: 14.2%</p> <p><u>12 - 24 months:</u></p> <p>March 2005: 7.1%</p> <p>March 2004: 8.8%</p> <p>March 2003: 5.9%</p> <p><u>24&gt; months:</u></p> <p>March 2005: 3.2%</p>	<p>St Edmundsbury has relatively low long-term (6+ months) unemployment. Rates are below those for Suffolk.</p>	Suffolk Observatory	Population, Material Assets

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		<u>24&gt; months:</u> March 2006: 3.9% March 2005: 6.2% March 2004: 5.2% March 2003: 4.7%		March 2004: 2.5% March 2003: 2.4%			
Average Earnings	St Edmundsbury mean annual pay (gross) for full-time employee jobs: 2005: £27,958  St Edmundsbury median annual pay (gross) for full-time employee jobs: 2007: £21,871	<u>Mean 2005:</u> East of England: £30,640 GB: £28,398  <u>Median April 2007:</u> East of England: £24,913 England: £24,055  <u>Median 2005:</u> East of England: £24,364 GB: £23,027	None identified.	St Edmundsbury mean annual pay (gross) for full-time employee jobs: 2004: £26,431 2003: £18,358 2002: £20,579  St Edmundsbury median annual pay (gross) for full-time employee jobs: 2005: £20,594 2004: £19,680 2003: £16,027 2002: £16,552	While figures show an upward trend for pay in the borough rates are still below that for the East of England and England. The median figures also indicate that there are a lot of low paid jobs in the borough.	National Statistics - Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings  Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008	Population, Material Assets
Annual net dwelling completions	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2007/08: 546 completions	<u>East of England:</u> 2006/07: 24,799 East of England average annual completions between 2001 and 2007: 21,761	Proposed East of England annual target of housing completions for St Edmundsbury (Policy H1)	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2006/07: 536 completions  St Edmundsbury average annual completions between 2001 and 2007: 415	Although in 2006/07 the number of housing completions in St Edmundsbury was above the H1 policy target, in previous years the number of completions has not reached the target level. As	East of England Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2006/07	Population, Material Assets

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
			between 2001 and 2021: 500		such, an increase in the number of completions each year will be required in order to meet the East of England Plan target.		
Affordable Housing	<p>St Edmundsbury net affordable completions:</p> <p>2007/08: 136 completions (25%)</p> <p>With a further 158 net number of units for affordable housing approved in 2007/08.</p>	<p>East of England net affordable completions and percentage of overall completions each year:</p> <p>2006/07: 4,411 (18%)</p> <p>2005/06: 4,042 (17%)</p> <p>2004/05: 3,682 (17%)</p> <p>2003/04: 2,182 (11%)</p> <p>2002/03: 2,166 (11%)</p> <p>2001/02: 1,939 (10%)</p>	<p>Policy H3 - Affordable Housing of the Replacement St Edmundsbury Borough Local Plan 2016:</p> <p>40% affordable housing on:</p> <p>i) sites of 0.5+ ha or 15+ dwellings, in settlements of 3,000+</p> <p>ii) sites of 0.17+ ha or 5+ dwellings, in settlements of less than</p>	<p>St Edmundsbury net affordable completions:</p> <p>2004/05: 20</p> <p>2003/04: 19</p> <p>2002/03: 75</p> <p>2001/02: 40</p> <p>Affordable housing completions as a percentage of total completions:</p> <p>2004/05: 10.6%</p> <p>2003/04: 8.35%</p> <p>2002/03: 53.55</p>	<p>Proportion of affordable completions has increased significantly between 2004/05 and 2007/08, reversing a trend of decreasing completion numbers in recent years. The proportion of net completions which were affordable in St Edmundsbury is higher than for the East of England.</p>	<p>Suffolk's Environments Monitoring Report 2004/05 (SSAG)</p> <p>SEBC Planning Department</p> <p>East of England Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2006/07</p> <p>Audit Commission - <a href="http://www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk">www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk</a></p>	Population, Material Assets



Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
			3000				
Provision for gypsy and traveller pitches	<u>St Edmundsbury</u> authorised pitches, January 2006: Public: 0 Private: 2	<u>East of England</u> authorised pitches, January 2006: Public: 885 Private: 963	The East of England Plan sets a target in Policy H4 of 17 pitches in St Edmundsbury by 2011.	No trend data is available.	The Borough is not on track to reach the Policy H4 target. An additional 15 pitches will be required by 2011.	East of England Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2006/07	Population, Material Assets
Special Needs Housing	St Edmundsbury Special needs housing completions: 2005/06: 06  St Edmundsbury Special needs housing completions expressed as a % of all housing completions in the borough: 2004/05: 12.3%	No comparison data available.	Cambridge sub-region, 2006 – 08, 2% of housing to be special needs.	St Edmundsbury Special needs housing completions: 2004/05: 21 2003/04: 11 2002/03: 76 2001/02: 40  St Edmundsbury Special needs housing completions expressed as a % of all housing completions in the borough: 2003/04: 1.8% 2002/03: 16.2% 2001/02: 11.8%	The proportion of housing completions which are special needs fluctuates but is significantly higher than the target set for the Cambridge sub-region.	SEBC Strategic Housing Department	Population, Material Assets
Number of homes	St Edmundsbury (April 1 <sup>st</sup> HIP	In 2003, percentage of	None	St Edmundsbury (April 1 <sup>st</sup> HIP	RSL figures are at their lowest since	SEBC Strategic Housing	Population,

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
managed by Registered Social Landlords (RSL*)	returns) RSL: 2006: 7238 (approx. 16% <sup>2</sup> ) *RSL provide homes and housing services to people in housing need. There are various types of RSL such as housing associations, housing cooperatives and charitable trusts. All RSL are non-profit making and are entirely separate and independent from the council.	dwellings rented from RSL: East of England: 7% England: 8%	identified.	returns) RSL: 2005: 7322 2004: 7388 2003: 7351 2002: 1187 2001 Census: 3.4%	2003 although still above the 2002 baseline. However, it is a high percentage compared to the regional and national averages.	Department – Housing Investment Programme (HIP) Returns Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008	Material Assets
Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area	St Edmundsbury_Dwellings per hectare: 546 net completions in 2007/08, of which: 37.9% <30 dwellings/ha 24.4% 30-50 dwellings/ha 37.7% >50 dwellings/ha	East of England: 1994: 23 dwellings/ha 2006: 36 dwellings/ha	“To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land” (PPG3). Recommended minimum guideline = 30 dwellings/hectare.	170 dwellings were built in 2004-5, of which: 43% = <30 dwellings/ha 41% = 30-50 dwellings/ha 16% = >50 dwellings/ha  2003/04: 48 dwellings/ha 2002/03: 28 dwellings/ha 2001/02: not recorded 2000/01: 37 dwellings/ha	The density of dwelling completions can be seen to have increased since 2003 and to be above the figures for East of England. Over 60% of housing completions in 2007/08 were also above the PPG3 recommended minimum.  This indicator measures completions on large sites (10+ units) and many of	SEBC Planning Department – Housing Land Availability Study Defra East of England Factsheet, 2008 St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08	Material Assets

<sup>2</sup> Atkins' calculation of a proportion of homes managed by RSL based on the assumption that there are 46,099 households in St Edmundsbury according to the most recent Council Tax figures.

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
					the permissions coming through were granted some years ago.		
Average property price and Housing Affordability * (average ratio)	<p>St Edmundsbury average property price (1<sup>st</sup> quarter): 2008 (2nd quarter): £197,503</p> <p>St Edmundsbury_Housing Affordability (average ratio – 1<sup>st</sup> Qtr): 2006/07: 8.86</p> <p>*The Housing Affordability ratio determines the affordability of housing by comparing the average house price for each housing category against average incomes. The calculation assumes a 5% deposit therefore the ratio is that of average house price multiplied by 95% to average income.</p>	<p>Average property price in the last quarter of 2006: East of England: £220,000 England: £205,000</p> <p>Suffolk average property price (1st quarter): 2006: £176,076 2005: £174,579 2004: £158,490 2003: £139,942</p> <p>East of England Housing Affordability (average ratio – 1<sup>st</sup> Qtr): 2006/07: 7.72</p>	None identified.	<p>St Edmundsbury average property price (1<sup>st</sup> quarter): 2006: £193,424 2005: £188,280 2004: £170,399 2003: £150,217</p> <p>St Edmundsbury_Housing Affordability (average ratio – 1<sup>st</sup> Qtr): 2006: 7.87 2005: 7.66 2004: 7.34 2003: 6.53</p>	<p>House prices in St Edmundsbury have risen steadily since 2003 and are consistently above the Suffolk average. However, average house prices in the Borough are lower than those for East of England and England.</p> <p>Housing affordability average ratios have increased steadily since 2003, and are currently significantly higher than those for East of England region, indicating major housing affordability problems.</p>	<p>Suffolk Observatory Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008</p> <p>St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08</p>	Population, Material Assets
Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings	<p>1<sup>st</sup> April 2006 St Edmundsbury: Total number of dwellings in the borough: 44,680</p>	<p>Proportion of dwellings failing to meet 'Decent Homes' standard in 2003: East of England: 27%</p>	None identified.	No trend or comparator data is currently obtainable.	The number of unfit dwellings in the borough should be reduced.	SEBC Defra East of England Factsheet, 2008	Population, Material Assets

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	Number unfit dwellings: 1,443 Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings: 32.3	England: 31%					
Number and percentage of estimated as having Category 1 Hazard under Housing Health and Safety Rating System	5,800 (15.5%) dwellings are estimated to have at least one Category 1 Hazard. Category 1 Hazards are associated with pre-1919 dwellings, the privately rented sector, detached houses and bungalows.		None identified.	No trend or comparator data is currently obtainable.	There is a clear association between Category 1 Hazards and low income households and those with heads of household over 60. There was no elevated level of Category 1 Hazards where households were in receipt of benefit, where residents had a disability and where the head of household was under 25 years.  The highest proportion of Category 1 Hazards by area was found in the Rural sub-area at 24.8% followed by the Bury St Edmunds sub-area at 13.4%.	SEBC	Material Assets, Population, Human Health
Number and percentage of new dwellings	St Edmundsbury net completions on PDL: 2007/8: 297 (= 54.4% of total)	Percentage of total dwelling completions on PDL in East of England:	Regional target of 50%	St Edmundsbury net completions on PDL: 2006/7: 43%	Figures fluctuate however the borough has met its target every year	SEBC Planning Department East of England	Material Assets,

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
completed on previously developed land (PDL)	completions)	2006/07: 72% 2005/06: 71% 2004/05: 71% 2003/04: 64% 2002/03: 59% 2001/02: 57%	(RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Borough target of 40% from SEBC Replacement Local Plan PPG3: 60% on brownfield. RPG: 50% on brownfield.	2004/5: 72 (= 42.4% of total completions) 2003/4: 294 (= 48.0% of total completions) 2002/3: 267 (= 57% of total completions) 2001/2: 101 (= 30% of total completions)	since 2002. The proportion of completions on PDL in St Edmundsbury is significantly lower than that for the East of England as a whole. However, it may be due to a generally lower level of PDL availability in the borough.	Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2006/07 St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08	Soil
Number of vacant dwellings	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> all vacant dwellings:  <u>Total Properties in borough:</u> 2006: 44,680  <u>All Empty Properties*:</u> 2006: 938 * These figures includes short term (<6 months) and long term (6> months) vacant dwellings. <u>% Empty:</u> 2006: 2.10%	<u>East of England:</u> Local Authority vacant dwellings:  2000 4,000 2001 3,900 2002 3,500 2003 3,600 2004 4,200 2005 3,400	None identified.	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> all vacant dwellings:  <u>Total Properties in borough:</u> 2005: 44,150 2004: 43,791 2003: 43,947 2002: 42,924  <u>All Empty Properties*:</u> 2005: 953 2004: 814 2003: 1,290	Records indicate that the number of vacant dwellings is falling.	SEBC – Strategic Housing Department	Material Assets

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
				2002: 995  % Empty: 2005: 2.16% 2004: 1.86% 2003: 2.94% 2002: 2.32%			
*Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (BV170a)	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2007/08: 1,504  * Visit/usage to those museum(s) means: a visit by a member of the public, telephone or email by post etc. enquiries for research purpose, e-enquiries to a museum's website or presentations by museum staff to a specific audience.	2007/08 Suffolk average: 672 England average: 2095  2005/06 Suffolk average: 344 England average: 1,687	820 visits/uses in St Edmundsbury in 2009/10	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2006/07: 866 2005/06: 635 2004/05: 834.0 2003/04: 1,680 2002/03: 1,004 2001/02: 520 (Moyse's Hall museum closed) 2000/01: 1,152	The figures fluctuate due to the temporary closure (e.g. for refurbishment) of museums. A significant increase in the number visits/uses in 2007/08 was observed. Figures for St Edmundsbury are consistently higher than those for Suffolk but lower than for England.	DCLG www.bvpi.gov.uk  SEBC Policy Department  St Edmundsbury Borough Council  Best Value Performance Plan 2007/08  Audit Commission Best Value Data 2007/08	Population
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL</b>							
Number and area of designated ecological sites	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> SPA: 3,473 ha – 5.3% of Borough (1 site: Breckland) SAC: 2 sites: Breckland (part) and Waveney & Little Ouse Valley Fens	<u>Suffolk:</u> Ramsar: 8,141 ha SPA: 20,606.5 ha SSSI: No: 145, Area: 31,384 ha Country Wildlife Site: No:	None identified.	No trend data available.	Large areas of the borough have an ecological designation and as such must be protected from the pressures of	Suffolk's Environments Monitoring Report 2004/05 (SSAG)  Suffolk Biological	Biodiversity, Flora, Fauna

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	SSSI: 5,449.58 ha – 8.3% of Borough National Nature Reserve: 169.99 ha – 0.25% of Borough County Wildlife Sites: 144 sites (3,526ha) Local Nature Reserve: 42.4ha (2 sites: Haverhill Railway Walks, and Moreton Hall Community Woods) Country Parks: 3 sites: West Stow Country Park, Knettishall Heath Country Park and Clare Castle Country Park.	889, Area: 19,240 ha Local Nature Reserve: No: 27, Area: 390.44 ha			development.	Records Centre St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08	
European sites	Breckland SPA: 39433.66 ha. Predominantly coniferous woodland, arable land, dry grassland and steppes, supporting significant populations of the Stone Curlew ( <i>Burhinus oedichnemus</i> ), the European Nightjar ( <i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i> ) and the woodlark ( <i>Lullula arborea</i> ).  Waveney & Little Ouse Valley Fens SAC: 193.18ha. Predominantly inland water bodies; bogs, marshes, water fringed vegetation and fens; heath scrub, Maquis and garrigue, and Phygrana; Humid grassland and	No comparator data.		No trend data available,	These valuable sites and the habitats, flora and fauna that they support must be safeguarded from damage and destruction.	Joint Nature Conservation Committee <a href="http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-4">http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-4</a>	Biodiversity, Flora, Fauna

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>Mesophile grassland; and broad-leaved deciduous woodland, providing key habitats which support fen sedge (<i>Cladium mariscus</i>), calcareous fens (<i>Caricion davallianae</i>) and Desmoulin's Whorl Snail</p> <p>Breckland SAC: 7548.06 ha. Predominantly supporting Inland dunes with open <i>Corynephorus</i> and <i>Agrostis</i> grasslands; Natural eutrophic lakes with <i>Magnopotamion</i> or <i>Hydrocharition</i>-type vegetation; European dry heaths; Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>), Alluvial forests with <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> and <i>Triturus cristatus</i>.</p>						
Number and reported condition of ecological SSSIs	<p><b>Barnham Heath: 76.5ha</b> Area favourable: 89.46% Area unfavourable recovering: 10.54%</p> <p><b>Black Ditches, Cavenham: 1.67ha</b> Area favourable: 26.55%</p>	<p>SSSI condition in East of England, February 2008: % area meeting PSA target: 77.65% % area favourable: 64.86% % area unfavourable recovering: 12.79% % area unfavourable no change: 6.91%</p>	None identified.	No trend data available.	The majority of the ecological SSSIs in the borough are partly in an unfavourable or mixed condition.  13 of the 23 SSSIs in St Edmundsbury meet the Public Service Agreement	Suffolk Biological Records Centre Natural England <a href="http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/index.cfm">http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/index.cfm</a>	Biodiversity, Flora, Fauna



Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>Area unfavourable no change: 73.45%</p> <p><b>Blo' Norton And Thelnetham Fen: 21.03 ha</b></p> <p>Area favourable: 34.78%</p> <p>Area unfavourable recovering: 29.34%</p> <p>Area unfavourable no change: 35.87%</p> <p><b>Bradfield Woods: 83.0 ha</b></p> <p>Area unfavourable recovering: 77.73%</p> <p>Area unfavourable no change: 5.79%</p> <p>Area unfavourable declining: 16.47%</p> <p><b>Breckland Farmland: 13,335.70ha</b></p> <p>Area favourable: 100%</p> <p><b>Breckland Forest: 18,078.70 ha</b></p> <p>Area favourable: 100%</p> <p><b>Bugg's Hole Fen, Thelnetham: 4.0ha</b></p> <p>% Area destroyed / part</p>	<p>% area unfavourable declining: 15.42%</p> <p>% area destroyed/part destroyed: 0.02%</p>			<p>(PSA) targets (i.e. are wholly in favourable or unfavourable but recovering condition).</p> <p>A further 7 of the SSSIs are meeting PSA targets in over half of their areas.</p> <p>However, 1 of the SSSIs is meeting PSA targets in under half of its area, with a further 2 SSSIs not meeting their PSA target at all.</p>		

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>destroyed: 100%</p> <p><b>Cavendish Woods: 52.0 ha</b> Area unfavourable recovering: 85.43% Area unfavourable declining: 14.57%</p> <p><b>Fakenham Wood And Sapiston Great Grove: 108.6 ha</b> Area unfavourable recovering: 100%</p> <p><b>Hay Wood, Whepstead: 10.5ha</b> Area unfavourable recovering: 100%</p> <p><b>Hopton Fen: 14.37 ha</b> Area unfavourable recovering: 100%</p> <p><b>Horringer Court Caves: 4ha</b> Area unfavourable declining: 100%</p> <p><b>Knettishall Heath: 91.2ha</b> Area favourable: 43.03%</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>Area unfavourable recovering: 11.85%</p> <p>Area unfavourable no change: 45.12%</p> <p><b>Lackford Lakes: 106.08 ha</b></p> <p>Area favourable: 94.57%</p> <p>Area unfavourable recovering: 5.43%</p> <p><b>Little Heath, Barnham: 45.73ha</b></p> <p>Area favourable: 13.52%</p> <p>Area unfavourable recovering: 86.48%</p> <p><b>Pakenham Meadows: 5.8 ha</b></p> <p>Area unfavourable recovering: 100%</p> <p><b>Shaker's Lane, Bury St. Edmunds: 1.26 ha</b></p> <p>Area unfavourable recovering: 100%</p> <p><b>Stanton Woods: 62.87ha</b></p> <p>Area favourable: 3.51%</p> <p>Area unfavourable recovering: 84.05%</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>Area unfavourable no change: 12.45%</p> <p><b>The Glen Chalk Caves, Bury St. Edmund's: 1.58ha</b> Area unfavourable recovering: 100%</p> <p><b>Thetford Heaths: 269.36 ha</b> Area favourable: 36.32% Area unfavourable recovering: 63.68%</p> <p><b>Trundley And Wadgell's Wood, Great Thurlow: 80 ha</b> Area unfavourable no change: 100%</p> <p><b>West Stow Heath: 42.62 ha</b> Area favourable: 76.79% Area unfavourable no change: 23.21%</p> <p><b>Weston Fen: 48.6 ha</b> Area favourable: 49.73% Area unfavourable recovering: 27.93% Area unfavourable no change: 22.34%</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
Number and reported condition of designated geological SSSIs	<p><b>Thetford Heaths: 269.36 ha</b> Area favourable: 36.32% Area unfavourable recovering: 63.68%</p> <p><b>Breckland Forest: 18,078.70 ha</b> Area favourable: 100%</p>	No comparator data.	None identified.	No trend data available.	100% of the area of both geological SSSIs meets PSA targets.	Natural England <a href="http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/index.cfm">http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/index.cfm</a>	Soil
Condition of County Wildlife Sites (National Indicator 197).	No data is currently available. This indicator will be added when data becomes available.						
BAP Habitats and Species	No local information regarding BAP habitats and species is available.	<p>The following Biodiversity Action Plans have been produced for Suffolk:</p> <p><b>Habitat action plans</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acid Grassland</li> <li>• Ancient and/or Species-rich Hedgerows</li> <li>• Cereal Field Margins</li> <li>• Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh</li> <li>• Coastal Sand Dunes</li> </ul>	No loss of designated BAP habitats or species	No trend data available.	There are a large number of designated BAP habitats and species in Suffolk, many of which will be present in St Edmundsbury. It is necessary that any permitted development does not detrimentally affect these habitats and species.	Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan <a href="http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/Environment/Biodiversity/BiodiversityActionPlans.htm">http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/Environment/Biodiversity/BiodiversityActionPlans.htm</a>	Biodiversity, Flora, Fauna

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coastal Vegetated Shingle</li> <li>• Fens</li> <li>• Lowland Hay Meadows</li> <li>• Lowland Heathland</li> <li>• Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland</li> <li>• Maritime Cliffs and Slopes</li> <li>• Mudflats</li> <li>• Reedbeds</li> <li>• Saline Lagoons</li> <li>• Saltmarsh</li> <li>• Sea Grass Beds</li> <li>• Eutrophic Ponds</li> <li>• Traditional orchards</li> <li>• Urban</li> <li>• Wet Woodland</li> <li>• Wood Pasture and Parkland</li> </ul> <p><b>Species Action Plans</b></p> <p><i>Mammals</i></p>					

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brown hare <i>Lepus europaeus</i></li> <li>• Dormouse <i>Muscardinus avellanarius</i></li> <li>• European otter <i>Lutra lutra</i></li> <li>• Harbour porpoise <i>Phocoena phocoena</i></li> <li>• Pipistrelle bat <i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i></li> <li>• Barbastelle Bat <i>Barbastella barbastellus</i></li> <li>• Red squirrel <i>Sciurus vulgaris</i></li> <li>• Water vole <i>Arvicola terrestris</i></li> <li>• Water Shrew <i>Neomys fodiens</i></li> </ul> <p>NB All bats will be included in a grouped plan to be completed 2009.</p> <p><i>Amphibians and Reptiles</i> Great crested newt <i>Triturus cristatus</i> Natterjack toad <i>Bufo calamita</i> Adder or Northern Viper</p>					

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		<p>Vipera berus</p> <p><i>Birds</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bittern Botaurus stellaris</li> <li>• Grey partridge Perdix perdix</li> <li>• Skylark Alauda arvensis</li> <li>• Song thrush Turdus philomelos</li> <li>• Stone curlew Burhinus oedicephalus</li> <li>• Bullfinch Pyrrhula pyrrhula</li> <li>• Corn Bunting Miliaria calandra</li> <li>• Linnet Carduelis cannabina</li> <li>• Nightjar Caprimulgus europaeus</li> <li>• Reed Bunting Emberiza schoeniclus</li> <li>• Barn Owl Tyto alba</li> </ul> <p><i>Local Character Species</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spotted Flycatcher</li> </ul>					



Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		<p>Muscicapa striata</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree Sparrow Passer montanus</li> <li>• Turtle Dove Streptopelia turtur</li> <li>• Woodlark Lullula arborea</li> <li>• Little tern Sterna albifrons</li> </ul> <p><i>Invertebrates</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ramshorn snail Anisus vorticulus</li> <li>• Narrow-mouth whorl snail Vertigo angustior</li> <li>• Desmoulin's whorl snail Vertigo moulinsiana</li> <li>• Shining ram's-horn snail Segmentina nitida</li> <li>• A leaf beetle Cryptocephalus exiguus</li> <li>• Stag beetle Lucanus cervus</li> <li>• Antlion Euroleon nostras</li> <li>• Bright wave moth Idaea ochrata</li> </ul>					

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dingy Skipper Erynnis tages</li> <li>• White-mantled Wainscot moth Archanara neurica</li> <li>• Silver-studded Blue Plebejus argus</li> <li>• Starlet sea-anemone Nematostella vectensis</li> <li>• Depressed river mussel Pseudanodonta complanata</li> <li>• White-clawed crayfish Austropotamobius pallipes</li> </ul> <p><i>Plants</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cornflower Centaurea cyanus</li> <li>• Greater Water-parsnip Sium latifolium</li> <li>• Shepherd's needle Scandix pectiniveneris</li> <li>• Pillwort Pilularia globulifera</li> <li>• Red-tipped Cudweed Filago lutescens</li> <li>• Small-flowered Catchfly</li> </ul>					

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		<p>Silene gallica</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spreading Hedge-parsley Torilis arvensis</li> <li>• Tassel Stonewort Tolypella intricata</li> <li>• Tower Mustard Arabis glabra</li> <li>• Native Black Poplar Populus nigra ssp.betulifolia</li> <li>• Unspotted Lungwort Pulmonaria obscura</li> <li>• Man orchid Aceras anthropophorum</li> </ul> <p><i>Lichens and Fungi</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orange-fruited elm-lichen Caloplaca luteoalba</li> <li>• Sandy stilt puffball Battarraea phalloides</li> <li>• Starry breck-lichen Buellia asterella</li> <li>• Oak Polypore Buglossoporus pulvinus</li> </ul>					

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
Landscape	<p>St Edmundsbury has 16,687 ha of Special landscape area (25.5% of Borough)</p> <p>The Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment identified 14 landscape types which are located within St Edmundsbury:</p> <p><b>Ancient plateau claylands</b> <i>Key Characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat or gently rolling arable landscape of clay soils dissected by small river valleys</li> <li>• Field pattern of ancient enclosure – random patterns in the south but often co-axial in the north. Small patches of straight-edged fields associated with the late enclosure of woods and greens</li> <li>• Dispersed settlement pattern of loosely clustered villages, hamlets and isolated farmsteads of medieval origin</li> <li>• Villages often associated with medieval greens or tyes</li> </ul>	<p>East of England 2004: The region has 14% of the country's greenbelt land and 22 character areas. They are under threat by urbanization and particularly developments geared to cars (e.g. out of town retail centres).</p>	No target identified.	No trend data available.	The borough's distinct landscape types must be preserved in order to ensure that the integrity and high landscape value of the borough is not lost.	<p>Defra East of England Factsheet, 2008</p> <p>Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment <a href="http://www.suffolklandscape.org.uk/">http://www.suffolklandscape.org.uk/</a></p>	Landscape, Biodiversity, Flora, Fauna

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farmstead buildings are predominantly timber-framed, the houses colour-washed and the barns blackened with tar. Roofs are frequently tiled, though thatched houses can be locally significant</li> <li>• Scattered ancient woodland parcels containing a mix of oak, lime, cherry, hazel, hornbeam, ash and holly</li> <li>• Hedges of hawthorn and elm with oak, ash and field maple as hedgerow trees.</li> <li>• Substantial open areas created for WWII airfields and by 20th-century agricultural changes</li> <li>• Network of winding lanes and paths often associated with hedges create visual intimacy</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i></p> <p>Although agricultural intensification in the 20th century has thinned out the historical field patterns, enough remains to give a distinctive character to the landscape. There is, also, still a strong vernacular feel to the settlements, especially south</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>of the Gipping. There are localised impacts of development associated with the A14 corridor and some former airfield sites, such as Stanton and Eye. Due to hedgerow removals and the enclosure of many of the greens, the ecological continuity is now localised in a series of hotspots based on the ancient woodlands and associated hedgerow networks or small river valleys.</p> <p><b>Estate sandlands</b> <i>Key Characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat or very gently rolling plateaux of freely-draining sandy soils, overlying drift deposits of either glacial or fluvial origin</li> <li>• Chalky in parts of the Brecks, but uniformly acid and sandy in the south-east</li> <li>• Absence of watercourses</li> <li>• Extensive areas of heathland or acid grassland</li> <li>• Strongly geometric structure of fields enclosed in the 18th</li> </ul>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>&amp; 19th century.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large continuous blocks of commercial forestry</li> <li>• Characteristic 'pine lines' especially, but not solely, in the Brecks</li> <li>• Widespread planting of tree belts and rectilinear plantations</li> <li>• Generally a landscape without ancient woodland, but there are some isolated and very significant exceptions</li> <li>• High incidence of relatively late, estate type, brick buildings</li> <li>• North-west slate roofs with white or yellow bricks. Flint is also widely used in as a walling material</li> <li>• On the coast red brick with pan-tiled roofs, often black-glazed</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i></p> <p>The two sections of this landscape are very different; in the south-east much of this area has a strong urban</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>influence. Martlesham has lost much of its rural character and much of the remnant heathland, such as at Rushmere and Foxhall, is in a suburban environment and further 'tamed' by being used for golf courses. Even in the central and northern parts of the coastal area there is a steady pressure of suburbanisation and tourism related development.</p> <p>In the Brecks the landscape remains strongly rural, except in the environs of Bury St Edmunds and Thetford, but is dominated by high-tech modern farming and forestry. The occasional new intrusion, such as the Elveden Forest Holiday Village, has made little impact as it is buried in the forest.</p> <p><b>Plateau estate farmlands</b> <i>Key Characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A landscape of large regular fields with small woodlands on light loamy soils</li> <li>• Flat landscape of light loams and sandy soils</li> </ul>						



Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large scale rectilinear field pattern</li> <li>• Network of tree belts and coverts</li> <li>• Large areas of enclosed former heathland</li> <li>• 18th- 19th &amp; 20thC Landscape Parks</li> <li>• Clustered villages with a scattering of farmsteads around them</li> <li>• Former airfield sites</li> <li>• Vernacular architecture is often 18th &amp; early 19thC estate type of brick and tile</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i> The eastern parts of this landscape suffer considerable localised effects from the A14 and A12 trunk roads. While in the wider landscape hedges tend to have a lot of elm suckering and be in poor condition.</p> <p>In general the picture in the west is more mixed with considerable growth of villages simplifying the landscape locally. However, the overall pattern of large fields with</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>hedges and woodland coverts remains apparent through some of the detail has been lost through 20th-century agricultural improvements, and through the construction and redevelopment of airfields at Rougham, Ipswich and Bentwaters.</p> <p><b>Rolling estate farmlands</b> <i>Key Characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gently sloping valley sides and plateau fringes</li> <li>• Generally deep loamy soils</li> <li>• An organic pattern of fields modified by later realignment</li> <li>• Important foci for early settlement</li> <li>• Coverts and plantations with some ancient woodlands</li> <li>• Landscape parks with a core of wood pasture</li> <li>• Location for mineral workings and related activity, especially in the Gipping valley</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i> The influence of single estate</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>ownership remains strong over much of this landscape, so the condition is often good despite the post war modification of the field patterns; In these areas hedges woods and trees are well maintained as is much of the built features of an estate landscape. However, in the east on the Shotley Peninsular and around Rendlesham there are areas where the pattern and features of the landscape are highly modified by agricultural improvement.</p> <p><b>Rolling estate sandlands</b> <b>Key Characteristics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sloping or rolling river terraces and coastal slopes</li> <li>• Sandy and free draining soils with areas of heathland</li> <li>• Late enclosure with a pattern of tree belts and straight hedges</li> <li>• Parklands</li> <li>• A focus of settlement in the Estate Sandlands landscape</li> <li>• In the east are 19thC red brick</li> </ul>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>buildings with black glazed pan tiles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lark valley buildings are frequently of brick or flint with tiled or slate roofs</li> <li>• Tree belts and plantations throughout</li> <li>• Occasional and significant semi natural woodlands and ribbons of wet woodland</li> <li>• Complex and intimate landscape on valley sides</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i></p> <p>Many of these valley side landscapes are under considerable development pressure because there are concentrations of settlement and land use change. However there are excellent areas of semi-natural landscapes and intact landscapes in many places.</p> <p><b>Rolling valley farmlands</b></p> <p>Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gentle valley sides with some complex and steep slopes</li> </ul>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deep well drained loamy soils</li> <li>• Organic pattern of fields smaller than on the plateaux</li> <li>• Distinct areas of regular field patterns</li> <li>• A scattering of landscape parks</li> <li>• Small ancient woodlands on the valley fringes</li> <li>• Sunken lanes</li> <li>• Towns and villages with distinctive mediaeval cores and late mediaeval churches</li> <li>• Industrial activity and manufacture, continuing in the Gipping valley</li> <li>• Large, often moated, houses</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i></p> <p>Much of this landscape retains its historic patterns, of both the agricultural and built environment. However, the Gipping valley has been a focus of economic activity so has been subject to transport and industrial developments. Conversely the Stour and its tributaries have been subject</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>to some gentrification, with significant changes in land use, such as the increase in horse pastures and the loss of much commercial orchard production.</p> <p><b>Rolling valley farmlands &amp; furze</b></p> <p><i>Key Characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Valley landscapes with distinctive areas of grass and gorse heaths</li> <li>• Valleys with prominent river terraces of sandy soil</li> <li>• Small areas of gorse heathland in a clayland setting</li> <li>• Straight boundaries associated with late enclosure</li> <li>• Co- axial field systems</li> <li>• Mixed hedgerows of hawthorn dogwood and blackthorn with oak ash and field maple</li> <li>• Fragmentary cover of woodland</li> </ul>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sand and gravel extraction</li> <li>• Golf Courses</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i></p> <p>The condition of this landscape is very mixed with some important semi-natural habitats such as Wortham Ling and parts of Stuston Common in good condition. However, as with the valley clayland and valley farmland landscapes away from the valley sides the completeness and connectivity of the hedgerow network reduces.</p> <p><b>Undulating ancient farmlands</b></p> <p><i>Key Characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A landscape of open undulating farmland with blocks of ancient woodland</li> <li>• Undulating arable landscape</li> <li>• Field pattern generally a random ancient pattern with occasional areas of regular fields associated with former mediaeval deer parks</li> <li>• Oak ash and field maple as</li> </ul>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>hedgerow trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substantial open areas created for airfields and by post WWII agricultural improvement</li> <li>• Studded with blocks of ancient woodland</li> <li>• Dispersed settlement pattern of loosely clustered villages, hamlets and isolated farmsteads</li> <li>• Villages often associated with greens or former greens</li> <li>• Rich stock of mediaeval and Tudor timber-framed and brick buildings and moated sites</li> <li>• A large scale landscape with long undulating open views trees, either in hedges or in woods, are always a prominent feature</li> <li>• In the undulating landscape, crop production, especially oilseeds can be visually prominent</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i></p> <p>The historic pattern of field</p>						



Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>boundaries has been degraded through 20th-century agricultural rationalisation that has resulted in a large number of hedges being removed, as at Rede or Mickley Green. Furthermore, inappropriate tree planting on greens has also had an adverse effect on the character of the historic landscape. However despite these changes the landscape maintains much of its historic character.</p> <p><b>Undulating estate farmlands</b> <i>Key Characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undulating arable landscape with parklands plantations and ancient woodland</li> <li>• Undulating arable landscape</li> <li>• Organic field pattern rationalised by estate ownership</li> <li>• Oak ash and field maple as hedgerow trees</li> <li>• Complex arrangements of plantations especially in the north</li> <li>• Ancient woodlands</li> </ul>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape parks and ornamental tree species</li> <li>• Substantial open areas created for airfields and by post WWII agricultural improvement</li> <li>• Dispersed settlement pattern of loosely clustered villages, hamlets and isolated farmsteads especially in the north</li> <li>• Settlements more clustered and less dispersed in the south</li> <li>• Rich stock of mediaeval and Tudor timber-framed and brick buildings and moated sites</li> <li>• A landscape of well wooded farmland in many places often with a well kept appearance</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i></p> <p>Much of the area has a rather well kept appearance with strong linkages of hedgerows and woodland maintained by the influence of shooting on these estates. However, in the south, the pressure of</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>industrial farming on the management of land and the larger field size has modified this landscape removing much of the detail of the field pattern.</p> <p><b>Urban</b> No additional information about the characteristics of the urban landscape is available.</p> <p><b>Valley meadowlands</b></p> <p><i>Key Characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat valley floor grasslands on silty and peat soils</li> <li>• Flat landscapes of alluvium or peat on valley floors</li> <li>• Grassland divided by a network of wet ditches</li> <li>• Occasional carr woodland and plantations of poplar</li> <li>• Occasional small reedbeds</li> <li>• Unsettled</li> <li>• Cattle grazed fields</li> </ul>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fields converted to arable production</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i></p> <p>Some these landscapes are in excellent condition, However many are affected by intakes into arable production, by horse grazing and by under grazing. The sense of tranquillity and isolation of this landscape can also be intruded upon by the development of the adjacent rolling valley landscapes which are often a focus of settlement and development.</p> <p><b>Valley meadows &amp; fens</b></p> <p><i>Key Characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat, narrow, river valley bottoms</li> <li>• Deep peat or mixtures of peat and sandy deposits</li> <li>• Ancient meres within the valley bottoms &amp; important fen sites</li> <li>• Small grassland fields, bounded by dykes running at right angles to the main river</li> <li>• Sparse scattering of small</li> </ul>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>alder carr &amp; plantation woodlands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of a wider estate type landscape</li> <li>• Largely unsettled, except for the occasional farmstead</li> <li>• Drier fields turned over to the production of arable crops</li> <li>• Cattle grazing now often peripheral to commercial agriculture</li> <li>• Loss to scrub encroachment, tree planting and horse paddocks</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i></p> <p>Some parts of this landscape are still in fine condition having a rural feel and maintain the traditional management of cattle grazing; this pattern is shown at its best at Blyford. There is though a lot of neglect and poor management in these landscapes, the small and difficult to access fields are often peripheral to any form of active agriculture. These difficult fields are being lost to scrub encroachment, tree planting and horse</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>paddocks.</p> <p><b>Wooded chalk slopes</b></p> <p><i>Key Characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rolling valleys</li> <li>• Shallow free draining chalk soils</li> <li>• Scattered plantation woodlands</li> <li>• Fringed with ancient woodland</li> <li>• Planned rectilinear field patterns</li> <li>• Hawthorn hedges with few trees</li> <li>• Compact villages and a scattering of farms</li> <li>• Flint and thatch vernacular buildings</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i></p> <p>This landscape is in generally reasonable condition. However the historic pattern has been degraded by agricultural improvement. The development style in the villages has created a rather</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>suburban feeling.</p> <p><b>Wooded valley meadowlands &amp; fens</b></p> <p><i>Key Characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat valley bottom</li> <li>• Extensive peat deposits</li> <li>• Cattle grazed pasture</li> <li>• Network of drainage ditches</li> <li>• Areas of unenclosed “wild” fenland</li> <li>• Widespread plantation and carr woodland</li> <li>• Important sites for nature conservation</li> <li>• Localised settlement on the valley floor “islands”</li> <li>• Sense of quiet and rural isolation in many places</li> </ul> <p><i>Condition</i></p> <p>This landscape is generally in good condition, with a lot of conservation effort being placed on the key fen sites. However the visual condition is threatened in places by the conversion of traditional</p>						

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	grazing into pony paddocks with their associated field shelters and fencing tape, rather than the more robust and discreet methods used for cattle. There has also been a certain amount of mineral extraction in the Waveney valley in the 20th century that has left a legacy of large lakes, as at Weybread, Wortwell, Earsham and Ditchingham. There has also been some extraction in some of the tributary valleys of the Little Ouse, such as at Hinderclay.						
RIGS	There is one site designated as RIGS near Thelnetham within the St Edmundsbury.	No comparator data available.	No targets identified	No trend data available.	Development within St Edmundsbury must not prejudice the integrity and vale of these sites.	Replacement St Edmundsbury Borough Local Plan 2016	Soil
Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk	<p><u>St Edmundsbury Listed Buildings 2008:</u></p> <p>Grade I: 98 Grade II*: 160 Grade II: 2,986 Total: 3,244</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury Buildings at Risk:</u> 2008: 17 (0.5%)</p>	<p><u>Suffolk Listed Buildings 2006:</u></p> <p>Grade I: 414 Grade II*: 876 Grade II: 15,365 Total: 16,655</p> <p><u>Suffolk Buildings at Risk:</u> 2003: 136 (0.8%) (most up-to-date figure available)</p>	No targets identified.	<p><u>St Edmundsbury Listed Buildings 2006:</u></p> <p>Grade I: 98 Grade II*: 160 Grade II: 2,977 Total: 3,235</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury Buildings at Risk:</u> 2007: 20 Feb 2006: 24 (0.7%)</p>	<p>3<sup>rd</sup> highest number of listed buildings in Suffolk. The number of listed buildings in St Edmundsbury has gradually increased since 1995.</p> <p>The number of buildings at risk has fallen since 2003 and the borough has met the Suffolk</p>	<p>SEBC Conservation Department SCC – Suffolk's Environment Monitoring Report 2004/5 St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08</p>	Cultural Heritage



Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
				2003: 33 (1%)	target of 0.7%.		
Area of historic parks and gardens	<u>St Edmundsbury, 2008:</u> Nationally designated historic parks and gardens: 4 parks covering 1,542 (ha). The parks are: Euston Park (Grade II* listed) Ickworth Park (Grade II* listed) Abbey Gardens (Grade II listed) Culforth Park (Grade II listed) County designated historic parkland: N/A	No comparator data.	To ensure that 100% of historic parks and gardens are maintained and enhanced.	Increase in 1 more Nationally designated park since 2001 an increase by 95.7 ha.	The increase in the number of designated parks in the Borough is favourable. However, it is vital that the integrity and value of these areas continues to be protected.	SCC – Suffolk Sustainability Appraisal Group SEBC – Conservation Department St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007-08	Cultural Heritage
Number and area of Conservation Areas (CAs) and Article 4 directions	<u>St Edmundsbury CAs:</u> 2008 : 35 (1,864 ha)  <u>SEBC Article 4 Directions:</u> 2007 – 2008 : 1,015 properties	<u>Suffolk CAs 2004/5:</u> 171 (covering 6,370 properties)  <u>Suffolk Article 4 Directions 2004/5:</u> 22 (covering 6,934 properties)	None identified.	<u>St Edmundsbury CAs:</u> 2004 - 2006: 35 (1,684 ha) 2003: 34 2002: 31 2001: 31 1996: 27  <u>SEBC Article 4 Directions:</u> 2004 - 2006: 6 (1,015 properties) 2003: 5 (1,003 properties) 2002: 2	The number of Conservation Areas and Article 4 Directions has increased over recent years. It is vital that these areas and properties continue to be protected.	SEBC Conservation Department SCC – Suffolk's Environment Monitoring Report 2004/5 St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08	Cultural Heritage
Number of Scheduled Ancient	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2003-4: 0	<u>Suffolk:</u> No SAMs have been damaged since 2000/01.	To prevent damage to any SAMs	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2002-3: 0	Whilst there is a lack of trend information the	SCC – Suffolk's Environment Monitoring	Cultural Heritage

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic																																																							
Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development			as a result of development	2001-2: 0 2000-1: 1 1999-0: 0 1998-9: 2 1997-8: 0	complete lack of damage to ancient monuments between 01/02 – 03/04 is very positive.	Report 2004/5																																																								
% of river length assessed as good biological quality	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> DEFRA has assessed the biological quality of rivers as being good (grades A and B), fair (grades C and D), poor (grade E) and bad (Grade F).</p> <table><tr><td></td><td colspan="4">% River length quality</td></tr><tr><td>Year</td><td>Good %</td><td>Fair %</td><td>Poor %</td><td>Bad %</td></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td>64</td><td>36</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr></table>		% River length quality				Year	Good %	Fair %	Poor %	Bad %	2005	64	36	0	0	<p>East of England, 2006: Good: 74% England, 2006: Good: 71%</p> <p>Percentage of rivers in various biological conditions in 2005: <u>East of England:</u> Good: 75% Fair: 21% Poor: 2% Bad: -%</p> <p><u>England:</u> Good: 71% Fair: 24% Poor: 4% Bad: 1%</p>	No target identified	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u></p> <table><tr><td></td><td colspan="4">% River length quality</td></tr><tr><td>Year</td><td>Good %</td><td>Fair %</td><td>Poor %</td><td>Bad %</td></tr><tr><td>1990</td><td>70</td><td>24</td><td>6</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>1995</td><td>68</td><td>32</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>2000</td><td>84</td><td>12</td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>2002</td><td>81</td><td>14</td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>2003</td><td>77</td><td>19</td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>2004</td><td>68</td><td>32</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr></table>		% River length quality				Year	Good %	Fair %	Poor %	Bad %	1990	70	24	6	0	1995	68	32	0	0	2000	84	12	4	0	2002	81	14	4	0	2003	77	19	4	0	2004	68	32	0	0	In 2004 and 2005 none of St Edmundsbury's rivers were assessed as being of poor or bad biological quality.	<a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk">www.defra.gov.uk</a> Defra East of England Factsheet, 2008 Audit Commission - <a href="http://www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk">www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk</a>	Water, Biodiversity, Flora, Fauna
	% River length quality																																																													
Year	Good %	Fair %	Poor %	Bad %																																																										
2005	64	36	0	0																																																										
	% River length quality																																																													
Year	Good %	Fair %	Poor %	Bad %																																																										
1990	70	24	6	0																																																										
1995	68	32	0	0																																																										
2000	84	12	4	0																																																										
2002	81	14	4	0																																																										
2003	77	19	4	0																																																										
2004	68	32	0	0																																																										
% of river length assessed as	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> % of river length assessed as</p>	<p><u>East of England, 2006:</u> Good: 44%</p>	No target identified	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> % of river length assessed as</p>	The proportion of St Edmundsbury's rivers that were	Audit Commission - <a href="http://www.areaprofile">www.areaprofile</a>	Water, Biodiversity,																																																							

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
good chemical quality	good chemical quality 2005: 41.07%	<u>England, 2006:</u> Good: 66%  National mean % of river length assessed as good biological quality 2005: 53.9%  Percentage of rivers in various chemical conditions in 2005: <u>East of England:</u> Good: 45% Fair: 42% Poor: 12% Bad: -%  <u>England:</u> Good: 64% Fair: 29% Poor: 7% Bad: 1%		good chemical quality 2004: 27.55% 2003: 36.11%	assessed as having good chemical water quality in 2005 was higher than in 2004 and 2003. However, the chemical quality of St Edmundsbury's rivers is worse than the average quality of rivers in the East of England and England.	s.audit-commission.gov.uk	Flora, Fauna
Groundwater quality	There are 16 Groundwater Source Protection Areas within the Borough, mainly in Bury St Edmunds and to the north of the Borough.	No data available.	None identified.	No data available.	It is essential that development, particularly in Groundwater Source Protection Areas, is strictly	Environment Agency/ DEFRA	Water

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
					controlled in order to prevent pollution as polluting these catchment areas could pose a serious public health risk		
Flood Risk – Planning applications approved against Environment Agency advice	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2006/07: 0	<u>East of England:</u> 2006/07: 3  <u>England:</u> 2006/07: 13	No planning applications approved against Environment Agency advice.	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2004/05: 0 2003/04: 1 2002/03: 1	No planning applications have been approved against EA advice since 2003/04. It is important that this trend continues.	Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2004/5  East of England Annual Monitoring Report 2006/07	Water, Climatic Factors
Properties at risk of flooding from rivers	St Edmundsbury 2006 properties located in Flood Zone 3 (high risk) and 2 (low to medium risk: 1,337 (1,240 residential and 97 commercial)  1 <sup>st</sup> April 2006 St Edmundsbury: Total number of dwellings in the borough: 44,680	Suffolk properties at risk of flooding from rivers and the sea: 11,943 (this excludes Forest Heath DC)	None identified.	No trend data available	A very low proportion of property in the borough is at risk of flooding. This will continue if no planning applications are approved against EA advice	Environment Agency	Water, Climatic Factors, Population
Number of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial	Potentially contaminated sites in borough: Start of 2006/7: 1,137  The borough has no sites that were declared as	No comparator data.	None identified.	Potentially contaminated sites in borough: Start of 2005/6: 1,171 The number of potentially contaminated sites has been reduced by 34 sites, of which:	Whilst remediation has reduced the number of potentially contaminated sites within the Borough, there still exist a	SEBC land contamination officer	Soil

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
use	Contaminated under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA).			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5 sites were investigated and remediated under Part IIA EPA (Oils spills etc);</li> <li>- 16 sites were investigated and remediated under the planning regime (Brownfield site development or similar); and</li> <li>- 13 sites were subjected to a desk study by this Service under Part IIA EPA and no further works were required.</li> </ul>	significant number of potentially contaminated sites which should be remediated.		
Have annual mean concentration s of any key air pollutants* been exceeded?	<p><u>St Edmundsbury 2006 air pollutants (max estimated level):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>): 22.3µg/m<sup>3</sup> (2005)</li> <li>- Particulates (PM<sub>10</sub>): 24.6µg/m<sup>3</sup> (2005)</li> <li>- Sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>): 4µg/m<sup>3</sup> (2001)</li> <li>- Lead: Not monitored (there are no new industrial sources that could give rise to potentially significant levels of lead)</li> <li>- Carbon monoxide (CO): 0.188µg/m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>- Benzene: 0.329µg/m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>1,3-butadiene: 0.102µg/m<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> <p>*There are seven key air pollutants that the UK</p>	<p><u>Suffolk max recorded annual mean air pollution levels (2001):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NO<sub>2</sub>: 36.50µg/m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>- PM<sub>10</sub>: 32.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (2005)</li> <li>- SO<sub>2</sub>: 32.90 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (2001)</li> <li>- CO: 0.4µg/m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>- Benzene: 0.78µg/m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>- 1,3-butadiene: 0.28µg/m<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> <p><u>East of England (2004):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>): 129,000 tonnes</li> <li>- SO<sub>2</sub>: 55,200 tonnes</li> <li>- PM<sub>10</sub>: 14,700 tonnes</li> </ul>	To not exceed threshold limits and to meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	<p><u>St Edmundsbury max recorded annual mean air pollution levels (2001):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NO<sub>2</sub>: 35.0µg/m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>- PM<sub>10</sub>: 20.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (2005)</li> <li>- SO<sub>2</sub>: 9.62 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (2001)</li> <li>- CO: 0.3µg/m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>- Benzene: 0.44µg/m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>- 1,3-butadiene: 0.18µg/m<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>	The concentrations of the six monitored key pollutants are at very low levels within the borough and do not exceed levels set out in the UK Government Air Quality Strategy. Concentrations decreased for all pollutants except PM <sub>10</sub> between 2001 and 2006. Maximum annual mean air pollution levels for St Edmundsbury are lower than those for Suffolk as a whole.	<p>SEBC Environmental Health Department</p> <p>Defra East of England Factsheet, 2008</p> <p>UK Air Quality Archive</p> <p><a href="http://www.airquality.co.uk/archive/index.php">http://www.airquality.co.uk/archive/index.php</a></p>	Air, Human Health

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	Government requires Local Authorities to monitor (NO <sub>2</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , SO <sub>2</sub> , lead, CO, benzene and 1,3-butadiene).						
Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected	No Air Quality Management Areas and no dwellings affected by poor air quality.	Suffolk currently has 4 air quality management areas: three in Ipswich and one in Suffolk Coastal.	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	No trend data available.	Air quality in the Borough is good.	Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2004/5 UK Air Quality Archive <a href="http://www.airquality.co.uk/archive/index.php">http://www.airquality.co.uk/archive/index.php</a>	Air, Human Health
Daily domestic water use (per capita consumption, litres)	St Edmundsbury: 2004: 146 litres	National (mean): 2004: 154.14 litres	Achieving the equivalent of 3 stars under the Code for Sustainable Homes for water use (105litres/capita/day) is a desirable target for new homes.	No trend data available	Lack of trend data makes it difficult to assess the position. However, consumption is marginally below national levels.	Audit Commission - <a href="http://www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk">www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk</a>	Water
Household and municipal waste produced	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Household (tonnes)*: 2005/06: 47,986	<u>East of England:</u> 2004-5: 21 million tonnes of waste (construction and demolition, industry and commerce and municipal, including household waste).	Reduce the amount of waste going to landfill (county level LATS).	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Household (tonnes)*: 2004/05: 48,752 2003/04: 46,903	The volume of waste produced in St Edmundsbury fluctuates greatly. The volume of household waste	Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2004/5 Defra East of	Population, Material Assets

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>Municipal (tonnes)**: 2005/06: 26,280</p> <p>* These figures include green garden waste. Quantities of green waste fluctuate dramatically each year dependent on weather and have a dramatic effect on household waste totals.</p> <p>** This figure is calculated by adding black bin waste and trade waste to give a rough municipal tonnage.</p>	<p>Household waste produced 2005/06 (kilograms per household per week): East of England: 23.7 kg England: 23.2 kg</p>	<p>No formal target year-on-year reduction desirable.</p>	<p>2002/03: 49,690 2001/02: 49,394 2000/01: 46,126 1999/00: 46,758</p> <p>Municipal (tonnes)*: 2004/05: 29,467 2003/04: 35,507 2002/03: 44,455 2001/02: 39,730</p>	<p>produced is roughly stable, whereas the volume of municipal waste produced has reduced by a significant amount since 2002/03.</p>	<p>England Factsheet, 2008 Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008</p>	
Kg of household waste collected per head	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2006/07: 475.5 kg</p>	<p>Kg of household waste collected per head: national mean: 2006/07: 441.33</p>	<p>No formal target: year-on-year reduction desirable.</p>	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2005/06: 477.4 kg 2004/05: 491.5 kg</p>	<p>The amount of household waste collected per head in St Edmundsbury has reduced since 2004/05 but is higher than the national mean.</p>	<p>Audit Commission - <a href="http://www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk">www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk</a></p>	Population, Material Assets
% of household waste produced that is recycled	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2008/09 (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter): 54.28%</p>	<p><u>East of England:</u> 2006/07: 38.3% 2005/06: 34%</p> <p><u>England:</u> 2006/07: 31% 2005/06: 27%</p>	<p><u>BVPI targets:</u> 2007/08: 50% 2003/04: 33% 2005/06: 40%</p>	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2007/08: 50.4% 2006/07: 50.1% 2005/06: 48.62% 2004/05: 50.64% 2003/04: 33.7% 2002/03: 29.8%</p>	<p>The proportion of household waste recycled in the borough is significantly higher than that for the East of England and England, and is increasing year on year. In January 2006 St</p>	<p>Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2004/5 SEBC Key Performance Indicators – Second Quarter Report</p>	Material Assets

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
					Edmundsbury Borough Council was announced as the Country's top performer for waste management and recycling and the first authority to break the 50% mark for recycling.	2008/2009 Defra East of England Factsheet, 2008 Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008	
Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> domestic use kWh: 2004: 19,618</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> commercial and industrial use kWh: 2004: 2,346,318</p>	<p><u>East of England domestic use kWh:</u> 2004: 20,744 2003: 20,456 2002: 20,446 2001: 20,144</p> <p><u>East of England commercial and industrial use kWh:</u> 2004: 652,108 2003: 683,197 2002: 707,128 2001: 706,349</p> <p><u>GB domestic use kWh:</u> 2004: 20,496 2003: 20,111 2002: 20,118 2001: 19,942</p> <p><u>GB commercial and industrial use kWh:</u></p>	None identified	<p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> domestic use kWh: 2003: 19,323 2002: 19,374 2001: 19,016</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury:</u> commercial and industrial use kWh: 2003: 2,489,349 2002: 1,320,903 2001: 2,065,734</p>	Domestic gas consumption is consistently below figures for East of England and GB. However, industrial gas consumption is relatively high. The data appear to show increasing consumption of gas by domestic uses over recent years.	DTI - <a href="http://www.dti.gov.uk">www.dti.gov.uk</a>	Population, Material Assets



Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		2004: 706,904 2003: 729,372 2002: 781,524 2001: 777,139					
Renewable Energy Generation: Installed Generating Capacity.	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2007/08: 0	Amount of energy obtained from renewable sources in 2004: East of England: 0.45% UK average: 2%  Renewable energy generating capacity of renewables obligation accredited generating stations in East of England (MW): Offshore wind: 60 Onshore wind: 88.875 Biomass: 92.666 Landfill gas: 174.118 Sewage gas: 3.719 Total: 419.378	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> 2004/05: 0 2003/04: 0 2002/03: 0	There are no commercial renewable energy facilities within the borough.	Suffolk's Environment Annual Monitoring Report 2004  St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08  East of England Annual Monitoring Report 2006/07	Climate Factors
Average annual domestic and commercial and industrial of electricity use (per	<u>St Edmundsbury domestic use (per customer):</u> 2006: 4,954 kWh  <u>St Edmundsbury commercial and industrial use:</u> 2006: 85,238 kWh	<u>East of England domestic use (per customer):</u> 2006: 4,873 kWh 2005: 4,954 kWh 2004: 5,091 kWh 2003: 5,043 kWh	None identified	<u>St Edmundsbury domestic use (per customer):</u> 2005: 5,068 kWh 2004: 5,232 kWh 2003: 5,209 kWh  <u>St Edmundsbury commercial</u>	Available figures show a decrease in domestic electricity consumption and an increase in industrial energy consumption in the borough since	DTI - <a href="http://www.dti.gov.uk">www.dti.gov.uk</a> East of England Annual Monitoring Report 2006/07 (Regional and local electricity	Population, Climate Factors

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
consumer, kWh)	2004: 71,156 kWh	<u>East of England commercial and industrial use:</u> 2006: 77,414 kWh 2005: 75,069 kWh 2004: 71,796kWh 2003: 70,587 kWh  <u>GB domestic use (per customer):</u> 2006: 4,457 kWh 2004: 4,628 kWh 2003: 4,600 kWh  <u>GB commercial and industrial use:</u> 2006: 81,952 kWh 2004: 77,620 kWh 2003: 77,909 kWh		<u>and industrial use:</u> 2003: 73,103 kWh	2003.  Figures also indicate that average domestic energy consumption in St Edmundsbury is above both that for the East of England and GB. Similarly, energy consumption by industry in 2006 is higher than in the region and GB.	consumption data (experimental) <a href="http://www.berr.gov.uk/energy/statistics/regional/regional-local-electricity/page36213.htm">http://www.berr.gov.uk/energy/statistics/regional/regional-local-electricity/page36213.htm</a> Audit Commission - <a href="http://www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk">www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk</a>	
Carbon Dioxide emissions	Local estimates of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> ) - Domestic emissions per capita: 2006: 2.43 tonnes  Local estimates of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (2006): - Total emissions per capita: 13.44 tonnes	East of England estimates of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> ) - Domestic emissions per capita: 2006: 2.48 tonnes 2005: 2.5 tonnes  East of England estimates of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> ) - Total emissions per	No target identified	Local estimates of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> ) - Domestic emissions per capita: 2005: 2.41 tonnes 2004: 2.7 tonnes 2003: 3.2 tonnes  Local estimates of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> ) -	Per capita domestic CO <sub>2</sub> emissions have decreased in St Edmundsbury and are comparable to national but higher than regional figures.  Total emissions per capita in 2006	Defra East of England Factsheet, 2008  Defra Emissions of carbon dioxide for local authority areas: <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/statistics/">http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/statistics/</a>	Climate Factors

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>Summary by sector (kt CO<sub>2</sub>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Industry and Commercial: 844 (61%)</li> <li>- Domestic: 248 (18%)</li> <li>- Road Transport: 289 (21%)</li> <li>- LULUCF: 12 (0)</li> </ul> <p>Total: 1,369</p>	<p>capita:</p> <p>2005: 8.11 tonnes</p> <p>2006: 8.09</p> <p>Summary by sector (kt CO<sub>2</sub>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Industry and Commercial: 16,902 (37%)</li> <li>- Domestic: 13,912 (31%)</li> <li>- Road Transport: 13,966 (31%)</li> <li>- LULUCF: 592 (1%)</li> </ul> <p>Total: 45,372</p> <p>National mean estimates of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>) - Domestic emissions per capita:</p> <p>2006: 2.54 tonnes</p> <p>2004: 2.67 tonnes</p> <p>National mean estimates of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>) - Total emissions per capita:</p> <p>2006: 8.94 tonnes</p> <p>2004: 10.4 tonnes</p>		<p>Total emissions per capita:</p> <p>2005: 12.10 tonnes</p> <p>2004: 12.7 tonnes</p> <p>2003: 14.3 tonnes</p> <p>Summary by sector (kt CO<sub>2</sub>) (2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Industry and Commercial: 692 (56.5%)</li> <li>- Domestic: 243 (19.5%)</li> <li>- Road Transport: 296 (24%)</li> <li>- LULUCF: 12 (0)</li> </ul> <p>Total: 1,220</p>	<p>increased from 2005 level and are higher than regional and national figures, as a result of the more industrial nature of the borough. The recent increase in total emissions in St Edmundsbury is likely to be as a result of industrial growth seen in Haverhill between 2005 and 2006.</p>	<p>obatosmos/galocal ghg.htm</p> <p>St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007-08</p> <p>East of England Annual Monitoring Report 2006/07</p>	
Traffic volumes in key locations	Average 7 day flow of traffic past monitoring points* in St Edmundsbury borough	Estimated traffic flows for all vehicle types (million vehicle kilometres)	None identified.	Average 7 day flow of traffic past monitoring points* in St Edmundsbury borough	Traffic volumes fell in 2005 – for the first time since 2000 (records go	Suffolk County Council	Air, Climatic

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic																																				
	<div>(thousands of vehicles)</div> <table><tr><td>Road Class</td><td>2005</td></tr><tr><td>Trunk</td><td>89.5</td></tr><tr><td>A</td><td>210.5</td></tr><tr><td>B</td><td>52.1</td></tr><tr><td>C</td><td>21.3</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>373.4</td></tr></table> <div>* There are 80 different monitoring points along roads in St Edmundsbury where monitoring has taken place since 1996.</div>	Road Class	2005	Trunk	89.5	A	210.5	B	52.1	C	21.3	Total	373.4	<div>Suffolk (million vehicle km):</div> <div>2006: 6,053</div> <div>2005: 5,947</div> <div>2004: 5,968</div>		<div>(thousands of vehicles)</div> <table><tr><td>Road Class</td><td>2002</td><td>2003</td><td>2004</td></tr><tr><td>Trunk</td><td>88.7</td><td>91.2</td><td>92.0</td></tr><tr><td>A</td><td>205.3</td><td>207.9</td><td>211.0</td></tr><tr><td>B</td><td>49.1</td><td>53.3</td><td>53.2</td></tr><tr><td>C</td><td>17.7</td><td>18.9</td><td>19.5</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>360.8</td><td>371.3</td><td>375.6</td></tr></table>	Road Class	2002	2003	2004	Trunk	88.7	91.2	92.0	A	205.3	207.9	211.0	B	49.1	53.3	53.2	C	17.7	18.9	19.5	Total	360.8	371.3	375.6	<div>back to 1996).</div> <div>However, traffic volumes remain high.</div>	<div>Audit Commission -</div> <div>www.areaprofiles</div> <div>.audit-</div> <div>commission.gov.</div> <div>uk</div>	<div>Factors</div>
Road Class	2005																																										
Trunk	89.5																																										
A	210.5																																										
B	52.1																																										
C	21.3																																										
Total	373.4																																										
Road Class	2002	2003	2004																																								
Trunk	88.7	91.2	92.0																																								
A	205.3	207.9	211.0																																								
B	49.1	53.3	53.2																																								
C	17.7	18.9	19.5																																								
Total	360.8	371.3	375.6																																								
<div>Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes</div>	<div>St Edmundsbury Census 2001 travel to work (number):</div> <div>Travel to work by car:</div> <div>34,882 people (69.5%)</div> <div>Travel to work by public transport:</div> <div>1,517 people (3.0%)</div> <div>St Edmundsbury residents aged 16-74 in employment (Census 2001): 98,193</div>	<div>2001:</div> <div>Travel to work by car, van, minibus, works van</div> <div>East of England: 64.7%</div> <div>England: 61.0%</div> <div>Travel to work by bus, coach, private bus and rail</div> <div>East of England: 10.9%</div> <div>England: 14.9%</div> <div>2006:</div>	<div>A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.</div>	<div>No trend data available.</div>	<div>The data indicates that a high proportion of journeys undertaken in the borough are made by car, with the proportion of journeys to work in St Edmundsbury by car being significantly higher in 2001 than that for the East of England and</div>	<div>Census 2001</div> <div>Office for National Statistics</div> <div>Regional Trends Report 2008</div>	<div>Air, Climatic Factors</div>																																				

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
		Travel to work by car, van, minibuss, works van East of England: 75.0% England: 69.8%  Travel to work by bus, coach, private bus and rail East of England: 10.5% England: 15.1%			England. The proportion of journeys to work undertaken by public transport in the borough is significantly lower than that for the East of England and England.		
Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle	<u>St Edmundsbury Census 2001 travel to work (number):</u> Travel to work on foot: 5,977 people (11.9%) Travel to work by bicycle: 1,734 people (3.5%)  St Edmundsbury residents aged 16-74 in employment (Census 2001): 98,193	2001: <u>East of England:</u> 9.1% foot 3.9% bicycle  <u>England:</u> 10.0% foot 2.8% Bicycle  2006: <u>East of England:</u> 9.3% foot 3.9% bicycle  <u>England:</u> 10.5% foot 3.0% Bicycle	To increase the number of walking journeys to work in Suffolk by 1% by 2006 and 2% by 2011. (2001 base of 31,607)  To increase the number of cycling journeys to work in Suffolk by 5% by 2006 and 10% by 2011. (2001 base of 15,532)	No trend data available.	The proportion of residents of St Edmundsbury who travel to work on foot is higher than regional and national figures. The proportion of residents who travel to work by bicycle is slightly lower than regional but higher than national figures.	Census 2001 Office for National Statistics Regional Trends Report 2008	Air, Climate Factors, Human Health
Distances	St Edmundsbury average	National mean % of the	None	No trend data available.	The available data	Census 2001	Air,

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
travelled to work for the resident population	distance (km) travelled to fixed place of work: 15km  % of the resident population travelling over 20 km to work 2001: 20.7%	resident population travelling over 20 km to work  2001: 14.16%	identified		would indicate that residents of the borough commute a considerable distance to work, significantly further than the national mean.	(KS015) Audit Commission - <a href="http://www.areaprofile.s.audit-commission.gov.uk">www.areaprofile.s.audit-commission.gov.uk</a>	Climate Factors, Population
<b>ECONOMIC</b>							
Take-up of employment floorspace (completions)	<u>Take-up of URBAN employment floorspace (completions):</u> St Edmundsbury: 2007/08: 4,875m <sup>2</sup>  <u>Take-up of RURAL employment floorspace:</u> St Edmundsbury: 2007/08: 1,313 m <sup>2</sup>	<u>Annual B1-B8 floorspace completions 2001-2007:</u> 2005-06: 372,000 m <sup>2</sup> 2006-07: 493,417 m <sup>2</sup>	To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development.	<u>Take-up of URBAN employment floorspace (completions):</u> St Edmundsbury: 2002/03: 13,074m <sup>2</sup> 2001/02: 624m <sup>2</sup> 2000/01: 29,111m <sup>2</sup>  <u>Take-up of RURAL employment floorspace:</u> St Edmundsbury: 2002/03: 0m <sup>2</sup> 2001/02: 0m <sup>2</sup> 2000/01: 1,870m <sup>2</sup>	Fluctuation and gaps in information means time series observations are difficult to make. The take up of rural employment floorspace was significantly higher in 2007/08 than between 2001 and 2003.	SEBC Planning Department East of England Annual Monitoring Report 2006/07 St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08	Material Assets
Business formation rate (or new VAT registrations as % of total VAT registered)	<u>St Edmundsbury Business formation rate ** %:</u> 2007: 8.1  * All firms with a turnover which exceeds £55,000 per annum must register for VAT.	<u>East of England Business formation rate ** %:</u> 2007: 9.9 2006: 8.9	None identified.	<u>St Edmundsbury Business formation rate ** %:</u> 2006: 8.1 2004: 9.6 2003: 8.8 2002: 9.7	Business development rate fluctuates but is broadly similar to that of East of England. The business formation rate in 2006 and	Suffolk Observatory <a href="http://www.suffolkobservatory.info">www.suffolkobservatory.info</a> Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring	Material Assets

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
stock) *	<p>However, some firms voluntarily register for VAT and these firms are included within the figures.</p> <p>** Business formation rates are the number of registrations as a percentage of stock during 2001.</p>			2001: 8.7	2007 was lower than that observed between 2001 and 2004.	Report 2007/08	
Business start ups and closures	<p><u>St Edmundsbury VAT Registrations*:</u> 2006: 310</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury VAT De-registrations*:</u> 2006: 235</p> <p>*VAT registrations and de-registrations are used as proxy measure for business formations and closures. Note - only firms with a turnover which exceeds £55,000 per annum must register for VAT. However some firms voluntarily register for VAT and these firms are included within the figures.</p>	<p><u>Suffolk VAT Stats – Registrations:</u> 2004: 2050 2003: 2130 2002: 2075 2001: 1860</p> <p><u>Suffolk VAT Stats – De-registrations:</u> 2004: 1,970 2003: 1,865 2002: 1,715 2001: 1,700</p>		<p><u>St Edmundsbury VAT Registrations*:</u> 2004: 345 2003: 310 2002: 340 2001: 295</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury VAT De-registrations*:</u> 2004: 280 2003: 275 2002: 235 2001: 260</p>	In 2004 SEBC had 4th highest number of de-registrations of all districts in Suffolk and the 2nd highest number of registrations. This represents a net change of +65. The number of VAT registrations in St Edmundsbury is fairly constant. The number of VAT de-registrations in 2006 was lower than in previous years.	<p>Suffolk Observatory - <a href="http://www.suffolkobservatory.info">www.suffolkobservatory.info</a></p> <p>SEBC – St Edmundsbury Profile 2006</p> <p>East of England Annual Monitoring Report 2006/07</p> <p>ONS data reported in St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08</p>	Material Assets
Employment by industry %	<u>St Edmundsbury % of total employment, 2006*:</u>	<p><u>Suffolk:</u></p> <p>Year                      04      03</p>	None identified.	<p><u>St Edmundsbury % of total employment</u></p> <p>Year                      04      03      02</p>	Employee % for agriculture, distribution and manufacturing	Suffolk Observatory - <a href="http://www.suffolkobservatory.info">www.suffolkobservatory.info</a>	Population

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	<p>Year <b>06</b></p> <p>Agriculture 1.3</p> <p>Energy *** 0.5</p> <p>Manufacturing 17.3</p> <p>Construction 5</p> <p>Distribution 24.8</p> <p>Transport 3.5</p> <p>Banking 13.3</p> <p>Public admin 30</p> <p>Other 4.3</p> <p>* Figures for SEBC do not add up to 100% this is due to rounding of data.</p> <p>** This fig. omits Ipswich Borough Council.</p> <p>** No data for energy at district borough level.</p>	<p>Agriculture ** 0.5 0.6</p> <p>Energy 1.9 1.3</p> <p>Manufacturing 14. 14.</p> <p>Construction 2 6</p> <p>Distribution 5 4.1</p> <p>Transport 24. 25.</p> <p>Banking 3 7</p> <p>Public admin 7.9 9.2</p> <p>Other 15. 14.</p> <p>Banking 9 9</p> <p>Public admin 26 4</p> <p>Other 5.1 6.2</p> <p><u>East of England:</u></p> <p>Service: 67%</p> <p>(Distribution, catering and repairs; Transport and communications; Banking, insurance and finance; Other services)</p> <p>Agriculture, forestry and fishing: 2.5%</p>		<p>Agriculture 1.4 1.4 1.6</p> <p>Energy *** - - -</p> <p>Manufacturing 18. 18.</p> <p>Construction 1 19 3</p> <p>Distribution 4.6 4.3 5.7</p> <p>Transport 24. 26. 29.</p> <p>Banking 8 4 6</p> <p>Public admin 3.3 3.5 2.7</p> <p>Other 13. 11. 10.</p> <p>Banking 4 9 5</p> <p>Public admin 29. 27. 26.</p> <p>Other 9 9 3</p> <p>Other 4 4.7 4.5</p>	<p>appear to be in decline during the period 2002-06. The proportion of people employed in agriculture and manufacturing in St Edmundsbury is significantly higher than for Suffolk. While % employed in public admin and banking appears to have increased between 2002 and 2004 and now stabilised.. Figures for transport and construction fluctuate slightly but overall appear to remain relatively static.</p> <p>These figures do not reflect the major differences in employment between the borough's principal urban areas. Haverhill is more industrial in nature with more than three times the proportion of manufacturing employment</p>	<p>St Edmundsbury LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2007/08</p> <p>England Rural Development Programme 2000 - 2006 <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/ERDP/docs/eastchapter/east13/employment.htm">http://www.defra.gov.uk/ERDP/docs/eastchapter/east13/employment.htm</a></p>	



Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic	
					compared to Bury which is dominated by public sector employment, accounting for almost one third of total employment.			
Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> Number and percentage of local units in all industries 2003 – 05 by broad industry group:		None identified.	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u>			Little change between 2003 and 2005. Minor increases in health, education, property and business services, motor trades and construction. Minor decreases in public administration and other services, transport, hotels and catering and retail. With unit numbers remaining static for all other industries. Percentage figures for St Edmundsbury 2005 are very similar to those for the county and compare very favourably to those for the East of England. Between 1998 and 2004, the Banking and	Material Assets

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
	property and business services 23 education 2 Health 2 public admin and other services 10.1	Health 1.5 public admin and other services 8.5 Note: % figures do not add up to 100% this is due to rounding of data by EERA for anonymity.		education 1.9 1.9 Health 1.7 1.7 public admin and other services 10 10.3  Sector Growth within St Edmundsbury 1998-2004  Agriculture and Fishing: -0.9% Energy and Water: -38.4% Manufacturing: -19.8% Construction: 14.7% Distribution: 4.6% Transport and Communications: 0.2% Banking and Finance Industry: 53.5% Public Administration, education and health: 22.4% Other: 1.5%	Finance industry, and the Public Admin, education and health sectors have seen significant levels of growth, with a large decline in the energy and water and manufacturing sectors.		
% Vacant units in town centres	Not monitored	No comparator data.	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national	No trend data available.	Further work required to obtain data for this indicator.		Material Assets

Indicator	Quantified data (St Edmundsbury)	Comparators (Quantified data for East of England and England)	Targets	Trends	Issues Identified	Source	SEA Topic
			average				
Import/export of workers to district and/or major towns	<u>St Edmundsbury:</u> % of working residents who remain in borough for work: 81.1%  % of working residents who remain in Bury St Edmunds for work: 65.9%	No comparator data available	None identified.	No trend data available.	Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.	Census 2001 East of England Observatory	Population
Number / percentage of people working from home as main place of work	<u>St Edmundsbury 2001:</u> 5,081 (10.1%) of population aged 16-74 in employment (50,181)	East of England <u>2001:</u> 243,485 (9.4%) of population aged 16-74 in employment (2,579,378)  England <u>2001:</u> 2,055,224 (9.2%) of population aged 16-74 in employment (22,441,498)	None identified.	No trend data available.	The proportion of the working population of St Edmundsbury who work at home was higher than that for the East of England and England in 2001.	Census 2001	Population

## Appendix B – Strategic Options Assessment Table

- B.1.1 This section presents the findings of the assessment of strategic spatial options in the St. Edmundsbury Core Strategy in full tabular format. A commentary/explanation for each of the assessment scorings is contained within the table. Table B.1 below explains the terms and symbols used in the assessment tables.

**Table B.1 – Scoring of Assessment**

3	+++	Major positive - likely to result in substantial progress towards the objective
2	++	Moderate positive - likely to result in some progress towards the objective
1	+	Minor positive - likely to result in very limited progress towards the objective
0	0	Neutral outcome
-0.5	+/-	Range of possible positive and negative outcomes
0	?	Uncertain outcome
-1	-	Minor negative - likely to be to the very limited detriment of achieving the objective
-2	--	Moderate negative - likely to be to the limited detriment of achieving the objective
-3	---	Major negative - likely to be substantially detrimental to achieving the objective

**Table B.2 - Assessment of Strategic Options for Spatial Strategy**

SA Objective		Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Commentary/Explanation
		Business as Usual	Urban Growth	Regeneration of Haverhill	Rural development	New settlement	
		Score	Score	Score	Score	Score	
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	+	++	++	+/-	++	Options 2, 3 and 5 are likely to deliver higher levels of benefits, as directing new growth to larger urban areas should help ensure better accessibility to health facilities and improve the provision of good cycle and pedestrian links with benefits for public health. Development in rural areas may provide opportunities for informal recreation but will restrain access to health facilities.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	+	++	++	+	+++	Options 2, 3 and 5 direct new growth to larger urban areas. This should help ensure better accessibility to educational, training and learning facilities. Option 5 scores the highest, as development of new settlement would also include provision of adequate community facilities, whereas additional growth in the existing settlements may put a strain on existing facilities.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	?	?	?	?	?	Insufficient information to make a meaningful assessment.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	0	0	++	0	0	There insufficient information to differentiate between most of the options, apart from Option 3, as deprivation levels in Haverhill are high compared to the rest of the borough and a larger scale development in Haverhill is likely to bring about opportunities for regeneration.
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	+	++	++	+/-	++	Directing new development to urban centres will improve accessibility to key services by enabling the use of public transport and non-motorised transport modes. New development in rural areas may help retain existing community facilities in villages, however, it is likely to lead to a continued reliance on the private car and may marginalise some social groups.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	+	++	++	-	+/-	Directing new development to urban centres would improve accessibility to existing employment opportunities and would also help attract new employment. Conversely, new development in rural areas is likely to restrict employment opportunities. Option 5, new settlement, although it may provide opportunities for creating new employment, it has potential for becoming a dormitory settlement with high dependency on the private car.

7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	+	++	++	--	+++	Urban growth provides opportunity for larger scale development, which is likely to also accommodate a proportion of affordable housing. Option 5 provides opportunity to provide the quality of volume house building of different types on a larger scale. Rural development is likely to be smaller in scale and may not be able to accommodate the required level of growth and deliver affordable housing as part of the scheme.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	+	++	++	+/-	+/-	Urban growth should provide opportunities for regeneration and provision of a mix of housing types, encouraging social cohesion, interaction and engagement. New settlement whilst providing opportunities within it, may lead to the lost opportunities in the existing settlements. Similarly, rural development may also divert from acting on opportunities in urban areas and is less likely to be conducive to social cohesion.
9	To improve water and air quality	-	--	--	--	-	Further development focused on the existing urban envelope would have the potential to result in: - negative effects on water quality due to high vulnerability of groundwater from intermediate leaching potential of soils - increased abstraction from potentially over-committed water supplies - increased densities of development, resulting in a considerable increase in impermeable surfaces, which may exacerbate the risk of pollutants entering watercourses from accelerated run off. The effects of development of new settlement would be less severe due the likely better baseline situation. More disperse development under Options 1 and 4 would help avoid incidences of overloading infrastructure, therefore these options would result in less severe negative effects than options 2 and 3. In terms of air quality effects, Option 4 is likely to perform the worst, it would lead to a continued reliance on the private car and air-borne pollution. Therefore, the combined effects for air and water quality of Option 4 are similar to those of Options 2 and 3.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	+	++	++	-	--	Option 1 includes sequential approach for sites allocation, thereby promoting the use of previously developed land. Urban development would also promote the reuse of derelict/ brownfield land, whilst Option 4 would lead to loss of green space within villages. Option 5 would result in loss of significant amount of greenfield land.

11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	+	+++	+++	--	++	More compact and dense development in urban areas is likely to lead to more resource savings features and thus be more resource efficient. Urban growth in existing settlements is likely to also provide opportunities for the re-use of existing buildings or structures.
12	To reduce waste	+	++	++	--	++	Compact urban development is also likely to make it more viable to implement effective recycling initiatives.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	+	++	++	--	++	Urban development is likely to help reduce the need to travel to access some local services, whilst rural development will exacerbate reliance on the private car.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	--	-	-	---	-	All new development will inevitably result in more GHG emissions from buildings and associated transport. However, new settlement would provide opportunities for energy-saving initiatives such as CHP. New development in the existing settlements may also provide potential for use of CHP systems, whilst rural development does not provide such opportunities and is likely to be less energy efficient and generate more GHG emissions from buildings and associated transport.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	-	--	--	-	--	New development is likely to exacerbate the existing flood risk through increased hard surfacing which may disrupt the natural water cycle and increase the likeliness of localised flooding. A more dispersed approach to development under Options 1 and 4 may lessen impacts arising from new development.
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	+	++	++	-	--	Further development in the urban existing settlement is likely to help preserve the countryside and natural habitats. Development of rural areas is likely to result in loss of green space and natural habitats. Effects of new settlement are similar but more severe due to the scale of development.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	+/-	++	++	-	--	Regeneration in the existing urban areas may result in some negative effects on cultural features, or it may improve the settings of these features. Development in rural areas may negatively affect culturally sensitive environments. New settlement may also affect culturally sensitive environments and unknown archaeological remains due to a large scale of the development.



18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	+	++	++	+/-	+/-	Development in the existing urban areas is likely to provide opportunities for regeneration and improvement of townscape. Development in rural areas may result affect rural landscape but may also help preserve village character. New settlement will provide opportunities for large scale high quality design development, but at the same time it may divert from regeneration opportunities in the existing towns and is likely to affect the existing landscape character.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	+++	++	++	+/-	++	Urban development under Option 2 and 3 will enable building on strengths of existing centres and improving the overall quality and attractiveness of the area. New settlement is likely to have the lowest cost of end product and provide opportunities to adopt sustainable development measures throughout the development and from the outset. More dispersed type of development under Options 1 also leads to significant positive effects by supporting the need for development in the rural service centres and thereby supporting sustainable community's development. Although development under Option 4 may help maintain livelihood of rural areas, it is likely to put a disproportional amount of pressure on natural assets and ecosystems services compared to the expected gains. Therefore, a mixture of positive and negative effects is expected.
20	To revitalise town centres	-	++	++	--	--	Options 2 and 3 supporting further growth in the existing urban centres are likely to help revitalise town centres whilst the other options will divert from these opportunities.
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	-	++	++	--	++	Options 2, 3 and 5, promoting urban development are likely to help promote the efficiency of transport networks, especially integration of sustainable modes.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	+	++	++	-	+/-	Regeneration of the existing urban centres may attract further inward investment. Although new settlement may also attract potential investors, scale of development/ risk, investment and commitment required for new settlement may be a deterrent to potential developers/ investors. Development in rural areas is less likely to provide stimulus for inward investment.

## Appendix C – Strategic Sites Assessment Tables

C.1.1 This section presents the findings of the assessment of strategic sites in and around Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill in full tabular format. A commentary/explanation for each of the assessment ratings is contained within the table. The assessment of the sites was undertaken using the following qualitative assessment scale:

Table C.1 – Key to Strategic Sites Assessment






	In conformity with the criterion		Not relevant to criterion / Neutral effects
	Partially meets the criterion / possibly in conflict with the criterion/ some constraints identified		Insufficient information is available
	In conflict with the criterion		

Table C.2 – Bury St. Edmunds - Site 1

SA Objective		Indicator	Notes	Colour Code
<b>Bury St. Edmunds - Site 1</b>				
Corresponding to site submission reference 39; Mixed Use Development (77.87ha).				
<b>Social</b>				
1	To improve health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	Is it within 30 mins of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport?	The site is within 30min of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport. The nearest doctor surgery is located about 2.98km from the site.	
		Will it lead to a direct loss of public open space or open access land?	The site will not result in any loss of public open space or open access land.	
		Will it improve accessibility by Public Rights of Way?	Nearby Public Rights of Way will improve accessibility to the site.	
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	Is it within 30 mins of a school by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of a primary school by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km)?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distance. The nearest primary school is located about 1,252 metres from the site.	
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will the site be located near or within LSOAs in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country?	As the site is not located within LSOA in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country, opportunities for regeneration are not likely.	
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	Is it within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to key services?	It is within cyclable distance but not walkable distance. Town centre is located approximately 2 km from the site.	
		Is it within 30 mins of a supermarket/ shopping centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of shops/supermarkets by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to supermarkets/shopping centre?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distance. The nearest grocery shop is located about 1,432 metres from the site.	

		Is the site proposed for mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities?	The site is proposed for mixed use development and will have good accessibility to local facilities.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	Is the site proposed for employment or mixed use with employment included?	The site is proposed for mixed use development with employment included.	
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	Is the site proposal over the relevant thresholds for the application of affordable housing policy? CS Policy H3 defines that, for Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill, for sites of 0.5ha and above, or 15 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable; for sites between 0.3ha and 0.5ha or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable, and for sites between 0.17ha and 3ha or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% should be affordable.	The proposed site area is 77.87 hectares and as such is above the relevant threshold for the application of affordable housing policy.	
8	To improve the quality of where people live and encourage community participation	Is the site proposed in a location with accessible natural green space?	The site is located next to an open access land.	
<b>Environmental</b>				
9	To improve water and air quality	Is the site proposed within a groundwater source protection zone?	The site is located within a groundwater source protection zone 2 and is within a major aquifer area.	
		Is the site proposed within a water abstraction management area?	The site is within a water abstraction management area.	
		Is the site proposed within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?	The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.	
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	Is the site proposed on Greenfield land?	The site is proposed on Greenfield Land.	
		Would it lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)?	The site is located on Grade 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.	
		Will it lead to remediation of contaminated land?	The site is not thought to be located on contaminated land.	
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	Does the site have good accessibility to local facilities (as assessed above)?	The site is proposed for mixed use development and it can be accessed by public transport, therefore, it should help minimise the need for travel and reliance on the private car.	

14	To reduce contributions to climate change	Will the site proposal promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments?	It is likely that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments, as Policy ENG1 of the Regional Plan states that new development of more than 10 dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of non residential floor space should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.	
		Is there a clear commitment to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes?	One of the requirements of the Policy CS2 is to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes for new-build dwellings and to achieve at least a BREEAM 'very good' rating for non-residential developments. This will be applicable for this site. Meeting Code Level 3 or achieving high BREEAM rating will help minimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	Does the site lie within the flood risk zones (2, 3a, 3b) identified in the SFRA and have a proposed 'non-compatible' use or is located within 9m of a river?	The site is not located within Flood Zones 2, 3a or 3b or located within 9m of a river.	
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Is the site in proximity to a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI	The site is not located in proximity to a SSSI, SAC or SPA.	
		Is the site in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 500m of a site.	The site is not located in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland.	
		Are BAP habitats known to be on the site?	There are no BAP habitats on the site or in its proximity.	

		Would it lead to a loss of or damage to a designated geological site - SSSI or RIGS (Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites). The site within 1km of a SSSI will be coded red and within 500m will be coded amber. The site adjacent to RIGS will be coded red and within 500m - amber.	There are no geological SSSIs or RIGS.	
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	Are there any listed buildings on or adjacent to the site?	There are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Conservation Area? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Conservation Area.	The site is adjacent to a village Conservation Area.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Historic Park and Garden? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Historic Park and Garden.	The site is not located in proximity to a Historic Park and Garden.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a SAM.	The nearest SAM is Fornham All Saints located about 100 meters away from the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance or a potential archaeological site? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of an Area of Archaeological Importance.	The site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance.	
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	Is the site in or adjacent to a Green Corridor? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Green Corridor.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Green Corridor.	

		Will the site development lead to coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages?	The site development will lead to coalescence of urban extension with Fornham All Saints.	
<b>Economic</b>				
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment?	The site is proposed for mixed-use development with employment.	
20	To revitalise town centres	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment in town centres?	The proposed site is located at the edge of the town.	
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Is the site proposed in a proximity to a public transport route or in a walkable/cyclable distance?	The site is located in proximity to a public transport route and the nearest bust stop is about 780 meters from the site.	
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	Will it increase employment land availability?	The site is proposed for mixed-use development with employment.	
<b>Summary Assessment</b>				
<p>The site abuts Bury St. Edmunds settlement boundary. It is a large-scale development (77.87ha) that would significantly increase the area of Bury St. Edmunds and result in the loss of a large area of greenfield agricultural land. It will also lead to coalescence of the urban extension with Fornham All Saints. The site would benefit from the services offered within Bury St. Edmunds and it has the advantage of being located in close proximity to a public transport route and to Public Rights of Way. The site is proposed for mixed use and has good accessibility to local facilities. Although is located adjacent to a Conservation Area, the proposed site is not within or in close proximity to any other statutory or locally designated sites and is not located within a flood zone.</p>				



Table C.3 - Bury St. Edmunds - Site 2

SA Objective		Indicator	Notes	Colour Code
<b>Bury St. Edmunds - Site 2</b>				
Corresponding to site submission references 40 - (25.04ha) and 41 - (23.59ha); 48.63 ha in total - Residential and Mixed Use Development.				
<b>Social</b>				
1	To improve health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	Is it within 30 mins of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport?	The site is within 30min of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport. The nearest doctor surgery is located about 2.04km from the site.	
		Will it lead to a direct loss of public open space or open access land?	The site will not result in any loss of public open space or open access land.	
		Will it improve accessibility by Public Rights of Way?	There are no nearby Public Rights of Way to improve accessibility to the site.	
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	Is it within 30 mins of a school by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of a primary school by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km)?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distance. The nearest primary school is located about 1,252 metres from the site.	
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will the site be located near or within LSOAs in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country?	As the site is not located within LSOA in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country, opportunities for regeneration are not likely.	
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	Is it within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to key services?	It is within cyclable distance but not walkable distance. Town centre is located approximately 2.5 km from the site.	
		Is it within 30 mins of a supermarket/ shopping centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of shops/supermarkets by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to supermarkets/shopping centre?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distance. The nearest grocery shop is located about 2,135 metres from the site.	

		Is the site proposed for mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities?	The site is proposed for employment.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	Is the site proposed for employment or mixed use with employment included?	The site is proposed for employment.	
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	Is the site proposal over the relevant thresholds for the application of affordable housing policy? CS Policy H3 defines that, for Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill, for sites of 0.5ha and above, or 15 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable; for sites between 0.3ha and 0.5ha or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable, and for sites between 0.17ha and 3ha or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% should be affordable.	The site is proposed for employment.	
8	To improve the quality of where people live and encourage community participation	Is the site proposed in a location with accessible natural green space?	The site is not located in proximity to an open access land. However, it is adjacent to a recreation/ amenity open space.	
<b>Environmental</b>				
9	To improve water and air quality	Is the site proposed within a groundwater source protection zone?	The site is located within a groundwater source protection zone 2 and is within a major aquifer area.	
		Is the site proposed within a water abstraction management area?	The site is within a water abstraction management area.	
		Is the site proposed within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?	The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.	
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	Is the site proposed on Greenfield land?	The site is proposed on Greenfield Land.	
		Would it lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)?	The site is located on Grade 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.	
		Will it lead to remediation of contaminated land?	The site is not thought to be located on contaminated land.	

13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	Does the site have good accessibility to local facilities (as assessed above)?	The site can be accessed by public transport and it is also within cyclable distances to the town centre and key services, therefore, it should help minimise the need for travel and reliance on the private car. As the nearest bus stop is located over 800m of the site, the site is coded amber.	
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	Will the site proposal promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments?	It is likely that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments as Policy ENG1 of the Regional Plan states that new development of more than 10 dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of non residential floor space should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.	
		Is there a clear commitment to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes?	One of the requirements of the Policy CS2 is to achieve at least a BREEAM 'very good' rating for non-residential developments. This will be applicable for this site. Achieving high BREEAM rating will help minimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	Does the site lie within the flood risk zones (2, 3a, 3b) identified in the SFRA and have a proposed 'non-compatible' use or is located within 9m of a river?	The site is not located within Flood Zones 2, 3a or 3b or located within 9m of a river.	
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Is the site in proximity to a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI	The site is not located in proximity to a SSSI, SAC or SPA.	
		Is the site in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 500m of a site.	The site is not located in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland. The nearest County Wildlife Site is Hyde Wood and is located approximately 800 meters from the site.	

		Are BAP habitats known to be on the site?	There are no BAP habitats on the site or in its proximity.	
		Would it lead to a loss of or damage to a designated geological site - SSSI or RIGS (Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites). The site within 1km of a SSSI will be coded red and within 500m will be coded amber. The site adjacent to RIGS will be coded red and within 500m - amber.	There are no geological SSSIs or RIGS.	
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	Are there any listed buildings on or adjacent to the site?	There are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Conservation Area? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Conservation Area.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Conservation Area.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Historic Park and Garden? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Historic Park and Garden.	The site is not located in proximity to a Historic Park and Garden.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a SAM.	The site is not located in proximity to a SAM.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance or a potential archaeological site? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of an Area of Archaeological Importance.	The site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance.	
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	Is the site in or adjacent to a Green Corridor? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Green Corridor.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Green Corridor.	

		Will the site development lead to coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages?	The site development will not lead to coalescence of urban extension with nearby villages.	
<b>Economic</b>				
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment?	The site is proposed for employment.	
20	To revitalise town centres	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment in town centres?	The proposed site is located at the edge of the town.	
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Is the site proposed in a proximity to a public transport route or in a walkable/cyclable distance?	The site is located in proximity to a public transport route. It is within cyclable distance, but not walkable distance. The nearest bus stop is about 1,012 meters from the site.	
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	Will it increase employment land availability?	The site is proposed for mixed-use development and will provide some employment opportunities.	
<b>Summary Assessment</b>				
<p>The site forms an urban extension to Bury St. Edmunds of 48.63ha. Its development would increase the area of Bury St. Edmunds and result in the loss of a comparatively large area of greenfield agricultural land. The site would benefit from the services offered within Bury St. Edmunds and it has the advantage of being located close to a public transport route - the nearest bus stop is located approximately 1km from the site. The site is proposed for employment only and has good accessibility to local facilities. The proposed site is not within or in close proximity to any statutory or locally designated sites and it is not located within an area of flood risk. The nearest County Wildlife Site (Hyde Wood) is located approximately 800m from the site.</p>				

Table C.4 – Bury St. Edmunds - Site 3 North of Westley Road

SA Objective		Indicator	Notes	Colour Code
<b>Bury St. Edmunds - Site 3 North of Westley Road</b>				
Corresponding to site submission references 5 - Residential and Mixed Use Development (52ha) and 6 Mixed Use Development (1.95ha); 53.95ha in total.				
<b>Social</b>				
1	To improve health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	Is it within 30 mins of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport?	The site is within 30min of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport. The nearest doctor surgery is located about 2.3km from the site.	
		Will it lead to a direct loss of public open space or open access land?	The site will not result in any loss of public open space or open access land.	
		Will it improve accessibility by Public Rights of Way?	Nearby Public Rights of Way will improve accessibility to the site.	
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	Is it within 30 mins of a school by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of a primary school by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km)?	It is within walkable and cyclable distances. The nearest primary school is located adjacent to the south border of the site.	
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will the site be located near or within LSOAs in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country?	As the site is not located within LSOA in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country, opportunities for regeneration are not likely.	
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	Is it within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to key services?	It is within cyclable distance but not walkable distance. Town centre is located approximately 2 km from the site.	
		Is it within 30 mins of a supermarket/ shopping centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of shops/supermarkets by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to supermarkets/shopping centre?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distance. The nearest grocery shop is located about 2.7km from the site.	

		Is the site proposed for mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities?	The site is proposed for mixed use development, including residential development and will have good accessibility to local facilities.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	Is the site proposed for employment or mixed use with employment included?	The site is proposed for mixed use development with employment included.	
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	Is the site proposal over the relevant thresholds for the application of affordable housing policy? CS Policy H3 defines that, for Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill, for sites of 0.5ha and above, or 15 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable; for sites between 0.3ha and 0.5ha or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable, and for sites between 0.17ha and 3ha or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% should be affordable.	The proposed site area is more than 50ha and as such is above the relevant threshold for the application of affordable housing policy.	
8	To improve the quality of where people live and encourage community participation	Is the site proposed in a location with accessible natural green space?	The site is located next to recreation/ amenity open spaces and the nearest open access land is located approximately 1.3km from the site.	
<b>Environmental</b>				
9	To improve water and air quality	Is the site proposed within a groundwater source protection zone?	The site is located within a groundwater source protection zone 2 and it is also within a major aquifer area.	
		Is the site proposed within a water abstraction management area?	The site is within a water abstraction management area.	
		Is the site proposed within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?	The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.	
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	Is the site proposed on Greenfield land?	The site is proposed on Greenfield Land.	
		Would it lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)?	The site is located on Grade 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.	
		Will it lead to remediation of contaminated land?	The site is not thought to be located on contaminated land.	

13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	Does the site have good accessibility to local facilities (as assessed above)?	The site can be accessed by public transport and it is also within cyclable distances to the town centre and key services, therefore, it should help minimise the need for travel and reliance on the private car. As the nearest bus stop is located approximately 50m from the site, the site is coded green.	
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	Will the site proposal promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments?	It is likely that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments as Policy ENG1 of the Regional Plan states that new development of more than 10 dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of non residential floor space should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.	
		Is there a clear commitment to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes?	One of the requirements of the Policy CS2 is to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes for new-build dwellings and to achieve at least a BREEAM 'very good' rating for non-residential developments. This will be applicable for this site. Meeting Code Level 3 or achieving high BREEAM rating will help minimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	Does the site lie within the flood risk zones (2, 3a, 3b) identified in the SFRA and have a proposed 'non-compatible' use or is located within 9m of a river?	The site is not located within Flood Zones 2, 3a or 3b or located within 9m of a river.	
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Is the site in proximity to a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI	The site is not located in proximity to a SSSI, SAC or SPA.	



		Is the site in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 500m of a site.	The site is not located in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland. The nearest County Wildlife Site is Ickworth Park located approximately 1.3km from the site.	
		Are BAP habitats known to be on the site?	There are no BAP habitats on the site or in its proximity.	
		Would it lead to a loss of or damage to a designated geological site - SSSI or RIGS (Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites). The site within 1km of a SSSI will be coded red and within 500m will be coded amber. The site adjacent to RIGS will be coded red and within 500m - amber.	There are no geological SSSIs or RIGS.	
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	Are there any listed buildings on or adjacent to the site?	There are no listed buildings on the site. However, there are three listed buildings adjacent to the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Conservation Area? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Conservation Area.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Conservation Area.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Historic Park and Garden? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Historic Park and Garden.	The site is not located in proximity to a Historic Park and Garden.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a SAM.	The site is not located in proximity to a SAM.	

		Is the site in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance or a potential archaeological site? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of an Area of Archaeological Importance.	The site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance.	
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	Is the site in or adjacent to a Green Corridor? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Green Corridor.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Green Corridor.	
		Will the site development lead to coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages?	The site development will lead to coalescence of urban extension with Westley.	
<b>Economic</b>				
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment?	The site is proposed for mixed-use development with employment.	
20	To revitalise town centres	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment in town centres?	The proposed site is located at the edge of the town.	
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Is the site proposed in a proximity to a public transport route or in a walkable/cyclable distance?	The site is located in proximity to a public transport route and the nearest bust stop is located approximately 50m from the site.	
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	Will it increase employment land availability?	The site is proposed for mixed-use development with employment.	
<b>Summary Assessment</b>				
<p>The site abuts Bury St. Edmunds settlement boundary. It is a large-scale development (50+ha) that would significantly increase the area of Bury St. Edmunds and result in the loss of a large area of greenfield agricultural land. The development of the site would also lead to coalescence of urban extension with Westley and may affect the quality of groundwater, as it is located within a water abstraction management area and a groundwater source protection zone 2 . On the positive side, the site would benefit from the services offered within Bury St. Edmunds and it has the advantage of being located close to a public transport route - the nearest bus stop is located approximately 50m from the site and to a Public Right of Way. The site is proposed for mixed use with employment included and has good accessibility to local facilities. The proposed site is not within or in close proximity to any statutory or locally designated sites and is not located within a flood zone. The nearest County Wildlife Site (Ickworth Park) is located approximately 1.3km from the site.</p>				

Table C.5 – Bury St. Edmunds - Site 3 South of Westley Road

SA Objective		Indicator	Notes	Colour Code
<b>Bury St. Edmunds - Site 3 South of Westley Road</b>				
Corresponding to site submission reference 122 - Residential Use (53ha).				
<b>Social</b>				
1	To improve health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	Is it within 30 mins of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport?	The site is within 30min of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport. The nearest doctor surgery is located about 2.5km from the site.	
		Will it lead to a direct loss of public open space or open access land?	The site will not result in any loss of public open space or open access land.	
		Will it improve accessibility by Public Rights of Way?	There are no nearby Public Rights of Way to improve accessibility to the site.	
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	Is it within 30 mins of a school by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of a primary school by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km)?	It is within walkable and cyclable distances. The nearest primary school is located approximately 200m from the site.	
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will the site be located near or within LSOAs in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country?	As the site is not located within LSOA in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country, opportunities for regeneration are not likely.	
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	Is it within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to key services?	It is within cyclable distance but not walkable distance. Town centre is located approximately 2km from the site.	
		Is it within 30 mins of a supermarket/ shopping centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of shops/supermarkets by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to supermarkets/shopping centre?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distances. The nearest grocery shop is located about 2.5km from the site.	

		Is the site proposed for mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities?	The site is proposed for residential development and it will have good accessibility to local facilities.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	Is the site proposed for employment or mixed use with employment included?	The site is proposed for residential development.	
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	Is the site proposal over the relevant thresholds for the application of affordable housing policy? CS Policy H3 defines that, for Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill, for sites of 0.5ha and above, or 15 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable; for sites between 0.3ha and 0.5ha or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable, and for sites between 0.17ha and 3ha or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% should be affordable.	The proposed site area is 53ha and as such is above the relevant threshold for the application of affordable housing policy.	
8	To improve the quality of where people live and encourage community participation	Is the site proposed in a location with accessible natural green space?	The site is located adjacent to recreation/ amenity open spaces and the nearest open access land is located approximately 600m from the site.	
<b>Environmental</b>				
9	To improve water and air quality	Is the site proposed within a groundwater source protection zone?	The site is located within a groundwater source protection zone 2 and it is also within a major aquifer area.	
		Is the site proposed within a water abstraction management area?	The site is within a water abstraction management area.	
		Is the site proposed within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?	The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.	
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	Is the site proposed on Greenfield land?	The site is proposed on Greenfield Land.	
		Would it lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)?	Great part of the site is located on Grade 3 Agricultural Land and a very small area north of the site is located on Grade 2 Agricultural Land.	
		Will it lead to remediation of contaminated land?	The site is not thought to be located on contaminated land.	

13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	Does the site have good accessibility to local facilities (as assessed above)?	The site can be accessed by public transport and it is also within cyclable distances to the town centre and key services, therefore, it should help minimise the need for travel and reliance on the private car. As the nearest bus stop is located about 800m of the site, the site is coded green.	
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	Will the site proposal promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments?	It is likely that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments as Policy ENG1 of the Regional Plan states that new development of more than 10 dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of non residential floor space should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.	
		Is there a clear commitment to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes?	One of the requirements of the Policy CS2 is to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes for new-build dwellings. This will be applicable for this site. Meeting Code Level 3 will help minimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	Does the site lie within the flood risk zones (2, 3a, 3b) identified in the SFRA and have a proposed 'non-compatible' use or is located within 9m of a river?	The site is partially located within Flood Zones 3 on the area where River Linnet crosses the site.	
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Is the site in proximity to a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI	The site is located approximately 450m from a SSSI (Horringer Court Caves SSSI).	
		Is the site in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 500m of a site.	The site is not located in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland. The nearest County Wildlife Site is Hyde Wood and is located approximately 670 meters from the site.	

		Are BAP habitats known to be on the site?	There are no BAP habitats on the site or in its proximity.	
		Would it lead to a loss of or damage to a designated geological site - SSSI or RIGS (Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites). The site within 1km of a SSSI will be coded red and within 500m will be coded amber. The site adjacent to RIGS will be coded red and within 500m - amber.	There are no geological SSSIs or RIGS.	
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	Are there any listed buildings on or adjacent to the site?	There are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Conservation Area? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Conservation Area.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Conservation Area.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Historic Park and Garden? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Historic Park and Garden.	The site is not located in proximity to a Historic Park and Garden.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a SAM.	The site is not located in proximity to a SAM.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance or a potential archaeological site? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of an Area of Archaeological Importance.	The site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance.	
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	Is the site in or adjacent to a Green Corridor? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Green Corridor.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Green Corridor.	

		Will the site development lead to coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages?	The site development will not lead to coalescence of urban extension with nearby villages.	
<b>Economic</b>				
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment?	The site is proposed for residential development without employment.	
20	To revitalise town centres	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment in town centres?	The proposed site is located at the edge of the town and is proposed for residential development only.	
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Is the site proposed in a proximity to a public transport route or in a walkable/cyclable distance?	The site is located in proximity to a public transport route and the nearest bust stop is about 800 meters from the site.	
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	Will it increase employment land availability?	The site is proposed for residential development only.	
<b>Summary Assessment</b>				
<p>The site abuts Bury St. Edmunds settlement boundary. It is a large-scale development (53ha) that would significantly increase the area of Bury St. Edmunds and result in the loss of a large area of greenfield agricultural land. The site development may affect the quality of groundwater, as it is located within a water abstraction management area and a groundwater source protection zone 2. On the positive side, the site would benefit from the services offered within Bury St. Edmunds and it would have the advantage of being located close to a public transport route - the nearest bus stop is located approximately 800m from the site. The site is proposed for residential use only and it has good accessibility to local facilities. The proposed site is located in proximity of Horringer Court Caves SSSI (about 450m). This may necessitate incorporation of mitigation measures in the site design and development. The nearest County Wildlife Site Hyde Wood is located approximately 670m from the site. The site is partially located within a high flood risk area (Flood Zone 3) where River Linnet crosses the site.</p>				

Table C.6 - Bury St. Edmunds - Site 4

SA Objective		Indicator	Notes	Colour Code
Bury St. Edmunds - Site 4				
Corresponding to site submission references 37, 89 and 128 (West side of the A14) - Residential, Mixed Use and Employment; 61 - Regional Sporting Centre; 95 - Residential and Mixed Use with Employment; 75ha in total.				
Social				
1	To improve health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	Is it within 30 mins of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport?	The site is within 30min of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport. The nearest doctor surgery is located about 850m from the site.	
		Will it lead to a direct loss of public open space or open access land?	The site will not result in any loss of public open space or open access land.	
		Will it improve accessibility by Public Rights of Way?	Nearby Public Rights of Way will improve accessibility to the site.	
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	Is it within 30 mins of a school by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of a primary school by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km)?	It is within walkable and cyclable distances. The nearest primary school is located approximately 200m from the site.	
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will the site be located near or within LSOAs in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country?	As the site is not located within LSOA in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country, opportunities for regeneration are not likely.	
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	Is it within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to key services?	It is within walkable and cyclable distance. Town centre is located approximately 500m from the site.	
		Is it within 30 mins of a supermarket/shopping centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of shops/supermarkets by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to supermarkets/shopping centre?	It is within walkable and cyclable distances. The nearest grocery shop is located about 200m from the site.	



		Is the site proposed for mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities?	The site is proposed for mixed use development and it will have good accessibility to local facilities.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	Is the site proposed for employment or mixed use with employment included?	The site is proposed for residential, mixed use development and employment.	
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	Is the site proposal over the relevant thresholds for the application of affordable housing policy? CS Policy H3 defines that, for Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill, for sites of 0.5ha and above, or 15 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable; for sites between 0.3ha and 0.5ha or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable, and for sites between 0.17ha and 3ha or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% should be affordable.	The proposed site area is 75ha and as such is above the relevant threshold for the application of affordable housing policy.	
8	To improve the quality of where people live and encourage community participation	Is the site proposed in a location with accessible natural green space?	The site is located in close proximity to recreation/ amenity open spaces and the nearest open access land is located adjacent to the site.	
<b>Environmental</b>				
9	To improve water and air quality	Is the site proposed within a groundwater source protection zone?	The site is located within a groundwater source protection zone 2 and it is also within a major aquifer area.	
		Is the site proposed within a water abstraction management area?	The site lies within a water abstraction management area.	
		Is the site proposed within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?	The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.	
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	Is the site proposed on Greenfield land?	The site is proposed on Greenfield Land.	
		Would it lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)?	The site is located on Grade 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.	
		Will it lead to remediation of contaminated land?	The site is not thought to be located on contaminated land.	

13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	Does the site have good accessibility to local facilities (as assessed above)?	The site can be accessed by public transport and it is also within cyclable distances to the town centre and key services, therefore, it should help minimise the need for travel and reliance on the private car. As the nearest bus stop is located about 200m of the site, the site is coded green.	
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	Will the site proposal promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments?	It is likely that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments as Policy ENG1 of the Regional Plan states that new development of more than 10 dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of non residential floor space should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.	
		Is there a clear commitment to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes?	One of the requirements of the Policy CS2 is to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes for new-build dwellings and to achieve at least a BREEAM 'very good' rating for non-residential developments. This will be applicable for this site. Meeting Code Level 3 or achieving high BREEAM rating will help minimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	Does the site lie within the flood risk zones (2, 3a, 3b) identified in the SFRA and have a proposed 'non-compatible' use or is located within 9m of a river?	A river body is crossing the site and a significant proportion of the site is located within Flood Zone 2 and 3.	
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Is the site in proximity to a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI	The site is located approximately 80m from a SSSI (Shaker's Lane SSSI).	

		Is the site in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 500m of a site.	The site is located approximately 240m from a Local Nature Reserve (Moreton Hall Community Woods). There are no County Wildlife Sites or Ancient Woodlands in proximity.	
		Are BAP habitats known to be on the site?	There are no BAP habitats on the site or in its proximity.	
		Would it lead to a loss of or damage to a designated geological site - SSSI or RIGS (Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites). The site within 1km of a SSSI will be coded red and within 500m will be coded amber. The site adjacent to RIGS will be coded red and within 500m - amber.	There are no geological SSSIs or RIGS.	
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	Are there any listed buildings on or adjacent to the site?	There are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Conservation Area? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Conservation Area.	Part of the northern boundary of the site is adjacent to a Conservation Area.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Historic Park and Garden? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Historic Park and Garden.	The site is located approximately 150m from a Registered Park and Garden (Abbey Gardens and Precincts).	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a SAM.	The north boundary of the site is adjacent to a SAM (Bury St. Edmund's Abbey).	

		Is the site in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance or a potential archaeological site? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of an Area of Archaeological Importance.	The site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance.	
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	Is the site in or adjacent to a Green Corridor? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Green Corridor.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Green Corridor.	
		Will the site development lead to coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages?	The site development will not lead to coalescence of urban extension with nearby villages.	
<b>Economic</b>				
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment?	The site is proposed for residential and mixed-use development with employment.	
20	To revitalise town centres	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment in town centres?	The proposed site is located at the edge of the town.	
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Is the site proposed in a proximity to a public transport route or in a walkable/cyclable distance?	The site is located in proximity to a public transport route and the nearest bust stop is located approximately 200m from the site.	
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	Will it increase employment land availability?	The site is proposed for residential and mixed-use development with employment.	
<b>Summary Assessment</b>				
<p>The site represents a large-scale urban extension (75ha), the development of which would significantly increase the area of Bury St. Edmunds and result in the loss of a large area of greenfield agricultural land. On the plus side, the site would benefit from the services offered within Bury St. Edmunds and it has the advantage of being located close to a public transport route - the nearest bus stop is located approximately 200m from the site and to Public Rights of Way. The site is proposed for residential and mixed use development with employment and has good accessibility to local facilities. The proposed site is located in proximity to the following designated sites: Shaker's Lane SSSI (about 80m) and Moreton Hall Community Woods Local Nature Reserve (about 240m). The site is also located approximately 150m from a Registered Park and Garden and the part of the northern boundary of the site is adjacent to a SAM. This may necessitate incorporation of mitigation measures in the site design and development to avoid potential effects on ecological and heritage assets and their settings. A water body crosses the site and a significant proportion of the proposed site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p>				

Table C.7 - Bury St. Edmunds - Site 4a

SA Objective		Indicator	Notes	Colour Code
<b>Bury St. Edmunds - Site 4a</b>				
No site submission reference - Proposed use - Residential and Public Open Space; 30ha in total.				
<b>Social</b>				
1	To improve health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	Is it within 30 mins of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport?	The site is within 30min of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport. The nearest doctor surgery is located about 1.5km from the site.	
		Will it lead to a direct loss of public open space or open access land?	The site will not result in any loss of public open space or open access land.	
		Will it improve accessibility by Public Rights of Way?	Nearby Public Rights of Way will improve accessibility to the site.	
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	Is it within 30 mins of a school by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of a primary school by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km)?	It is within walkable and cyclable distances. The nearest primary school is located approximately 750m from the site.	
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will the site be located near or within LSOAs in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country?	As the site is not located within LSOA in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country, opportunities for regeneration are not likely.	
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	Is it within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to key services?	It is within cyclable distance but not within walkable distance. Town centre is located approximately 2km from the site.	
		Is it within 30 mins of a supermarket/shopping centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of shops/supermarkets by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to supermarkets/shopping centre?	It is within cyclable distance but not walkable distance. The nearest grocery shop is located about 2.8km from the site.	

		Is the site proposed for mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities?	The site is proposed for residential development and public open space it will have good accessibility to local facilities.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	Is the site proposed for employment or mixed use with employment included?	The site is proposed for residential development and public open space.	
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	Is the site proposal over the relevant thresholds for the application of affordable housing policy? CS Policy H3 defines that, for Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill, for sites of 0.5ha and above, or 15 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable; for sites between 0.3ha and 0.5ha or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable, and for sites between 0.17ha and 3ha or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% should be affordable.	The proposed site area is 30ha and as such is above the relevant threshold for the application of affordable housing policy.	
8	To improve the quality of where people live and encourage community participation	Is the site proposed in a location with accessible natural green space?	The site is located in close proximity to recreation/amenity open spaces and the nearest open access land is located adjacent to the site.	
<b>Environmental</b>				
9	To improve water and air quality	Is the site proposed within a groundwater source protection zone?	The site is located within a groundwater source protection zone 2 and partially within a groundwater source protection zone 1. It also lies within a major aquifer area.	
		Is the site proposed within a water abstraction management area?	The site is within a water abstraction management area.	
		Is the site proposed within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?	The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.	
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	Is the site proposed on Greenfield land?	The site is proposed on Greenfield Land.	
		Would it lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)?	The site is located on Grade 3 Agricultural Land.	
		Will it lead to remediation of contaminated land?	Insufficient information is available.	?

13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	Does the site have good accessibility to local facilities (as assessed above)?	The site can be accessed by public transport and it is also within cyclable distances to the town centre and key services, therefore, it should help minimise the need for travel and reliance on the private car. As the nearest bus stop is located about 500m of the site, the site is coded green.	
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	Will the site proposal promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments?	It is likely that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments as Policy ENG1 of the Regional Plan states that new development of more than 10 dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of non residential floor space should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.	
		Is there a clear commitment to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes?	One of the requirements of the Policy CS2 is to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes for new-build dwellings and to achieve at least a BREEAM 'very good' rating for non-residential developments. This will be applicable for this site. Meeting Code Level 3 or achieving high BREEAM rating will help minimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	Does the site lie within the flood risk zones (2, 3a, 3b) identified in the SFRA and have a proposed 'non-compatible' use or is located within 9m of a river?	The site is partially located within Flood Zone 2 and 3 and it is adjacent to a river body.	
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Is the site in proximity to a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI	The site is located approximately 1.3km from a SSSI (Shaker's Lane SSSI).	

		Is the site in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 500m of a site.	The site is not located in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland. The nearest Local Nature Reserve, Moreton Hall Community Woods, is located approximately 1.2km from the site.	
		Are BAP habitats known to be on the site?	There are no BAP habitats on the site or in its proximity.	
		Would it lead to a loss of or damage to a designated geological site - SSSI or RIGS (Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites). The site within 1km of a SSSI will be coded red and within 500m will be coded amber. The site adjacent to RIGS will be coded red and within 500m - amber.	There are no geological SSSIs or RIGS in proximity to the site.	
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	Are there any listed buildings on or adjacent to the site?	There are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Conservation Area? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Conservation Area.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Conservation Area.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Historic Park and Garden? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Historic Park and Garden.	The site is not located in proximity to a Historic Park and Garden.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a SAM.	The site is not located in proximity to a SAM.	



		Is the site in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance or a potential archaeological site? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of an Area of Archaeological Importance.	The site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance.	
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	Is the site in or adjacent to a Green Corridor? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Green Corridor.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Green Corridor.	
		Will the site development lead to coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages?	The site development will not lead to coalescence of the urban extension with nearby villages.	
<b>Economic</b>				
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment?	The site is proposed for residential development and public open space without employment.	
20	To revitalise town centres	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment in town centres?	The proposed site is located at the edge of the town and is proposed for residential development only with public open spaces included.	
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Is the site proposed in a proximity to a public transport route or in a walkable/cyclable distance?	The site is located in proximity to a public transport route and the nearest bust stop is located approximately 500m from the site.	
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	Will it increase employment land availability?	The site is proposed for residential development and public open space.	
<b>Summary Assessment</b>				
<p>Site 4a is an urban extension to Bury St. Edmunds of 30ha. Its development would result in the loss of a comparatively large area of greenfield agricultural land. The site is located within a groundwater source protection zone 2 and partially within a groundwater source protection zone 1, as well as within a water abstraction management area. Therefore, the site development may affect the quality of groundwater. On the plus side, the site would benefit from the services offered within Bury St. Edmunds and it would have the advantage of being located close to a public transport route - the nearest bus stop is located approximately 500m from the site and to Public Rights of Way. The site is proposed for residential development and public open space and it has good accessibility to local facilities. The proposed site is located in proximity to the Shaker's Lane SSSI (about 1.3km). However, there are no other statutory or locally designated sites in its proximity. The site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and it is adjacent to a water body.</p>				

Table C.8 - Bury St. Edmunds - Site 5

SA Objective		Indicator	Notes	Colour Code
<b>Bury St. Edmunds - Site 5</b>				
Corresponding to site submission references 73 - Residential (6.23ha), 94 - Residential (30.38ha) and 130 - Residential and Commercial with additional ancillary uses (17.88ha); 54.49ha in total.				
<b>Social</b>				
1	To improve health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	Is it within 30 mins of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport?	The site is within 30min of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport. The nearest doctor surgery is located about 1.75km from the site.	
		Will it lead to a direct loss of public open space or open access land?	The site will not result in any loss of public open space or open access land.	
		Will it improve accessibility by Public Rights of Way?	Nearby Public Rights of Way will improve accessibility to the site.	
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	Is it within 30 mins of a school by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of a primary school by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km)?	It is within cyclable distance but not within walking distance. The nearest primary school is located approximately 850m from the site.	
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will the site be located near or within LSOAs in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country?	As the site is not located within LSOA in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country, opportunities for regeneration are not likely.	
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	Is it within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to key services?	It is within cyclable distance but not walkable distance. Town centre is located approximately 3km from the site.	
		Is it within 30 mins of a supermarket/ shopping centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of shops/supermarkets by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to supermarkets/shopping centre?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distance. The nearest grocery shop that can provide is located about 3km from the site.	

		Is the site proposed for mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities?	The site is proposed for residential development and it will have good accessibility to local facilities.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	Is the site proposed for employment or mixed use with employment included?	The site is proposed for mixed use development with employment included.	
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	Is the site proposal over the relevant thresholds for the application of affordable housing policy? CS Policy H3 defines that, for Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill, for sites of 0.5ha and above, or 15 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable; for sites between 0.3ha and 0.5ha or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable, and for sites between 0.17ha and 3ha or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% should be affordable.	The proposed site area is 54.49ha and as such is above the relevant threshold for the application of affordable housing policy.	
8	To improve the quality of where people live and encourage community participation	Is the site proposed in a location with accessible natural green space?	The site is located next to recreation/ amenity open spaces and the nearest open access land is located approximately 1.45km from the site.	
<b>Environmental</b>				
9	To improve water and air quality	Is the site proposed within a groundwater source protection zone?	The site is located within a groundwater source protection zone 2 and it is also lies within a major aquifer area.	
		Is the site proposed within a water abstraction management area?	The site is within a water abstraction management area.	
		Is the site proposed within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?	The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.	
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	Is the site proposed on Greenfield land?	The site is proposed on Greenfield Land.	
		Would it lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)?	The site is located on Grade 3 Agricultural Land.	
		Will it lead to remediation of contaminated land?	The site is not thought to be located on contaminated land.	

13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	Does the site have good accessibility to local facilities (as assessed above)?	The site can be accessed by public transport and it is also within cyclable distances to the town centre and key services, therefore, it should help minimise the need for travel and reliance on the private car. As the nearest bus stop is located approximately 100m from the site, the site is coded green.	
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	Will the site proposal promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments?	It is likely that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments as Policy ENG1 of the regional plan states that new development of more than 10 dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of non residential floor space should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.	
		Is there a clear commitment to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes?	One of the requirements of the Policy CS2 is to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes for new-build dwellings and to achieve at least a BREEAM 'very good' rating for non-residential developments. This will be applicable for this site. Meeting Code Level 3 or achieving high BREEAM rating will help minimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	Does the site lie within the flood risk zones (2, 3a, 3b) identified in the SFRA and have a proposed 'non-compatible' use or is located within 9m of a river?	The site is not located within Flood Zones 2, 3a or 3b or within 9m of a river.	
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Is the site in proximity to a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI	The site is located approximately 1.5km of a SSSI (The Glen Chalk Caves). However, is not located in proximity to a SAC or SPA.	

		Is the site in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 500m of a site.	The site is not located in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland. The nearest Local Nature Reserve is Moreton Hall Community Woods located approximately 1km from the site.	
		Are BAP habitats known to be on the site?	There are no BAP habitats on the site or in its proximity.	
		Would it lead to a loss of or damage to a designated geological site - SSSI or RIGS (Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites). The site within 1km of a SSSI will be coded red and within 500m will be coded amber. The site adjacent to RIGS will be coded red and within 500m - amber.	There are no geological SSSIs or RIGS.	
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	Are there any listed buildings on or adjacent to the site?	There are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Conservation Area? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Conservation Area.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Conservation Area.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Historic Park and Garden? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Historic Park and Garden.	The site is not located in proximity to a Historic Park and Garden.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a SAM.	The site is not located in proximity to a SAM.	

		Is the site in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance or a potential archaeological site? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of an Area of Archaeological Importance.	The site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance.	
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	Is the site in or adjacent to a Green Corridor? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Green Corridor.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Green Corridor.	
		Will the site development lead to coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages?	The site development will not lead to coalescence of urban extension with nearby villages.	
<b>Economic</b>				
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment?	The site is proposed for residential development with employment.	
20	To revitalise town centres	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment in town centres?	The proposed site is located at the edge of the town.	
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Is the site proposed in a proximity to a public transport route or in a walkable/cyclable distance?	The site is located in proximity to a public transport route and the nearest bust stop is located approximately 100m from the site.	
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	Will it increase employment land availability?	The site is proposed for residential development with employment.	
<b>Summary Assessment</b>				
<p>The 54.49ha site abuts Bury St. Edmunds settlement boundary. Its development would lead to a comparatively substantial increase in the area of Bury St. Edmunds and result in the loss of a large area of greenfield agricultural land. It may also affect the quality of groundwater, as it is located within a water abstraction management area and a groundwater source protection zone 2. The proposed site is located in proximity to the Glen Chalk Caves SSSI (about 1.5km). The nearest Local Nature Reserve is Moreton Hall Community Woods located approximately 1km from the site. Similarly to the other proposed sites, this site would benefit from the services offered within Bury St. Edmunds and it would have the advantage of being located close to a public transport route - the nearest bus stop is located approximately 100m from the site and to Public Rights of Way. The site is proposed for residential and commercial development with additional ancillary uses (with employment) and has good accessibility to local facilities. The site is not located within a flood risk area.</p>				

Table C.9 - Bury St. Edmunds - Site 6

SA Objective		Indicator	Notes	Colour Code
<b>Bury St. Edmunds - Site 6</b>				
Corresponding to site submission references 48 and 65 (133ha in total); Site 48 - Residential and Community Facilities and Site 65 - Residential and Community Facilities.				
1	To improve health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	Is it within 30 mins of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport?	The site is within 30min of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport. The nearest doctor surgery is located about 0.83km from the site.	
		Will it lead to a direct loss of public open space or open access land?	The site will not result in any loss of public open space or open access land.	
		Will it improve accessibility by Public Rights of Way?	Nearby Public Rights of Way will improve accessibility to the site.	
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	Is it within 30 mins of a school by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of a primary school by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km)?	It is within cyclable distance but not within walking distance. The nearest primary school is located approximately 1,000m from the site.	
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will the site be located near or within LSOAs in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country?	As the site is not located within LSOA in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country, opportunities for regeneration are not likely.	
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	Is it within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to key services?	It is within cyclable distance but not walkable distance. Town centre is located approximately 2.4 km from the site.	
		Is it within 30 mins of a supermarket/ shopping centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of shops/supermarkets by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to supermarkets/shopping centre?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distance. The nearest grocery shop is located about 1,600m from the site.	

		Is the site proposed for mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities?	Although the site is proposed for residential and community facilities development, it has already good accessibility to existing local facilities.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	Is the site proposed for employment or mixed use with employment included?	The site is proposed for residential and community development and it is likely to provide some employment with the construction of new community facilities.	
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	Is the site proposal over the relevant thresholds for the application of affordable housing policy? CS Policy H3 defines that, for Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill, for sites of 0.5ha and above, or 15 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable; for sites between 0.3ha and 0.5ha or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable, and for sites between 0.17ha and 3ha or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% should be affordable.	The proposed site area is 133ha and as such is above the relevant threshold for the application of affordable housing policy.	
8	To improve the quality of where people live and encourage community participation	Is the site proposed in a location with accessible natural green space?	The site is located next to recreation/ amenity open spaces and the nearest open access land is located approximately 600m from the site.	
<b>Environmental</b>				
9	To improve water and air quality	Is the site proposed within a groundwater source protection zone?	The site is located within a groundwater source protection zone 2 and is within a major aquifer area.	
		Is the site proposed within a water abstraction management area?	The site is within a water abstraction management area.	
		Is the site proposed within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?	The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.	
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	Is the site proposed on Greenfield land?	The site is proposed on Greenfield Land.	
		Would it lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)?	The site is located on Grade 2 and 3 Agricultural Land.	
		Will it lead to remediation of contaminated land?	The site is not thought to be located on contaminated land.	



13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	Does the site have good accessibility to local facilities (as assessed above)?	The site can be accessed by public transport and it is also within cyclable distances to the town centre and key services, although a range of community facilities is also being proposed for the site. As the nearest bus stop is located approximately 150m from the site, the site is coded green.	
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	Will the site proposal promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments?	It is thought that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments as Policy ENG1 of the regional plan states that new development of more than 10 dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of non residential floor space should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.	
		Is there a clear commitment to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes?	One of the requirements of the Policy CS2 is to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes for new-build dwellings and to achieve at least a BREEAM 'very good' rating for non-residential developments. This will be applicable for this site. Meeting Code Level 3 or achieving high BREEAM rating will help minimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	Does the site lie within the flood risk zones (2, 3a, 3b) identified in the SFRA and have a proposed 'non-compatible' use or is located within 9m of a river?	The site is not located within Flood Zones 2, 3a or 3b or located within 9m of a river.	
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Is the site in proximity to a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI	The site is located approximately 800m of a SSSI (The Glen Chalk Caves). However, is not located in proximity to a SAC or SPA.	

		Is the site in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 500m of a site.	The site is not located in proximity to a County Wildlife Site or Ancient Woodland. However, the nearest Local Nature Reserve, Moreton Hall Community Woods, is located approximately 500m from the site.	
		Are BAP habitats known to be on the site?	There are no BAP habitats on the site or in its proximity.	
		Would it lead to a loss of or damage to a designated geological site - SSSI or RIGS (Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites). The site within 1km of a SSSI will be coded red and within 500m will be coded amber. The site adjacent to RIGS will be coded red and within 500m - amber.	There are no geological SSSIs or RIGS.	
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	Are there any listed buildings on or adjacent to the site?	There are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Conservation Area? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Conservation Area.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Conservation Area.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Historic Park and Garden? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Historic Park and Garden.	The site is not located in proximity to a Historic Park and Garden.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a SAM.	The site is not located in proximity to a SAM.	

		Is the site in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance or a potential archaeological site? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of an Area of Archaeological Importance.	The site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance.	
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	Is the site in or adjacent to a Green Corridor? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Green Corridor.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Green Corridor.	
		Will the site development lead to coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages?	The site development will not lead to coalescence of the urban extension with nearby villages.	
<b>Economic</b>				
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment?	The site is proposed for residential use and community facilities development. It may provide some employment opportunities at the new community facilities.	
20	To revitalise town centres	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment in town centres?	The proposed site is located at the edge of the town.	
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Is the site proposed in a proximity to a public transport route or in a walkable/cyclable distance?	The site is located in proximity to a public transport route and the nearest bust stop is located approximately 150m from the site.	
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	Will it increase employment land availability?	There may be some benefits against this objective, but they are likely to be not significant.	
<b>Summary Assessment</b>				
<p>The proposed site represents a large-scale urban extension of 133ha, potentially leading to a significant increase in the area of Bury St. Edmunds and resulting in the loss of a large area of greenfield agricultural land. The site development may affect the quality of groundwater, as it is located within a water abstraction management area and a groundwater source protection zone 2. The proposed site is located in proximity of the Glen Chalk Caves SSSI (about 800m) and to the Local Nature Reserve, Moreton Hall Community Woods (500m). On the positive side, the site would benefit from the services offered within Bury St. Edmunds and it would have the advantage of being located close to a public transport route - the nearest bus stop is located approximately 150m from the site and to Public Rights of Way. The site is proposed for residential use and community facilities and therefore it is likely to provide some employment opportunities and good accessibility to local facilities. The site is not located within an area of flood risk.</p>				

Table C.10 - Haverhill - Site 1

SA Objective		Indicator	Notes	Colour Code
<b>Haverhill - Site 1</b>				
No site submission reference - Proposed use - Mixed Use; 150ha in total.				
<b>Social</b>				
1	To improve health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	Is it within 30 mins of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport?	The site is within 30min of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport. The nearest doctor surgery is located about 3km from the site.	
		Will it lead to a direct loss of public open space or open access land?	The site will not result in any loss of public open space or open access land.	
		Will it improve accessibility by Public Rights of Way?	Nearby Public Rights of Way will improve accessibility to the site.	
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	Is it within 30 mins of a school by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of a primary school by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km)?	It is within cyclable distance but not walkable distance. The nearest primary school is located about 2km from the site.	
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will the site be located near or within LSOAs in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country?	As the site is not located within LSOA in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country, opportunities for regeneration are not likely.	
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	Is it within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to key services?	It is within cyclable distance but not walkable distance. Town centre is located approximately 2.5 km from the site.	
		Is it within 30 mins of a supermarket/shopping centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of shops/supermarkets by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to supermarkets/shopping centre?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distance. Town Centre is located approximately 2.5km from the site where grocery shops can be found.	

		Is the site proposed for mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities?	The site is proposed for mixed use development and will have good accessibility to local facilities.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	Is the site proposed for employment or mixed use with employment included?	The site is proposed for mixed use development with employment included.	
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	Is the site proposal over the relevant thresholds for the application of affordable housing policy? CS Policy H3 defines that, for Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill, for sites of 0.5ha and above, or 15 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable; for sites between 0.3ha and 0.5ha or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable, and for sites between 0.17ha and 3ha or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% should be affordable.	The proposed site area is 150 hectares and as such is above the relevant threshold for the application of affordable housing policy.	
8	To improve the quality of where people live and encourage community participation	Is the site proposed in a location with accessible natural green space?	The site is located next to an open access land (about 500m).	
<b>Environmental</b>				
9	To improve water and air quality	Is the site proposed within a groundwater source protection zone?	The site is partially located within a groundwater source protection zone.	
		Is the site proposed within a water abstraction management area?	The site is within a water abstraction management area.	
		Is the site proposed within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?	The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.	
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	Is the site proposed on Greenfield land?	The site is proposed on Greenfield Land.	
		Would it lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)?	The site is located on Grade 2 Agricultural Land.	
		Will it lead to remediation of contaminated land?	Insufficient information is available.	?
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	Does the site have good accessibility to local facilities (as assessed above)?	The site can be accessed by public transport, therefore, it should help minimise the need for travel and reliance on the private car.	

14	To reduce contributions to climate change	Will the site proposal promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments?	It is likely that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments, as Policy ENG1 of the Regional Plan states that new development of more than 10 dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of non residential floor space should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.	
		Is there a clear commitment to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes?	One of the requirements of the Policy CS2 is to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes for new-build dwellings and to achieve at least a BREEAM 'very good' rating for non-residential developments. This will be applicable for this site. Meeting Code Level 3 or achieving high BREEAM rating will help minimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	Does the site lie within the flood risk zones (2, 3a, 3b) identified in the SFRA and have a proposed 'non-compatible' use or is located within 9m of a river?	The site is partially located within Flood Zone 3 and a river body is crossing the site.	
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Is the site in proximity to a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI	The site is located approximately 1km from a SSSI (Lawn Wood SSSI).	
		Is the site in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 500m of a site.	The site is not located in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland. The nearest Local Nature Reserve is Haverhill Railway Walks and is located approximately 1km from the site.	
		Are BAP habitats known to be on the site?	The site is located adjacent to a BAP habitat - Wet Woodland.	

		Would it lead to a loss of or damage to a designated geological site - SSSI or RIGS (Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites). The site within 1km of a SSSI will be coded red and within 500m will be coded amber. The site adjacent to RIGS will be coded red and within 500m - amber.	There are no geological SSSIs or RIGS.	
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	Are there any listed buildings on or adjacent to the site?	There are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Conservation Area? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Conservation Area.	The nearest village Conservation Area is Withersfield located approximately 500m from the site. The recommended gap between a village Conservation Area and new development is 800m; therefore the site development may affect the settings of the Conservation Area.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Historic Park and Garden? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Historic Park and Garden.	The site is not located in proximity to a Historic Park and Garden.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a SAM.	The nearest SAM is Moated Site located about 250m away from the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance or a potential archaeological site? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of an Area of Archaeological Importance.	The site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance.	
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	Is the site in or adjacent to a Green Corridor? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Green Corridor.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Green Corridor.	

		Will the site development lead to coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages?	The site development will not lead to coalescence of the urban extension with nearby villages.	
<b>Economic</b>				
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment?	The site is proposed for mixed-use development with employment.	
20	To revitalise town centres	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment in town centres?	The proposed site is located at the edge of the town.	
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Is the site proposed in a proximity to a public transport route or in a walkable/cyclable distance?	The site is located in proximity to a public transport route and the nearest bust stop is about 200m from the site.	
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	Will it increase employment land availability?	The site is proposed for mixed-use development with employment.	
<b>Summary Assessment</b>				
<p>The proposed site represents a large-scale urban extension of 150ha, potentially leading to a significant increase in the area of Haverhill and resulting in the loss of a large area of greenfield agricultural land. The site lies within a water abstraction management area and partially within groundwater source protection zone. The proposed site is located in proximity to Lawn Wood SSSI (about 1km) and it is adjacent to a BAP habitat (Wet Woodland). The site development may also impact on the setting on the nearby village Conservation Area. This may necessitate incorporation of mitigation measures in the site design and development to avoid potential effects on ecologically and historically important areas and their settings. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 with a river body crossing it. On the positive side, the site would benefit from the services offered within Haverhill and it would have the advantage of being located in close proximity to a public transport route - the nearest bus stop is located approximately 200m from the site and to Public Rights of Way. The site is proposed for mixed use and has good accessibility to local facilities.</p>				



Table C.11 - Haverhill - Site 2

SA Objective		Indicator	Notes	Colour Code
<b>Haverhill - Site 2</b>				
No site submission reference - Proposed use - Mixed Use; 85ha in total.				
<b>Social</b>				
1	To improve health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	Is it within 30 mins of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport?	The site is within 30min of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport. The nearest doctor surgery is located about 2.5km from the site.	
		Will it lead to a direct loss of public open space or open access land?	The site will not result in any loss of public open space or open access land.	
		Will it improve accessibility by Public Rights of Way?	Nearby Public Rights of Way will improve accessibility to the site.	
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	Is it within 30 mins of a school by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of a primary school by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km)?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distance. The nearest primary school is located about 1.4km from the site.	
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will the site be located near or within LSOAs in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country?	As the site is not located within LSOA in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country, opportunities for regeneration are not likely.	
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	Is it within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to key services?	It is within cyclable distance but not walkable distance. Town centre is located approximately 1.5 km from the site.	
		Is it within 30 mins of a supermarket/ shopping centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of shops/supermarkets by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to supermarkets/shopping centre?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distance. Town Centre is located approximately 1.5km from the site where grocery shops can be found.	

		Is the site proposed for mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities?	The site is proposed for mixed use development and will have good accessibility to local facilities.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	Is the site proposed for employment or mixed use with employment included?	The site is proposed for mixed use development with employment included.	
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	Is the site proposal over the relevant thresholds for the application of affordable housing policy? CS Policy H3 defines that, for Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill, for sites of 0.5ha and above, or 15 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable; for sites between 0.3ha and 0.5ha or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable, and for sites between 0.17ha and 3ha or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% should be affordable.	The proposed site area is 85 hectares and as such is above the relevant threshold for the application of affordable housing policy.	
8	To improve the quality of where people live and encourage community participation	Is the site proposed in a location with accessible natural green space?	The site is located next to an open access land (about 500m).	
<b>Environmental</b>				
9	To improve water and air quality	Is the site proposed within a groundwater source protection zone?	The site is not located within a groundwater source protection zone.	
		Is the site proposed within a water abstraction management area?	The site is within a water abstraction management area.	
		Is the site proposed within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?	The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.	
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	Is the site proposed on Greenfield land?	The site is proposed on Greenfield Land.	
		Would it lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)?	The site is located on Grade 2 Agricultural Land.	
		Will it lead to remediation of contaminated land?	Insufficient information is available.	?
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	Does the site have good accessibility to local facilities (as assessed above)?	The site can be accessed by public transport, therefore, it should help minimise the need for travel and reliance on the private car.	

1 4	To reduce contributions to climate change	Will the site proposal promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments?	It is likely that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments, as Policy ENG1 of the Regional Plan states that new development of more than 10 dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of non residential floor space should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.	
		Is there a clear commitment to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes?	One of the requirements of the Policy CS2 is to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes for new-build dwellings and to achieve at least a BREEAM 'very good' rating for non-residential developments. This will be applicable for this site. Meeting Code Level 3 or achieving high BREEAM rating will help minimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
1 5	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	Does the site lie within the flood risk zones (2, 3a, 3b) identified in the SFRA and have a proposed 'non-compatible' use or is located within 9m of a river?	The site is not located within Flood Zones 2, 3a or 3b or located within 9m of a river.	
1 6	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Is the site in proximity to a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI	The site is located approximately 1.5km from a SSSI (Lawn Wood SSSI).	
		Is the site in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 500m of a site.	The site is not located in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, or Ancient Woodland. However it is located approximately 500m from a Local Nature Reserve (Haverhill Railway Walks).	
		Are BAP habitats known to be on the site?	The site is located adjacent to a BAP habitat - Wet Woodland.	

		Would it lead to a loss of or damage to a designated geological site - SSSI or RIGS (Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites). The site within 1km of a SSSI will be coded red and within 500m will be coded amber. The site adjacent to RIGS will be coded red and within 500m - amber.	There are no geological SSSIs or RIGS.	
1 7	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	Are there any listed buildings on or adjacent to the site?	There are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Conservation Area? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Conservation Area.	The nearest village Conservation Area is Withersfield located approximately 500m from the site. The recommended gap between a village Conservation Area and new development is 800m, therefore the site development may affect the settings of the Conservation Area.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Historic Park and Garden? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Historic Park and Garden.	The site is not located in proximity to a Historic Park and Garden.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a SAM.	The site is not located in proximity to a SAM.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance or a potential archaeological site? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of an Area of Archaeological Importance.	The site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance.	
1 8	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	Is the site in or adjacent to a Green Corridor? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Green Corridor.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Green Corridor.	

		Will the site development lead to coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages?	The site development will not lead to coalescence of the urban extension with nearby villages.	
<b>Economic</b>				
1 9	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment?	The site is proposed for mixed-use development with employment.	
2 0	To revitalise town centres	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment in town centres?	The proposed site is located at the edge of the town.	
2 1	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Is the site proposed in a proximity to a public transport route or in a walkable/cyclable distance?	The site is located in proximity to a public transport route and the nearest bust stop is about 600 meters from the site.	
2 2	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	Will it increase employment land availability?	The site is proposed for mixed-use development with employment.	
<b>Summary Assessment</b>				
<p>The site represents an urban extension of 85ha, the development of which would significantly increase the area of Haverhill and result in the loss of a large area of greenfield agricultural land. The site lies within a water abstraction management area. The proposed site is located in proximity of Lawn Wood SSSI (about 1.5km) and to a Local Nature Reserve (about 500m). The site is also adjacent to a BAP habitat (Wet Woodland). The site development may also impact on the setting on the nearby village Conservation Area. This may necessitate incorporation of mitigation measures in the site design and development to avoid potential effects on ecologically and historically important areas and their settings. The site would benefit from the services offered within Haverhill and it would have the advantage of being located in close proximity to a public transport route - the nearest bus stop is located approximately 600m from the site and to Public Rights of Ways. The site is proposed for mixed use and has good accessibility to local facilities.</p>				

Table C.12 - Haverhill - Site 3

SA Objective		Indicator	Notes	Colour Code
<b>Haverhill - Site 3</b>				
No site submission reference - Proposed use - Mixed Use; 170ha in total.				
<b>Social</b>				
1	To improve health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	Is it within 30 mins of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport?	The site is within 30min of a GP, dentist and hospital by public transport. The nearest doctor surgery is located about 1.5km from the site.	
		Will it lead to a direct loss of public open space or open access land?	The site will not result in any loss of public open space or open access land.	
		Will it improve accessibility by Public Rights of Way?	Nearby Public Rights of Way will improve accessibility to the site.	
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	Is it within 30 mins of a school by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of a primary school by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km)?	It is within walkable and cyclable distances. The nearest primary school is located about 500m from the site.	
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will the site be located near or within LSOAs in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country?	As the site is not located within LSOA in the most deprived 20% to 40% in the country, opportunities for regeneration are not likely.	
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	Is it within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of the town centre by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to key services?	It is within cyclable distance but not walkable distance. Town centre is located approximately 1.2 km from the site.	
		Is it within 30 mins of a supermarket/ shopping centre by public transport?	The site is within 30 mins of shops/supermarkets by public transport.	
		Is it within walkable/cyclable distances (800m and 2-5km) to supermarkets/shopping centre?	It is within cyclable distances but not walkable distance. Town Centre is located approximately 1.2km from the site where grocery shops can be found.	

		Is the site proposed for mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities?	The site is proposed for mixed use development and will have good accessibility to local facilities.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	Is the site proposed for employment or mixed use with employment included?	The site is proposed for mixed use development with employment included.	
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	Is the site proposal over the relevant thresholds for the application of affordable housing policy? CS Policy H3 defines that, for Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill, for sites of 0.5ha and above, or 15 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable; for sites between 0.3ha and 0.5ha or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable, and for sites between 0.17ha and 3ha or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% should be affordable.	The proposed site area is 170 hectares and as such is above the relevant threshold for the application of affordable housing policy.	
8	To improve the quality of where people live and encourage community participation	Is the site proposed in a location with accessible natural green space?	The site is located adjacent to a recreation/amenity open space.	
<b>Environmental</b>				
9	To improve water and air quality	Is the site proposed within a groundwater source protection zone?	The site is partially located within a groundwater source protection zone.	
		Is the site proposed within a water abstraction management area?	The site is within a water abstraction management area.	
		Is the site proposed within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?	The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.	
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	Is the site proposed on Greenfield land?	The site is proposed on Greenfield Land.	
		Would it lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)?	The site is located on Grade 2 Agricultural Land.	
		Will it lead to remediation of contaminated land?	Insufficient information is available.	?
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	Does the site have good accessibility to local facilities (as assessed above)?	The site can be accessed by public transport, therefore, it should help minimise the need for travel and reliance on the private car.	

14	To reduce contributions to climate change	Will the site proposal promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments?	It is likely that the site will promote the incorporation of small-scale renewable in developments, as Policy ENG1 of the Regional Plan states that new development of more than 10 dwellings or 1,000m <sup>2</sup> of non residential floor space should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources, unless this is not feasible or viable.	
		Is there a clear commitment to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes?	One of the requirements of the Policy CS2 is to meet Code Level 3 or above of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes for new-build dwellings and to achieve at least a BREEAM 'very good' rating for non-residential developments. This will be applicable for this site. Meeting Code Level 3 or achieving high BREEAM rating will help minimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	Does the site lie within the flood risk zones (2, 3a, 3b) identified in the SFRA and have a proposed 'non-compatible' use or is located within 9m of a river?	The site is not located within Flood Zones 2, 3a or 3b or located within 9m of a river.	
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Is the site in proximity to a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI	The site is not located in proximity to a SSSI, SAC or SPA.	
		Is the site in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve or Ancient Woodland? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 500m of a site.	The site is not located in proximity to a County Wildlife Site, or Ancient Woodland. However it is located approximately 350m from a Local Nature Reserve (Haverhill Railway Walks).	
		Are BAP habitats known to be on the site?	There are no BAP habitats on the site or in its proximity.	



		Would it lead to a loss of or damage to a designated geological site - SSSI or RIGS (Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites). The site within 1km of a SSSI will be coded red and within 500m will be coded amber. The site adjacent to RIGS will be coded red and within 500m - amber.	There are no geological SSSIs or RIGS.	
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	Are there any listed buildings on or adjacent to the site?	There are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Conservation Area? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Conservation Area.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Conservation Area.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Historic Park and Garden? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Historic Park and Garden.	The site is not located in proximity to a Historic Park and Garden.	
		Is the site in or adjacent to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a SAM.	There is a SAM within the proposed site (Moated Site at Great Wilsey Farm).	
		Is the site in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance or a potential archaeological site? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of an Area of Archaeological Importance.	The site is not in or adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Importance.	
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	Is the site in or adjacent to a Green Corridor? Note: For the purposes of this assessment, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 40m of a Green Corridor.	The site is not in or adjacent to a Green Corridor.	

		Will the site development lead to coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages?	The site development will not lead to coalescence of urban extension.	
<b>Economic</b>				
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment?	The site is proposed for mixed-use development with employment.	
20	To revitalise town centres	Is the site proposed for mixed-use development or employment in town centres?	The proposed site is located at the edge of the town.	
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Is the site proposed in a proximity to a public transport route or in a walkable/cyclable distance?	The site is located in proximity to a public transport route and the nearest bust stop is adjacent to the site.	
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	Will it increase employment land availability?	The site is proposed for mixed-use development with employment.	
<b>Summary Assessment</b>				
<p>The proposed site represents a large-scale urban extension of 170ha, potentially leading to a significant increase in the area of Haverhill and resulting in the loss of a large area of greenfield agricultural land. The proposed site is located in close proximity of a Local Nature Reserve (about 350m) and also there is a SAM within the site - the Moated Site at Great Wilsey Farm. This may necessitate incorporation of mitigation measures in the site design and development to avoid potential effects on ecological and heritage assets and their settings. The site lies within a water abstraction management area. The site would benefit from the services offered within Haverhill and it would have the advantage of being located in close proximity to a public transport route - the nearest bus stop is located adjacent to the site and to Public Rights of Ways. The site is proposed for mixed use and has good accessibility to local facilities.</p>				

## Appendix D – Assessment of Plan Policies<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> (as in Core Strategy Draft Document of June 2009)

- D.1.1 This section presents the findings of the detailed assessment of the policies set out in the St Edmundsbury Core Strategy Draft Document dated 1st June 2009. Each table contains predictions and evaluation of effects for each SA objective, in accordance with the methodology described in Section 3, together with a commentary/explanation of the assessment and recommendations of the mitigation measures. Table D.1 below explains the terms and symbols used in the tables.

**Table D.1 - Assessment Tables – Terms and Symbols**

Magnitude		Scale		Duration		Permanence		Certainty
✓✓	Major positive	Local	Within or in proximity to St Edmundsbury	ST-MT	Short term - Medium term	Temp	Temporary	Low
✓	Minor positive	Sub-Reg	Western Suffolk and surrounding districts	ST-LT	Short term - Long term	Perm	Permanent	Med
-	No effect	Reg/Nat	East of England and beyond	MT-LT	Medium term - Long term			High
?	Unclear effects			ST	Short term			
×	Minor negative			MT	Medium term			
××	Major negative			LT	Long term			

Table D.2 – Policy CS1 St. Edmundsbury Spatial Strategy &amp; Policy CS5: Settlement Hierarchy and Identity

Policy CS1 St. Edmundsbury Spatial Strategy & Policy CS5: Settlement Hierarchy and Identity											
<p><b>Policy CS1</b></p> <p>To date (1 April 2008) development (including land with a valid planning consent but not yet built) provided for 6,380 new homes and has been distributed across the borough as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bury St Edmunds 42%</li> <li>- Haverhill 40%</li> <li>- Rural Area 17%</li> </ul> <p>During the remainder of the LDF period, to 2031, new homes will be distributed as follows:</p> <p>Bury St Edmunds 5,950:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Previously developed land 650+</li> <li>- Greenfield 1,800</li> <li>- Strategic Urban Extensions 3,500</li> </ul> <p>Haverhill 3,900:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Previously developed land 250</li> <li>- Greenfield 1,150</li> <li>- Strategic Urban Extensions 2,500</li> </ul> <p>Rural Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Previously developed land 105</li> <li>- Greenfield</li> </ul> <p>Area Action Plans for Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill and a Site Allocations Development Plan Document for the rural area will identify the location and precise boundaries of future development land.</p>						<p><b>Policy CS5</b></p> <p>All proposals for new development will be expected to have regard to the position of the site within the settlement hierarchy as follows:</p> <p><b>Towns</b></p> <p>Bury St Edmunds Haverhill</p> <p><b>Key Service Centres</b></p> <p>Barrow Clare</p> <p>Ixworth Kedington</p> <p>Stanton Wickhambrook</p> <p><b>Local Service Centres</b></p> <p>Bardwell Barningham</p> <p>Cavendish Chedburgh</p> <p>Great Barton Great &amp; Little Thurlow</p> <p>Great &amp; Little Welnetham Hopton</p> <p>Hundon Ingham</p> <p>Risby Rougham</p> <p><b>Infill Villages</b></p> <p>Barnham Bradfield St George</p> <p>Chevington Coney Weston</p> <p>Cowlinge Fornham All Saints</p> <p>Fornham St Martin Great Bradley</p> <p>Hawkedon Hepworth</p> <p>Honington &amp; Sapiston RAF Honington</p> <p>Horringer Lidgate</p> <p>Market Weston Ousden</p> <p>Pakenham Rede</p> <p>Stanningfield Stansfield</p> <p>Stoke by Clare Stradishall</p> <p>Thelnetham Troston</p> <p>Whepstead Withersfield</p> <p><b>Countryside</b></p> <p>All other settlements not identified in the list above and where a housing settlement boundary is not identified on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Careful consideration will be given to maintaining the identity, character and historical context of settlements, to ensure new development does not detract from the environmental quality, townscape and functional vitality of the settlement as a whole. The coalescence of towns with surrounding settlements through new development will not be allowed to happen.</p>					
SA Objective	Effects						Assessment				
	Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert		ST	MT	LT	Sm	Summary of Effects
											Recommendation/Mitigation

1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	✓	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		+	+	++	++	Focusing development in existing towns and service centres could contribute to securing long term investment in local health facilities as a result of economies of scale and increase in demand. The settlement hierarchy focuses development in sustainable locations maximising the opportunity for walking and cycling to work, study and services.	None identified.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	✓	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		+	+	++	++	Focusing development in existing towns and services centres could contribute to securing long term investment in local education facilities as a result of economies of scale and increase in demand.	None identified.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Perm	High		+	++	++	++	The towns of Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill will be the main focus for the location of new development, supported by appropriate levels of development in Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Infill Villages. This will support improved access to services resulting in permanent medium to long term positive effects.	See assessment of Policy CS8 as this policy states that all development proposals will be required to be accessible to people of all abilities including the mobility impaired resulting in permanent positive cumulative effects if these 2 policies are effectively implemented.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	✓✓	Sub-Reg	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	++	++	++	Spatial distribution of housing across the borough totalling 10,000 new homes to 2031 will have permanent significant effects on meeting housing requirements for the borough.	Reference to affordable housing of cross referring to Policy CS 6 which sets out the affordable housing targets for the borough is recommended.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+	+	+	+	Maintaining the identity and cohesion of nearby settlements should help preserve the quality of residential amenity and thus deliver positive, permanent effects for this objective.	None identified.

9	To improve water and air quality	x	Sub-Reg	MT-LT	Perm	Med		-	-	--	--	The spatial strategy aims to achieve environmentally sustainable economic growth with the protection of the natural environment however; any new development is likely to have negative effects on water resources and local air quality. Increasingly over time, the development of more housing will give rise to increases in population, which is likely in turn to increase traffic movement and generate additional building and transport related emissions, contributing to localised degradation in air quality and added pressure on water resources.	Effective implementation of CS Policy 2 should ensure that any new development incorporates measures to improve water and local air quality to a certain extent.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		0	-	--	-	In the short-term new development will be sited on the previously developed land through the sequential approach. Some housing is likely to be on greenfield sites in the medium to longer term which will have negative effects on this objective.	Effective implementation of CS Policy 2 should ensure that any new development incorporates measures to conserve water resources and local air quality to a certain extent. No indication of housing densities is provided.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		-	-	--	--	The spatial strategy aims to achieve environmentally sustainable economic growth with the protection of the natural environment. However, increasingly over time, the development of more housing will give rise to increases in population resulting in pressure on water resources.	Effective implementation of CS Policy 2 should ensure that any new development incorporates measures to make efficient use of water however, no reference to re-use and recycle of minerals and waste resources. See assessment of Policy CS2.
12	To reduce waste	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		-	-	--	--	More housing is likely to result in additional waste.	See assessment of Policy CS2.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		0	-	--	-	Although the sequential approach should help reduce the need to travel, traffic volumes are likely to increase, as housing is built over the plan period. This will result in negative effects on the environment, the significance increases in the long term due to the cumulative effect.	See assessment of Policy CS8: Sustainable Transport - effective implementation of the sustainable transport hierarchy which promotes walking and cycling above the use of the car in all new development should offset these negative effects.

14	To reduce contributions to climate change	✗	Reg/Nat	MT-LT	Perm	High	-	--	--	--	More housing, increasing over the plan period, will continue to contribute to climate change through greenhouse gas emissions from development and increased traffic flows.	No specific reference to climate change in the Core Strategy. Suggest separate policy dealing with climate change at a strategic level or reference should be made in Policy CS2: Sustainable development.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	✗	Reg/Nat	MT-LT	Perm	High	-	-	-	-	New development will increase amount of impermeable surfaces and may increase flood risk.	See comment above for SA Objective 14.
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	✗	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med	0	-	--	-	In the short-term new development will be sited on the previously developed land through the sequential approach. Some housing is likely to be on greenfield sites in the medium to longer term which will have negative effects on this objective.	Effective implementation of CS Policy 2 should ensure that any new development incorporates measures to protect and enhance biodiversity, wildlife and geodiversity therefore offsetting these negative effects to a certain degree.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	✗	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med	+/-	+/-	-	-	The spatial strategy aims to achieve environmentally sustainable economic growth with the protection of the built and historic environment. Focusing development in existing settlements may have negative effects on historic buildings. Some housing is likely to be on greenfield sites in the medium to longer term which will have negative effects on this objective. Increased traffic levels can also have negative effects on the setting of historic buildings	See assessment of Policy CS4 as effective implementation of this policy aimed to create high quality developments may offset these negative effects.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	-	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med	+/-	+/-	-	-	Concentrating development in housing settlement areas is likely to protect the local landscape however; intensification of development in existing areas may have negative effects in the setting of heritage resources and provision of urban open space.	See assessment of Policy CS4 as effective implementation of this policy aimed to create high quality developments may offset these negative effects.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med	+	+	+	+	Additional housing in existing settlement areas could provide a local supply of workers required by new and existing businesses.	None identified.



20	To revitalise town centres	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	The towns of Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill will be the main focus for the location of new development, supported by appropriate levels of development in Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Infill Villages. This approach should ensure positive significant permanent effects in revitalising existing centres.	None identified.
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+	+	+	+	Sequential approach to siting new development may help reduce the need to travel, particularly by private car.	See assessment of Policy CS8 as this policy states that all development proposals will be required to follow the sustainable transport hierarchy resulting in permanent positive cumulative effects if these 2 policies are effectively implemented.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

Table D.3 - Policy CS2: Sustainable Development

Policy CS2: Sustainable Development													
<p>A high quality, sustainable environment will be achieved by designing and incorporating measures appropriate to the nature and scale of development, including:</p> <p><b>The protection and enhancement of natural resources:</b></p> <p>a) making the most efficient use of land and infrastructure;</p> <p>b) protecting and enhancing biodiversity, wildlife and geodiversity, and avoiding impact on areas of nature conservation interest;</p> <p>c) safeguarding and enhancing wildlife corridors and ecological networks;</p> <p>d) conserving and, wherever possible, enhancing the character and quality of local landscapes and the wider countryside and public access to them, in a way that recognises and protects the fragility of these resources;</p> <p>e) conserving other natural resources including, air quality and soil and, wherever possible, enhancing them;</p> <p>f) protecting the quality and potential yield of water resources;</p> <p>g) maximising the efficient use of water including recycling of dirty water; and <b>sustainable design of the built environment:</b></p> <p>h) providing the infrastructure and services necessary to serve the development;</p> <p>i) minimising the use of resources and energy, and exploring the feasibility and viability of decentralised energy (low carbon and/or renewable) in all new developments;</p> <p>j) incorporating the principles of sustainable construction including provision for recycling; and the minimisation of energy and resource efficiency at construction and occupancy phases. Developments should comply with the appropriate national standards such as the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM;</p> <p>k) wherever possible, creating carbon neutral development;</p> <p>l) orientating buildings to maximise the benefit from sunlight and passive solar heating unless to do so would conflict with the grain of the surrounding area's townscape, landscape or topography;</p> <p>m) aiming to meet, as a minimum, Code Level 3 of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes for new-build dwellings;</p> <p>n) maximising the use of recycled materials;</p> <p>o) taking account of flood risk;</p> <p>p) considering the natural drainage of surface water, including, where appropriate, the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS);</p> <p>q) making a positive contribution towards the vitality of the area through an appropriate mix of uses. In areas of strategic growth this will include employment, community, social, health and recreation facilities (including the protection and provision of informal and formal recreation, parks, open spaces and allotments);</p> <p>r) creating a safe environment which enhances the quality of the public realm;</p> <p>s) making a positive contribution to local distinctiveness, character, townscape and the setting of settlements;</p> <p>t) wherever possible, conserving or enhancing the historic environment including archaeological resources.</p>													
SA Objective		Effects						Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert		ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Low		+	+	++	++	CS2 (q) requires new development to make a positive contribution towards the vitality of the area included the protection and provision of informal and formal recreation, parks and open spaces which may have indirect positive effects on improving health through provided increased opportunities for recreation.	None identified.

2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	✓	Local	LT	Perm	Low		+	+	+	+	Provision of employment, community, social, health and recreation facilities as part of new development (CS2:q) may have indirect positive effects on crime levels. Policy also aims to create a safe environment (CS2:r).	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	✓	Local	LT	Perm	Low		+	+	+	+	Provision of community and social facilities as part of new development should help create cohesive communities.	None required.
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	+++	+++	This policy strives to provide the infrastructure and services necessary to serve development which should result in improving access to key facilities.	See assessment of Policy CS1 and CS8. Effective implementation of all three policies should result in permanent significant cumulative effects in improving accessibility for communities.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
9	To improve water and air quality	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	++	++	++	This policy strives to conserve natural resources including air quality (CS2:e) and protecting the quality of water (CS2:f) through designing and incorporating measures into new development resulting in permanent significant positive effects.	None identified.

10	To conserve soil resources and quality	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	++	++	++	The policy strives to conserve natural resources including soil wherever possible. If successfully implemented, this policy will have positive effects, increasing over time.	None identified.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	++	++	++	This policy strives to maximise the efficient use of water including recycling of dirty water (CS2:g). The policy requires new development to protect the water environment, which implies measures to promote water conservation will be supported and promotes the reuse of recycled materials (CS2:n) resulting in permanent significant positive effects.	None identified.
12	To reduce waste	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	++	++	++	This is one of the key aims of the policy. In applying it to all new development, the benefits should increase over time.	None identified.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	?	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	No reference to minimising effects of car use or promoting shift to non-motorised users in this policy so as it currently stands, this policy does not achieve positive effects.	See assessment of Policy CS8: Sustainable Transport - effective implementation of the sustainable transport hierarchy which promotes walking and cycling above the use of the car in all new development should ensure effects on traffic on the environment are reduced. Recommend that this policy includes a criterion that cross-refers to the overall aim of Policy CS8.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	✓	Reg/Nat	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	++	++	++	Policy CS2:m requires new development to meet Level 3 (25% improvement in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions over Target Emission Rate as determined by the 2006 Building Regulation Standards) of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes and refers to creating carbon neutral development where possible. However, no reference to minimising the effects of car use and its contribution to	Effective implementation of Policy CS8 should ensure positive effects are achieved. Recommend that this policy includes a criterion that cross-refers to the overall aim of Policy CS8.

157

21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

Table D.4 - Policy CS3: The Natural and Built Environment

<b>Policy CS3: The Natural and Built Environment</b>												
The diversity, character and quality of the natural and built environment will be protected, conserved, managed, and where possible enhanced. A network of designated sites, protected habitats and species (BAPS), wildlife or green corridors, and other green spaces will be identified and protected and habitat creation supported through policies in the Development Management DPD and other DPDs in the Local Development Framework.												
SA Objective		Effects					Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert	ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Low	+	+	+	+	Positive but not significant indirect effects on improving health identified as provision of green spaces may provide increased opportunity for passive recreation	None identified.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓	Local	ST-LT	Temp	Low	+	+	+	+	Positive but not significant indirect effects identified as provision of green spaces may provide increased opportunity for access to recreational facilities.	None identified.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

9	To improve water and air quality	✓	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	+	+	Conservation, management and enhancement of habitats and wildlife corridors may have minor positive effects on local air quality through providing carbon sink.	None identified.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Perm	High		+	+	+	+	The enhancement and identification of new sites for habitats and species should help to conserve soils.	None identified.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
12	To reduce waste	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	✓✓	Sub-Reg	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	+++	+++	This policy directly strives to protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity and protected BAP habitats and species will be identified resulting in permanent significant effects which should enhance biodiversity and the local and sub-regional level.	Specific reference to international, national and local nature conservation designated sites in the policy wording is recommended to strengthen the protection of these sites.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Low		+	+	+	+	Whilst this policy title refers to the natural and built environment, it does not refer to the built environment in the policy wording itself only in the supporting text.	Suggest including reference to the protection and enhancement of the built environment in the policy wording itself to strengthen the policy wording and to achieve more significant positive effects for this objective.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Low		+	+	+	+	Whilst the supporting text to this policy refers to the conservation and enhancement of landscapes the policy wording itself does not. No explicit reference to conserving and enhancing local townscapes.	Suggest including reference to the protection and enhancement of landscapes in the policy wording itself to strengthen the policy wording and to achieve more significant positive effects for this objective.



19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
20	To revitalise town centres	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

Table D.5 - Policy CS4: Design and Local Distinctiveness

# Policy CS4: Design and Local Distinctiveness

Proposals for new development must create and contribute to a high quality, sustainable environment. Proposals will be expected to address, as appropriate, the following components:

- detailed heritage and conservation design appraisals and information;
- consideration of protection of the landscape and historic views;
- an understanding of the local context and an indication of how the proposal will enhance the area;
- protection of the natural environment;
- in housing proposals the density and mix of housing;
- provision or enhancement of open space, play, leisure and cultural facilities;
- access and transport considerations.

Concept Statements and Masterplans will be required for sites which by virtue of size, location or proposed mix of uses are determined by the local planning authority to require a masterplanning approach. A landscape/townscape character appraisal will be an essential prerequisite for concept statements, design briefs and master plans. Area Action Plans and Site Allocations DPDs will define those sites where this approach is required.

The promotion of secure attractive, safe and people-friendly streets, to encourage more walking, cycling, recreation and local shopping, will be a priority for the council. Where appropriate the street environment will be improved/developed with a combination of the following (not exclusive):

- Quality pavements and well-coordinated street furniture
- Improvements to footpaths and cycle routes
- Street trees and well-maintained landscaping
- Clear and minimal signage
- Traffic management schemes
- Shared spaces and home zones
- Cycle paths
- Crime deterrence and safety measures, including lighting and CCTV
- Public art

New developments will be required to contribute towards public realm improvements. They should also provide active street frontages to create attractive and safe street environments.

SA Objective		Effects						Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert		ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Low		+	+	+	+	All new proposals are required to address the provision of enhancement of open space and leisure facilities which may have indirect positive effects in providing more opportunities for passive recreation.	The remit for this policy is that proposals for new development must create and contribute to a high quality, sustainable environment, this is similar to the aim of CS1 and CS2. This policy seems to combine a number of CS policies CS2, CS3, CS8 - is this policy necessary?
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+	++	++	++	A key priority for this policy is to promote secure and safe streets to encourage more walking, cycling and recreation. Measures such as crime deterrence and safety measures, including lighting and CCTV will be promoted which should help to reduce crime	Suggest that this policy is too detailed for a Core Strategy Policy and recommend including this policy in the development management DPD which would be derived from Policy CS2.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Low		+	+	+	+	This policy requires new proposals to address access and transport considerations which could improve access.	
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+	+	+	+	This policy requires new development to address the density and mix of housing which should go some way to achieving positive effects in meeting housing requirements for the whole community.	See general recommendation above.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	A high quality, sustainable environment is the key aim of this objective. New developments are requires contributing towards public realm improvements which should improve the quality of where people live resulting in significant permanent long term effects.	See general recommendation above.
9	To improve water and air quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	It is suggested that the criterion relating to 'protection of natural environment' should be removed from this policy as this is covered in Policy CS2.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	As above.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	As above.
12	To reduce waste	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	As above.

13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	As above.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	As above.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	As above.
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	As above.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	All new proposals are required to take account of detailed heritage and conservation design appraisals and the protection of historic views as well as concept statements and master plans being required for larger sites. This should ensure that development is in keeping with areas and buildings of historic importance resulting in significant permanent effects.	See general recommendation above.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	Concept statements and master plans for larger sites should ensure that the development is in keeping with the surrounding local landscape resulting in significant permanent effects.	See general recommendation above.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
20	To revitalise town centres	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		+	++	++	++	This Policy should benefit this objective by providing for a mix of uses and promoting sustainable modes of transport through improvements to footpaths and cycle routes and traffic management schemes.	None identified.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

Table D.6 - Policy CS6: Affordable Housing

<b>Policy CS6: Affordable Housing</b>												
<p>Developers will be expected to allocate land within sites where housing is proposed to ensure that affordable housing is provided</p> <p>In Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill:</p> <p>i. Where sites are 0.5 hectares and above or 15 dwellings or more are proposed, 40% shall be affordable.</p> <p>ii. Where sites are between 0.3 hectares and 0.5 hectares or between 10 and 14 dwellings, 30% shall be affordable.</p> <p>iii. Where sites are between 0.17 hectares and 0.3 hectares or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% shall be affordable.</p> <p>In other settlements, on sites of 0.17 hectares and above or 5 dwellings or more, 40% shall be affordable.</p> <p>These criteria shall also apply where a site is part of a wider but contiguous site.</p> <p>Conditions or legal obligations will be used to ensure that affordable housing is secured and retained for those in housing need.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority will consider issues of development viability and mix, including additional costs associated with the development of brownfield sites and the provision of significant community benefits, and may be willing to negotiate a lower percentage of affordable housing.</p> <p>Note: This policy applies to both new build and conversion housing schemes.</p>												
SA Objective		Effects					Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert	ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High	+	++	++	++	The policy seeks the development of affordable housing as an integral part of qualifying new development, which offers the potential to make a significant contribution to tackling poverty and social exclusion through the development of mixed communities.	None identified.

5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	++	++	++	The policy allows the LPA to ensure that affordable housing provision is directed to locations that offer the greatest accessibility to education, employment, recreation, countryside health, community services and cultural facilities for a wider proportion of the population, particularly those without access to a car as greatest proportion of affordable housing will be provided in Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill	None identified.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	This is the aim of the policy therefore permanent positive significant effects are predicted.	None identified.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
9	To improve water and air quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
12	To reduce waste	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
20	To revitalise town centres	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Low		+	+	++	++	In order to create vibrant towns and villages, it is important that local people can remain within their communities – the provision of affordable housing should help to maintain a mixed population, with likely benefits against the objective.	None identified.
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

Table D.7 - Policy CS7: Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation

Policy CS7: Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation													
In the countryside, proposals for gypsy sites and travelling show people will be permitted where:													
a) the site has been identified in the DPD, or in the interim, where satisfactory evidence supporting a need for the accommodation is provided;													
b) the use of the site would not have an adverse impact upon the amenities of nearby occupiers;													
c) the proposal would not detract from the undeveloped open and rural character and appearance of the countryside; and													
d) adequate landscaping measures are included.													
A condition or legal agreement to control the future use of sites for gypsies and travelling show people may be imposed, as appropriate.													
Where the proven need is short term the development will be limited by a temporary permission.													
SA Objective		Effects					Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation	
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert	ST	MT	LT	Sm			
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	✓	Local	ST-LT	Temp	Low		+	+	+	+	By providing formalised provision for gypsies and travellers, this group will not be susceptible to inadvertent criminal activity such as trespassing thus there may be some positive effects.	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+	+	+	+	In seeking to accommodate the gypsy and traveller population as opposed to excluding them, the preferred option should make a contribution to the objective.	None identified.
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		+	+	+	+	Improvements in accessibility for this group of the population through the provision of permanent encampments.	None identified.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.



7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+	+	+	+	St Edmundsbury is required to provide up to 20 pitches for gypsies and travellers by 2012 (the number of authorised pitches in 2006 were 2) therefore this provision should meet the requirements of the gypsy and traveller community.	None identified.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	✓	Local	ST-LT	Temp	Med		++	++	++	++	By identifying specific sites for encampments, the risk that sites will result in damage to the countryside or loss of recreational space for the wider population is reduced. In addition, it gives certainty of residence for gypsies and travellers improving their quality of life.	None identified.
9	To improve water and air quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	✗		MT-LT	Perm	High		-	-	--	--	Sites for gypsies and travellers are likely to be in the countryside and therefore there will be permanent negative effects on soil resources as this policy wording currently stands there is no reference to site selection criteria other than 'proposals would not detract from the undeveloped and rural character and appearance of the countryside'. Stronger wording is required to protect the natural environment.	Recommend a criteria-based policy for selecting suitable sites based on criteria outlined in Policy CS2 or alternatively cross-reference to policy CS2 should be made to ensure sites are considered against biodiversity, landscape and heritage designations, soil quality, flood risk etc.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
12	To reduce waste	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	High		-	-	--	--	Sites for gypsies and travellers are likely to be in the countryside and therefore there will be permanent negative effects on local biodiversity as this policy wording currently stands. There is no reference to site selection criteria other than 'proposals would not detract from the undeveloped and rural character and appearance of the countryside'. Stronger wording is required to protect the natural environment.	Recommend a criteria-based policy for selecting suitable sites based on criteria outlined in Policy CS2 or alternatively cross-reference to Policy CS2 should be made to ensure sites are considered against biodiversity, landscape and heritage designations, soil quality, flood risk etc.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	High		-	-	-	-	Negative effects are likely as sites are likely to be in the countryside.	Recommend a criteria-based policy for selecting suitable sites based on criteria outlined in Policy CS2 or alternatively cross-reference to Policy CS2 should be made to ensure sites are considered against biodiversity, landscape and heritage designations, soil quality, flood risk etc.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	?	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Low		+/-	-	-	-	The policy does include a criterion seeking to avoid insensitive location in respect of neighbouring uses. This offers the opportunity to minimise adverse effects against the objective; although encampments may be considered to detract from the quality of the countryside and wider landscape through visual intrusion. The requirement for landscaping measures may offset these negative effects to a certain degree.	Recommend a criteria-based policy for selecting suitable sites based on criteria outlined in CS2 or alternatively cross-reference to CS2 should be made to ensure sites are considered against biodiversity, landscape and heritage designations, soil quality, flood risk etc.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
20	To revitalise town centres	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

Table D.8 - Policy CS8: Sustainable Transport

<b>Policy CS8: Sustainable Transport</b>												
<p>The council will develop and promote a high quality and sustainable transport system across the borough and reduce the need for travel through spatial planning and design.</p> <p>All proposals for development will be required to provide for travel by a range of means of transport other than the private car in accordance with the following hierarchy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walking</li> <li>• Cycling</li> <li>• Public Transport (including taxis)</li> <li>• Commercial vehicles</li> <li>• Cars</li> </ul> <p>All development proposals will be required to be accessible to people of all abilities including those with mobility impairments.</p> <p>New commercial development, including leisure uses and visitor attractions, which generate significant demands for travel, should be located in areas well served by a variety of transport modes. Where appropriate, development proposals that will have significant transport implications will be required to have a transport assessment and travel plan showing how car based travel to the site can be minimised.</p>												
SA Objective		Effects					Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert	ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	✓	Local	ST-LT	Temp	Med	+	+	+	+	The promotion of walking and cycling should result in some indirect positive effects in improving health.	None identified.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High	++	++	++	++	This policy requires that all development proposals will be accessible to people of all abilities including those mobility impaired which should result in permanent positive and significant effects.	None identified.

6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
9	To improve water and air quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
12	To reduce waste	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	This sustainable transport hierarchy promoting non-motorised users could contribute to reducing car emissions and effects of traffic on the environment. The implementation of travels plans for new commercial development should also achieve positive effects. However, new development will inevitably increase traffic volumes, as housing is built over the plan period resulting in negative effects on the environment.	See assessment of CS1 and CS2.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	As above.	As above
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
20	To revitalise town centres	✓	Local	LT	Perm	Low		+	+	+	+	The promotion of alternatives to the car is likely to have an indirect positive effect on the viability and vitality of town centres by making town centres more accessible to a wider cross-section of the population. Effects are likely to be long term, although not significant.	None identified.
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

Table D.9 - Policy CS9: Strategic Transport Improvements

<b>Policy CS9: Strategic Transport Improvements</b>												
<p>The council will continue to work with relevant partners, including Suffolk County Council and the Highways Agency, and developers, to secure the necessary transport infrastructure to achieve improvements to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Junctions 42 and 44 of the A14 adjacent to Bury St Edmunds</li> <li>• Transport safety on the A1307 between Haverhill and the A11</li> <li>• Relieve the adverse impacts of traffic in Bury St Edmunds, Haverhill and those villages which have identified transport issues</li> <li>• Rail infrastructure in the borough</li> <li>• The public transport network in the towns and rural areas</li> <li>• Rights of way in the borough to achieve the objectives of the Suffolk Rights of Way Improvement Plan</li> </ul>												
SA Objective		Effects					Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert	ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	✓	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med	+	+	+	+	Improvements in the transport network could improve currently inaccessible areas reducing social exclusion.	None identified.
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓✓	Local	LT	Temp	High	+	+	++	++	Improvements to all transport network modes should have significant long term positive effects on improving accessibility to key services particularly in the towns of Bury St.Edmunds and Haverhill.	None identified.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
9	To improve water and air quality	?	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	This policy results in a contradictory mix of positive and negative effects. Effective implementation of CS2 should ensure negative effects are minimised.	See assessment of Policy CS2.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	?	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	This policy results in a contradictory mix of positive and negative effects. Effective implementation of CS2 should ensure negative effects are minimised.	See assessment of Policy CS2.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
12	To reduce waste	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	?	Local	LT	Temp	High		+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	This policy aims to relieve the adverse impacts of traffic in Bury St Edmunds, Haverhill and those villages which have identified transport issues resulting in positive effects. Road infrastructure improvements conversely will result in negative effects.	This policy results in a contradictory mix of positive and negative effects.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	x	Sub-Reg	LT	Temp	High		-	-	--	--	Strategic transport improvements are likely to have significant negative effects and contribute to further climate change.	This policy results in a contradictory mix of positive and negative effects.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	x	Sub-Reg	LT	Temp	High		-	-	--	--	Improvements to Junctions 42 and 44 of the A14 are likely to have an affect on floodplain zone 2.	This policy results in a contradictory mix of positive and negative effects. Strategic transport improvements will be subject to an EIA.
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	?	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	This policy results in a contradictory mix of positive and negative effects. Effective implementation of CS2 should ensure negative effects are	See assessment of Policy CS2.



												minimised.	
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	?	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	This policy results in a contradictory mix of positive and negative effects. Effective implementation of CS2 should ensure negative effects are minimised.	See assessment of Policy CS2.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	?	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	This policy results in a contradictory mix of positive and negative effects. Effective implementation of CS2 should ensure negative effects are minimised.	See assessment of Policy CS2.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	✓✓	Local	LT	Temp	High		+	+	++	++	Improvements to all transport network modes should have significant long term positive effects on strengthening the economy.	None identified.
20	To revitalise town centres	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	✓✓	Local	LT	Temp	High		+	+	++	++	Improvements to all transport network modes should have significant long term positive effects on strengthening the economy.	None identified.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	✓✓	Local	LT	Temp	High		+	+	++	++	Improvements to all transport network modes should have significant long term positive effects on strengthening the economy through improved access and in attracting inward investment.	None identified.

Table D.10 - Policy CS10: Employment and the Local Economy

Policy CS10: Employment and the Local Economy													
Employment land will be allocated in sustainable locations in the towns of Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill. Existing General Employment Areas in or near Key Service Centres or Local Service Centres will continue to be protected and promoted for employment uses.													
Policies in Local Development Documents will ensure that Bury St Edmunds can fulfil its role as a Key Centre for Development and Change by providing for quality employment development at the Suffolk Business Park, and that Haverhill can continue to meet the local employment needs in the Greater Cambridge area, particularly those of research and development and bio-technology industries.													
Existing employment areas will continue to meet local and sub-regional needs at Clare, Great Wratting, Chedburgh, Barnham, Saxham and Stanton/Hepworth (Shepherd’s Grove).													
Proposals for growth in Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres will be expected to include provision for employment land and premises to meet local needs and encourage sustainable communities.													
Policies in Local Development Documents will set criteria for the continued encouragement of sustainable employment development and tourism development opportunities (including conversion of suitable buildings) in villages and rural areas.													
SA Objective		Effects						Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert		ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓✓	Sub-Reg	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	By concentrating employment in the towns of Bury St.Edmunds and Haverhill and in existing general employment areas in or near key service centres or local service centres should result in significant positive effects in improving access to employment.	None identified.

6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	✓✓	Sub-Reg	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	By concentrating employment in the towns of Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill and in existing general employment areas in or near key service centres or local service centres should ensure readily available opportunities for employment. Proposals for growth in Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres will meet local needs and encourage sustainable communities.	None identified.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
9	To improve water and air quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
12	To reduce waste	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	✓✓	Sub-Reg	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	+	+	+	Possible reduction in car use and the need to travel due to provision of employment land in accessible locations resulting in minor positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the long term.	Positive effects would be maximised through the effective implementation of CS8 in ensuring travel plans are in place for any new commercial development.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	✓✓	Sub-Reg	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	+	+	+	Possible reduction in car use and the need to travel due to provision of employment land in accessible locations resulting in minor positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the long term.	Positive effects would be maximised through the effective implementation of CS8 in ensuring travel plans are in place for any new commercial development.

15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	✓✓	Sub-Reg	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	By protecting existing employment land in sustainable locations and promoting quality employment development at the Suffolk Business Park, will continue to meet the local employment needs in the Greater Cambridge area resulting in positive significant effects for the local and sub-region.	None identified.
20	To revitalise town centres	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	By focusing development in existing towns and key service centres would help the vitality of the retail facilities in these areas and could create opportunities their improvement through economies of scale and investment.	
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	✓✓	Sub-Reg	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	Proposals for growth in Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres will encourage and accommodate investment into the region resulting in positive significant effects.	None identified.
----	--	----	---------	-------	------	------	--	----	----	----	----	--	------------------

Table D.11 - Policy CS11: Retail, Leisure and Office Development

Policy CS11: Retail, Leisure and Office Development												
<p>The town centres of Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill will continue to be the focus for new retail, leisure and office development, taking into account;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the need to maintain their vitality and viability</li> <li>• the requirement to assess the need for future growth</li> <li>• the sequential approach to development</li> <li>• the impact of any development on existing centres</li> <li>• the need to ensure locations are accessible by a variety of modes of transport</li> </ul> <p>Retail and leisure activity elsewhere will be focused on those Key Service and Service Centres identified in Core Strategy Policy CS5 and in the new local centres located in the areas for growth identified in Policies CS12 and CS13. The development of services and facilities in these locations will be expected to be of an appropriate scale and character to reflect the role and function of the local centres and in accordance with the sequential approach.</p>												
SA Objective		Effects					Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert	ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	By concentrating retail in the towns of Bury St.Edmunds and Haverhill should result in significant positive effects in improving access to retail and leisure facilities. It will ensure that shopping facilities are accessible by a range of modes particularly with the effective implementation of the sustainable transport hierarchy.	See assessment of CS8. If the aim of the policy is to encourage cultural facilities alongside retail and leisure opportunities, it is suggested that the title of the policy be changed to encompass a broader spectrum.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	By concentrating retail in the towns of Bury St.Edmunds and Haverhill should ensure readily available opportunities for employment.	Recommend removal of 'office development' from this policy title as employment is dealt with in CS10.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
9	To improve water and air quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
12	To reduce waste	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	✓✓	Sub-Reg	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	+	+	+	Possible reduction in car use and the need to travel due to promotion of retail and leisure facilities in accessible locations resulting in minor positive effects on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the long term.	Positive effects would be maximised through the effective implementation of CS8.

14	To reduce contributions to climate change	✓✓	Sub-Reg	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	+	+	+	Possible reduction in car use and the need to travel due to promotion of retail and leisure facilities in accessible locations resulting in minor positive effects on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the long term.	Positive effects would be maximised through the effective implementation of CS8.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	✓✓	Sub-Reg	ST-LT	Perm	High		+	+	+	+	The promotion of retail and leisure facilities in Bury St.Edmunds and Haverhill should help to strengthen the local economy.	None identified.
20	To revitalise town centres	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	This is the key aim of this policy.	None identified.
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.





Table D.12 - Policy CS12: Bury St Edmunds Strategic Growth

Policy CS12: Bury St Edmunds Strategic Growth
<p>Limited growth to the north-west:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ around 900 homes</li> <li>§ local employment provision</li> <li>§ additional education, community and leisure facilities</li> <li>§ maintaining identity and segregation of Fornham All Saints</li> <li>§ new strategic public open space and recreation facilities</li> <li>§ providing traffic relief</li> <li>§ improved links to town centre</li> </ul> <p>Limited growth to the west:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ around 450 homes</li> <li>§ maintaining identity and segregation of Westley</li> <li>§ providing traffic relief</li> <li>§ new sub-regional health campus (West Suffolk Hospital)</li> </ul> <p>Further growth at Moreton Hall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Around xxx homes</li> <li>§ Completion of Eastern Relief Road</li> <li>§ Other transport improvements</li> <li>§ Secondary school</li> <li>§ Community and recreation facilities</li> </ul> <p>Long term strategic growth - north-east Bury St Edmunds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Around 1,250 homes</li> <li>§ Local employment provision</li> <li>§ Improved connections to existing built-up area, including strategic employment sites, A14 and town centre</li> <li>§ Country park</li> <li>§ Education, social and community facilities</li> <li>§ Maintaining identity and segregation of Great Barton</li> </ul> <p>Long term strategic growth – south-east Bury St Edmunds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Upto 3,500 homes beyond 2031</li> <li>§ Local employment provision</li> <li>§ Improved connections to existing built-up area, including strategic employment sites and town centre</li> <li>§ River valley open space corridor</li> <li>§ Education, social and community facilities</li> <li>§ South-eastern relief road</li> </ul> <p>In each case, the actual amount of development will be determined by environmental and infrastructure considerations and the preparation of detailed masterplans in which the local community and other stakeholders have been fully engaged.</p> <p><i>Note: For the assessment purposes, it has been considered that strategic sites identified in the Preferred Options Report relate to the identified locations for growth in Policy CS12 as follows: See Core Strategy and assessment of strategic sites: Limited growth to the north -west (strategic sites 1 and 2)</i></p>

Limited growth to the west (strategic site 3)  
Further growth at Moreton Hall (strategic site 5)  
Long term strategic growth - north east Bury St.Edmunds (strategic site 6)  
Long term strategic growth - south east Bury St.Edmunds (strategic sites 4 and 4a).

SA Objective		Effects					Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert	ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Perm	High	0	+	+	+	Positive but not significant indirect effects on improving health identified as provision of recreation facilities and public open space in the strategic expansion of Bury St. Edmunds may provide increased opportunity for recreation.	An area action plan for Bury St. Edmunds is proposed. Also see assessment of strategic sites.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Perm	High	0	++	++	++	The strategic growth around Bury St. Edmunds with the provision of additional education facilities to serve the local population will have positive significant effects on improving education opportunities and hence skills over the long term.	As above.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	+	+	+	+	The policy should benefit the objective by providing new housing, including a proportion of affordable housing, and new facilities and improving accessibility to the existing facilities.	None identified.

5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓✓	Sub-Reg	MT-LT	Perm	High	0	++	++	++	The growth of Bury St. Edmunds with its strategic location on the A14 and the improvements in infrastructure as a result of new development will improve accessibility resulting in positive significant effects.	An area action plan for Bury St. Edmunds is proposed. Also see assessment of strategic sites.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	✓✓	Sub-Reg	MT-LT	Perm	High	0	++	++	++	The strategic growth around Bury St. Edmunds with the provision of local employment to serve the local population will have positive significant effects on improving employment opportunities.	As above.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Perm	High	0	++	++	++	The strategic growth around Bury St. Edmunds with the provision of approx 6,100 new homes spread around Bury St. Edmunds will contribute to meeting the housing requirements in the medium and longer term.	As above.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Low	+	++	++	++	The provision of improvements in open space provision and recreation facilities may have indirect positive effects on improving the quality of where people live.	Positive effects would be maximised particularly through the effective implementation of CS3 in improving public realm.

9	To improve water and air quality	x	Sub-Reg	MT-LT	Perm	Med		0	-	-	-	The strategic expansion of Bury St. Edmunds, like any new development, is likely to have negative effects on water resources and local air quality. Increasingly over time, the development of more housing will give rise to increases in population, which is likely in turn to increase traffic movement and generate additional building and transport related emissions, contributing to localised degradation in air quality and added pressure on water resources. These effects will be minimised to some extent through the promotion of sustainable transport modes, a mixed-use nature of the sites and design measures.	Effective implementation of CS Policy 2 should ensure that any new development incorporates measures to improve water and local air quality to a certain extent.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		0	-	--	-	The strategic expansion of Bury St. Edmunds is likely to be on greenfield sites in the medium to longer term which will have negative effects on this objective.	Effective implementation of CS Policy 2 should ensure that efficient use of land . No indication of housing densities is provided.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		0	-	--	-	The development of more housing will give rise to increases in population resulting in pressure on water resources. These effects will be minimised to some extent through high quality building design.	Effective implementation of CS Policy 2 should ensure that any new development incorporates measures to make efficient use of water however, no reference to re-use and recycle of minerals and waste resources. See assessment of CS2.
12	To reduce waste	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		0	-	-	-	More housing is likely to result in additional waste. These effects are likely to be minimised, as the nature of new development (i.e. urban extensions) should make implementation of recycling schemes viable.	See assessment of CS2.

13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	✗	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		0	-	---	-	New development will result in more traffic and negative effects on the environment, the significance increases in the long term due to the cumulative effect. These effects will be minimised to some extent through the promotion of sustainable transport modes and a mixed-use nature of the sites.	See assessment of CS8: Sustainable Transport - effective implementation of the sustainable transport hierarchy which promotes walking and cycling above the use of the car in all new development should offset these negative effects.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	✗	Reg/Nat	MT-LT	Perm	High		-	-	---	---	More housing, increasing over the plan period, will continue to contribute to climate change through greenhouse gas emissions from development and increased traffic flows. These effects will be minimised to some extent through the promotion of sustainable transport modes and design measures.	No specific reference to climate change in the Core Strategy policies. Suggest reference should be made in Policy CS2: Sustainable development.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	✗	Reg/Nat	MT-LT	Perm	High		0	+/-	+/-	+/-	New development will increase amount of impermeable surfaces and may increase flood risk.	See comment above for SA Objective 14.

16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med	0	-	-	-	Expansion in and around Bury St. Edmunds is likely to be on greenfield sites resulting in negative effects. Some of the sites are located in proximity to national and local designations. Their development may potentially affect these sites. See assessment of strategic sites for specific effects on local biodiversity.	Effective implementation of CS Policy 2 should ensure that any new development incorporates measures to protect and enhance biodiversity, wildlife and geodiversity therefore offsetting these negative effects to a certain degree. The expansion of Bury St Edmunds will be subject to a detailed planning application and EIA, which could mitigate negative effects and provide opportunities for habitat enhancement. Potential effects identified in the detailed assessment for the strategic sites need to be carefully addressed through appropriate mitigation measures.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med	-	--	--	--	Bury St. Edmunds is a historic market town with the medieval core of the town being of exceptional value. This policy aims to ensure development does not have a detrimental impact on the unique fabric. New development may impact on the settings of historical assets or affect unknown archaeological remains.	See assessment of CS4 as effective implementation of this policy aimed to create high quality developments may offset these negative effects. Cross-referencing is recommended. Potential effects against this objective identified in the detailed assessment for the strategic sites need to be carefully addressed through appropriate mitigation measures.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	x	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med	-	-	-	-	Greenfield development may have negative effects in the local landscape.	See assessment of CS4 as effective implementation of this policy aimed to create high quality developments may offset these negative effects. Cross-referencing is recommended.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	✓✓	Sub-Reg	MT-LT	Perm	High	0	++	++	++	The strategic expansion of Bury St. Edmunds should contribute to economic growth for the Borough.	An area action plan for Bury St. Edmunds is proposed. Also see assessment of strategic sites.

20	To revitalise town centres	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Perm	High	0	++	++	++	The growth of Bury St. Edmunds will have significant positive effects on the vitality and viability of the town centre through increased demand for local facilities and the provision of more facilities as a result of the increased demand.	An area action plan for Bury St. Edmunds is proposed. Also see assessment of strategic sites.
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	✓✓	Sub-Reg	MT-LT	Perm	High	0	++	++	++	Bury St. Edmunds is a key centre for development and change and due to its strategic location between the Cambridge Growth Area and the Haven Gateway growth point will have positive significant effects.	An area action plan for Bury St. Edmunds is proposed. Also see assessment of strategic sites.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	✓✓	Sub-Reg	MT-LT	Perm	High	0	++	++	++	Strategic growth of Bury St. Edmunds is likely to result in attracting inward investment.	An area action plan for Bury St. Edmunds is proposed. Also see assessment of strategic sites.

Table D.13 - Policy CS13:Haverhill Strategic Growth

Policy CS13:Haverhill Strategic Growth													
<div>Land on the north-eastern edge of Haverhill will accommodate the future long term strategic growth for the town and will provide;</div> <div><div><div>• At least 2,200 homes</div><div>• Improved connections to the existing built up area with a network of foot and cycle links to the town centre and employment areas</div><div>• Protection so that the ridge and the visual boundary with Kedington is not breached</div><div>• Protection for the Scheduled Ancient Monument at Wilsey Farm</div><div>• New strategic public open space and recreation facilities</div><div>• Education, social and recreational facilities</div><div>• Local employment facilities</div><div>• Opportunities for renewable energy generation and efficient use of resources</div><div>• An opportunity to explore the potential for a North-eastern relief road</div></div></div>													
SA Objective		Effects						Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert		ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	✓	Local	LT	Perm	Med		0	0	+	+	Positive but not significant indirect effects on improving health identified as provision of recreational areas facilities in the expansion of Haverhill may provide increased opportunity for passive recreation	None identified.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	✓✓	Local	LT	Perm	Med		+	+	++	++	The expansion on the north-eastern edge of Haverhill will provide education facilities as part of the provision of 2,200 homes which will have positive significant effects on improving education opportunities and hence skills over the long term.	None identified.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		+	+	+	+	The policy should benefit the objective by providing new housing, including a proportion of affordable housing, and new facilities and improving accessibility to the existing facilities.	None identified.



5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓✓	Local	LT	Perm	Med	0	0	++	+	The potential north-eastern relief road could improve access for the population of Haverhill. Additional education, social and recreational facilities within an already accessible area and improved local connections will have positive effects in terms of improved accessibility.	A master plan for Haverhill extension is likely to be prepared in accordance with CS4 which will assess potential transport improvements for the area which would confirm these positive effects.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	✓✓	Local	LT	Perm	High	+	+	+	+	The policy refers to the provision of local employment facilities which should result in positive effects.	Recommend reference to level employment provision if relevant for the strategic growth of Haverhill.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	✓✓	Local	LT	Perm	High	++	++	++	++	The provision of 2,200 homes will contribute to meeting the medium and long term housing requirements of the borough.	Effective implementation of CS6 should ensure a proportion of affordable housing in the expansion of Haverhill.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	-	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Low	+	++	+	++	The provision of improvements in open space provision and recreation facilities may have indirect positive effects on improving the quality of where people live.	Positive effects would be maximised particularly through the effective implementation of CS3 in improving public realm.
9	To improve water and air quality	✗	Sub-Reg	LT	Perm	Med	0	0	--	-	The development of housing will give rise to increases in population, which is likely in turn to increase traffic movement and generate additional building and transport related emissions, contributing to localised degradation in air quality and added pressure on water quality.	All proposals for growth in Haverhill should be in accordance with CS2. Recommend referring to this in the policy wording to strength the protection of the natural and built environment through this policy. In accordance with CS4 a master plan for the extension of Haverhill will be prepared together with transport and environmental assessments.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	✗	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med	0	0	--	-	Greenfield expansion will have negative effects on this objective.	Effective implementation of CS Policy 2 should ensure that efficient use of land . No indication of housing densities is provided.

11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	✓✓	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	-	-	-	The development of more housing will give rise to increases in population resulting in pressure on water resources. These effects will be minimised to some extent through high quality building design.	Effective implementation of CS Policy 2 should ensure that any new development incorporates measures to make efficient use of water however, no reference to re-use and recycle of minerals and waste resources. See assessment of CS2.
12	To reduce waste	✗	Local	LT	Perm	Med	0	-	-	-	More housing is likely to result in additional waste. These effects are likely to be minimised, as the nature of new development (i.e. urban extensions) should make implementation of recycling schemes viable.	See assessment of CS2. Cross-referencing to Policy CS2 is recommended.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	✗	Local	LT	Perm	Med	0	0	+/-	+/-	Although the sequential approach should help reduce the need to travel, traffic volumes are likely to increase, as housing is built over the plan period. This will result in negative effects on the environment, the significance increases in the long term due to the cumulative effect.	As above.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	✗	Reg/Nat	LT	Perm	High	0	0	--	-	The expansion of Haverhill would contribute to climate change through greenhouse gas emissions from development and increased traffic flows.	No specific reference to climate change in the Core Strategy policies. Suggest reference should be made in Policy CS2: Sustainable development.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	✗	Reg/Nat	LT	Perm	High	+	0	-	+/-	The north eastern edge of Haverhill is not located within the floodplain however development will increase amount of impermeable surfaces and may increase flood risk.	See comment above for SA Objective 14.

16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	x	Local	LT	Perm	Med	0	0	---	-	Expansion around Haverhill is likely to be on greenfield sites resulting in negative effects. No reference is made in the policy to protect important habitats and species which may have colonised the greenfield site. Some of the sites are located in proximity to national and local designations. Their development may potentially affect these sites. See assessment of strategic sites for specific effects on local biodiversity.	The expansion of Haverhill will be subject to a detailed planning application and EIA which could mitigate negative effects and provide opportunities for habitat enhancement. Potential effects identified in the detailed assessment for the strategic sites need to be carefully addressed through appropriate mitigation measures.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	✓✓	Local	LT	Perm	Med	0	0	+	+	The policy specifically refers to protecting the SAM at Wilsey Farm and ensuring that the ridge and the visual boundary with Kedington are not breached resulting in positive but not significant effects.	None identified.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	✓✓	Local	LT	Perm	Med	0	0	++	+	The policy specifically refers to protecting the SAM at Wilsey Farm and ensuring that the ridge and the visual boundary with Kedington are not breached resulting in positive significant effects.	None identified.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	✓✓	Local	LT	Perm	Med	0	0	++	+	The strategic expansion of Haverhill should contribute to economic growth for the Borough.	None identified.

20	To revitalise town centres	✓✓	Local	LT	Perm	High		0	0	++	+	The growth of Haverhill will have significant positive effects on the vitality and viability of Haverhill town centre through increased demand for local facilities and the provision of more facilities as a result of the increased demand.	None identified.
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	✓✓	Local	LT	Perm	Med		0	0	++	+	Strategic growth of Haverhill is likely to result in attracting inward investment.	None identified.

Table D.14 - Policy CS14: Phasing

Policy CS14: Phasing												
<p>In accordance with the spatial strategy, the Council will promote the re-use of previously developed land within housing settlement boundaries ahead of releasing greenfield sites for new neighbourhoods. The need to release land for new neighbourhoods will be assessed against the release of potential release of sites within the existing urban areas of the towns concerned. Matters to be considered in making such an assessment will include:</p> <p>§ The potential to deliver national and regional targets for the development of previously developed land;  § The projected delivery of the annual target for constructing new homes in the borough;  § The delivery of required infrastructure; and  § Achieving the objectives of the spatial strategy.</p>												
SA Objective		Effects					Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert	ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med	+	++	++	++	A phased programme for housing in Bury St.Edmunds is likely to ensure the delivery of sustainable communities ensuring that infrastructure (in combination with CS15) is in place to reduce the burden on existing facilities which is likely to occur with the pressure of new housing development. Positive effects are likely to be permanent and increase over the plan period.	None identified.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	✓✓	Sub-Reg	MT-LT	Perm	Med		+	++	++	++	A phased programme for housing is likely to meet the short, medium and long term requirements for housing in the borough to meet the regional housing targets resulting in positive permanent effects.	None identified.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
9	To improve water and air quality	✗	Sub-Reg	MT-LT	Perm	Med		-	-	--	--	The policy sets out a sequential approach to the siting of development, prioritising PDL within housing settlement boundaries ahead of releasing greenfield sites for new neighbourhoods. However, any new development is likely to have negative effects on this objective.	See assessment of Policy CS1.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	✗	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		0	-	--	-	As above.	See assessment of Policy CS1.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	✗	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		-	-	--	--	Any new development is likely to have negative effects on this objective.	See assessment of Policy CS1.
12	To reduce waste	✗	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		-	-	--	--	Any new development is likely to have negative effects on this objective.	See assessment of Policy CS1.
13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	✗	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		0	-	--	-	As above.	See assessment of Policies CS1 and CS8.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	✗	Reg/Nat	MT-LT	Perm	High		-	--	--	--	Any new development is likely to have negative effects on this objective.	See assessment of Policy CS1.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	✗	Reg/Nat	MT-LT	Perm	High		-	-	-	-	Any new development is likely to have negative effects on this objective.	See assessment of Policy CS1.
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	✗	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		0	-	--	-	The policy sets out a sequential approach to the siting of development, prioritising PDL within housing settlement boundaries ahead of releasing greenfield sites for new neighbourhoods. In the long term therefore negative effects are predicted.	See assessment of Policy CS1.

17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	x	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+/-	+/-	-	-	The policy sets out a sequential approach to the siting of development, prioritising PDL within housing settlement boundaries ahead of releasing greenfield sites for new neighbourhoods. Focusing development in existing settlements may have negative effects on historic buildings. Some housing is likely to be on greenfield sites in the medium to longer term which will have negative effects on this objective. Increased traffic levels can also have negative effects on the setting of historic buildings.	See assessment of Policy CS1.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	-	Local	MT-LT	Perm	Med		+/-	+/-	-	-	The policy sets out a sequential approach to the siting of development, prioritising PDL within housing settlement boundaries ahead of releasing greenfield sites for new neighbourhoods. In the long term therefore negative effects are predicted as greenfield land is released to meet housing targets.	See assessment of CS1. Recommend that this policy cross refers to Policy CS2.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+	+	+	+	The sequential approach to the siting of development could provide a local supply of workers required by new and existing businesses.	See assessment of CS1.
20	To revitalise town centres	✓✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	High		++	++	++	++	The towns of Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill will be the main focus for the location of new development, supported by appropriate levels of development in Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Infill Villages. This approach should ensure positive significant permanent effects in revitalising existing centres.	See assessment of CS1.
21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	✓	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+	+	+	+	Sequential approach to siting new development may help reduce the need to travel, particularly by private car.	See assessment of CS8 as this policy states that all development proposals will be required to follow the sustainable transport hierarchy resulting in permanent positive cumulative effects if these two policies are effectively implemented.

22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	
----	--	---	-------	----	------	-----	---	---	---	---	---------------------	--

Table D.15 - Policy CS15: Infrastructure

Policy CS15: Infrastructure												
<p>All new proposals for development will be required to demonstrate that the necessary on and off-site infrastructure capacity required to support the development and to mitigate the impact of it on existing community facilities exists or will exist prior to that development being occupied.</p> <p>In circumstances where the provision or improvement of infrastructure or other works or facilities is necessary, both within and beyond the borough boundary, to address community or environmental needs associated with new development or to mitigate the impact of development on the environment or existing communities, standard charges and/or standard formulae will be imposed for the payment of financial contributions towards such infrastructure, works or facilities to ensure that all such development makes an appropriate and reasonable contribution to the costs of provision.</p> <p>The requirement to pay the standard charge and/or standard formulae will be reviewed and modified as appropriate in circumstances where the provision of infrastructure, works or facilities normally covered by standard charges is to be provided as part of the development proposals.</p> <p>The provision of infrastructure will be linked directly to phasing of development on land throughout the borough to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on existing infrastructure, the environment or residential amenity. It will be coordinated and delivered in partnership with other authorities and agencies such as the local highways authority, local education authority, the environment agency, primary car trusts, utility companies and other private and public sector partners.</p>												
SA Objective		Effects					Assessment				Summary of Effects	Recommendation/Mitigation
		Mag	Scale	Dur	T/P	Cert	ST	MT	LT	Sm		
1	To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Temp	Low	+	+	+	+	Provision of facilities and services such as doctors' surgeries or recreational facilities may contribute indirectly to improving health. However, effects are uncertain and will depend on identified need.	Should this policy be titled 'infrastructure capacity and tariffs'? The scale and effects of this policy is likely to be monitored through the development control process.
2	To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Temp	Low	+	+	+	+	This policy offers the opportunity to ensure financial contributions are sought which could be use to fund educational provision however, will depend on identified need and scale of development. Minor positive effects are likely in the medium and long term but not significant.	The scale and effects of this policy is likely to be monitored through the development control process.
3	To reduce crime and anti-social activity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low	0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.



4	To reduce poverty and social exclusion	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
5	To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Temp	Low		+	+	+	+	This policy offers the opportunity to ensure financial contributions are sought which could be used to fund improvements in accessibility however, will depend on identified need and scale of development. Minor positive effects are likely in the medium and long term.	The scale and effects of this policy is likely to be monitored through the development control process.
6	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
7	To meet the housing requirements of the whole community	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
8	To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
9	To improve water and air quality	✗	Local	ST-LT	Perm	Med		+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	Provision of facilities through infrastructure provision may include water quality and capacity improvements however, this is required as part of CS2 and intrinsic to any planning permission therefore effects may be positive but uncertain. Construction and operation of any development may cause pollution of watercourses and negative effects on local air quality.	Effective implementation of measures in Policy CS2 should ensure that negative effects are minimised. CEMP for any new development should also ensure negative effects are minimised. The scale and effects of this policy is likely to be monitored through the development control process.
10	To conserve soil resources and quality	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
11	To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
12	To reduce waste	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

13	To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Temp	Low		+	+	+	+	Provision of infrastructure through developer contributions may generate sufficient funding to enhance sustainable transport options in combination with CS8. However, positive effects will depend on the nature of obligations sought and therefore effects are uncertain.	Cumulative positive effects likely if effective implementation of Policy CS8. The scale and effects of this policy is likely to be monitored through the development control process.
14	To reduce contributions to climate change	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
15	To reduce vulnerability to climatic events	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
16	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
17	To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
18	To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
19	To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Temp	Low		+	++	++	++	Infrastructure provision through developer contributions has the potential for significant positive effects through the provision of a range of community facilities and infrastructure improvements to support economic growth. Effects are likely to be permanent and long term.	None identified.
20	To revitalise town centres	✓✓	Local	MT-LT	Temp	Low		+	++	++	++	This policy aims to protect the vitality and viability of existing facilities but also promotes the provision of enhanced infrastructure where a need has been identified. This policy should contribute to revitalising town centres based on need.	The scale and effects of this policy is likely to be monitored through the development control process.

21	To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.
22	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-	Local	LT	Perm	Low		0	0	0	0	No obvious effects.	None identified.

## Appendix E - Consultation Comments on Scoping Report

**Table E.1 - Summary of Comments Made by Consultees on Scoping Report and how they have been incorporated into the SA Process**

Date	Consultees	Report Section	Summary of Consultees Comments (includes proposed changes)	Response to the Comment
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	General	Changes to text with regard to 'easy reading', grammar and spelling. Several amendments throughout text, including replacing unnecessary capital letters, writing SEBC in full, replacing '&' with 'and', minor spelling and factual mistakes, grammatical errors and removal / replacement of words in order to improve readability.	Appropriate amendments will be made.
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	Chapter 1, Para 1.12, point 2	Include further detail. Add 'e.g. population change' to end of sentence 'assess the broad Env., social...'	These are just summary statements and therefore do not require further detail
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	Chapter 2, Table 3	Need to include more relevant documents. Under 'local authorities corporate plans and strategies' include SEBC Equality Framework (2005) and SEBC Disability Equality Scheme 06-09 (Oct 2006).	Documents were included in the review of relevant Plans and Programmes.
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	Chapter 2, Table 3	SEBC health and wellbeing strategy 2004 repeated twice.	Delete duplicate.
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	Chapter 2, Table 3	Far more community cohesion documents exist that could be included under 'social inclusion'.	Scoping Report is considered to have included key documents that have a spatial impact.
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	Chapter 3, General	Gender, faith and disability are not addressed in this chapter.	This data has been added to the baseline data table.
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	Chapter 3, Table 12	'white' is too broad. Should clearly identify 'white British' and an ever increasing 'white other'.	Comment noted and addressed in the relevant baseline table.
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	Chapter 3, General	No mention of migrant workers. Might be worth adding a sentence for migrant workers and their impact on the economy. NI registration figures are available.	No data were found to be available only for the Government office

				regions; not at the borough level.
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	Chapter 3, Para 3.1	'How good or bad' is a difficult criterion to use. Consider changing.	Comment noted.
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	Chapter 3, Para 3.4	No mention of access to info for disabled, those speaking a different language, etc. May want to add a paragraph covering other types of access to services, e.g. physical access for disabled, alternative formats (?), language.	Comment noted and the relevant additional information has been included in the baseline section.
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	Chapter 3, Para 3.67	Add 'and composting' behind '...terms of recycling'. Appears twice in paragraph.	Paragraph 3.67 has been amended.
14.11.06	Davina Howes, SEBC Strategic Performance	Chapter 4, Table 25	Add some equality indicators, e.g. - BVPI Indicators on equality standards and duty to promote race equality	Disagree. While the LDF should promote equality in its policies, the BVPI indicators relate to the Council as an organisation and not the land use planning system. However, ethnicity data is now included in the baseline data tables.
15.11.06	Richard Whitehead, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 2, Table 3	The Updating and Screening Assessment of Air Quality in St Edmundsbury is no longer a draft. An annual update of the local air quality will be carried out in 2007 and 2008 and a further Updating and Screening in 2009.	Updating and Screening Assessment (2006) and Progress Report (2007) have been included in the review of relevant plans and programmes.
15.11.06	Richard Whitehead, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 3, Table 5	Indicator 25 only refers to complaints made between neighbours. It omits commercial noise complaints. With the likely increase in industrial/commercial noise complaints as a result of economic growth/development, perhaps it would be appropriate to include commercial	Indicator has been amended in the Final Report to include commercial noise

			noise complaints.	complaints.
15.11.06	Richard Whitehead, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 3, Table 5	Incorrect figures. Indicator 25. Domestic complaints are actually increasing. Indicator 25, table 5 should probably be in table 7.	Comment noted and appropriate amendments were made.
15.11.06	Richard Whitehead, SEBC Env. Health	App. 1, Indicator 25	Figures in App. 1 differ greatly from our records. Figures in App. 1, pg 36, should be changed: delete - 2002 - 563; 2003 - 426; 2004 - 486; 2005/6 - 403 replace with - 2002/3 - 411; 2003/4 - 483; 2004/5 - 419; 2005/6 - 465	This data has been amended in the baseline data table.
15.11.06	Richard Whitehead, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 3, Table 8	Indicator 47, number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings, is essentially redundant due to recent changes in legislation and a new assessment system. An alternative indicator could be the percentage of vulnerable persons living in non-decent homes.	The Final Report has been amended to include relevant indicators related to the new Housing Health and Safety Rating System. Comment addressed through the inclusion of the suggested indicator under Objective 7 of the SA Framework.
15.11.06	Richard Whitehead, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 3, Para 3.65	Replace '□greenfield' with 'greenfield'	Comment noted and addressed.
20.11.06	Nick Vass-Bowen, Go East	General	It appears...that the SR has been produced for a number of LDDs. If so - SR needs to provide adequate information on the scope and level of detail in each LDD. This might be achieved by producing two SRs or somehow splitting the content to relate to all LDD matters and those that relate to individual LDDs. The first would be a general section, setting out common elements. The second would outline additional/specific details for individual LDDs.	The Scoping Report sets the baseline indicators which will guide the detailed assessment of individual LDD's.
24.11.06	Jane Chance, SEBC Community	App. 1, Indicator 17-20	Discrepancy in figures. May want to use Department for Education stats.	The data is provided by the Suffolk Observatory which uses Department for

	Development			Education data as a source.
24.11.06	Jane Chance, SEBC Community Development	Chapter 2, Table 3	The Western Suffolk Community Strategy has been listed as a draft but has now been approved and is final.	Suffolk's Community Strategy (Transforming Suffolk 2008-2028) has been added to the reviews of the relevant plans and programmes.
24.11.06	Jane Chance, SEBC Community Development	App. 1, Indicators 12-4 and 54	Issues relating to open space and volunteering are covered in the Local Area Agreement. SCC partnership team should be able provide some data. Contact SCC for data?	This has been researched further but not provided data. Work will continue to try and source meaningful data relating to these indicators.
24.11.06	Jane Chance, SEBC Community Development	Chapter 3, Para 3.5	There are a number of active community/resident groups, some with funding and officer support.	Comment noted and appropriate amendments were made.
24.11.06	Jane Chance, SEBC Community Development	Chapter 4, Para 4.1	Whilst we agree that cancer and heart disease are priorities...obesity, exercise and healthy eating are of key significance. Perhaps these are worth highlighting in their own right.	Comment noted. The SA Framework was amended to reflect the levels of obesity in the population. A new indicator on sport and active recreation has been added to SA Objective 1. Healthy eating is deemed as not appropriate indicator for the LDF.
27.11.06	Susan Heinrich, EEDA	General	Concerned that scoping reports don't address sustainable economic development and regeneration sufficiently. Where appropriate, consider: provision for businesses (particularly based in science and technology, research and innovation) including the supply of high quality business premises in sustainable locations;	It is considered that the relevant and appropriate indicators have been included in the Scoping Report and the policies of



			<p>improving the region's skills base and human capital (and especially to address skills gaps and shortages);</p> <p>tackling deprivation and social exclusion, equality and diversity (giving communities improved opportunities to participate fully in the regional economy);</p> <p>improving provision of port, airport and transport infrastructure so as to enable corridors of economic activity, and deliver growth and sustainable communities;</p> <p>promoting sustainable development, urban renaissance and rural vitality, including the supply of high quality and affordable housing/ residential environments, balanced with provision for employment;</p> <p>managing growth and development sensitively and effectively;</p> <p>complementing and enhancing the position of London as a world city; and</p> <p>protecting and enhancing the region's landscapes and environmental assets.</p>	the RES and RSS will provide the context for the development of policies and proposals in the LDF.
27.11.06	Susan Heinrich, EEDA	General	<p>Concerned that scoping reports don't address sustainable economic development and regeneration sufficiently. Consider the Sub-regional policies contained in the RES for the Thetford area (see pg 99 of RES report):</p> <p>building on Thetford's role as a key service and economic centre on the A11 corridor</p> <p>facilitating regeneration of the town centre, while protecting its historic core and natural setting</p> <p>developing the economic potential of the rural hinterland through workspace creation and re-use</p> <p>developing links to foster the emerging cluster of motorsport/auto engineering industries focused on the A11 corridor.</p>	It is considered that the relevant and appropriate indicators have been included in the Scoping Report and the policies of the RES and RSS will provide the context for the development of policies and proposals in the LDF.
05.12.06	Donna Wagers	App. 1, Indicator 42	<p>General needs housing completions do not match our records.</p> <p>Delete: 2004/5 - 28; 2003/4 - 27; 2002/3 - 62; 2001/2 - 49</p> <p>Replace with : 2004/5 - 20; 2003/4 - 19; 2002/3 - 75; 2001/2 - 40</p>	<p>Affordable housing figures were obtained from the Annual Monitoring Review.</p> <p>This data has been changed in the baseline</p>

				tables.
05.12.06	Donna Wagers	App. 1 Indicator 43	Under 'issues identified and action required' the comment is that there is a low level of completions for special needs housing in the Borough. Whilst comment is true, it's important to understand that Council is guided by the Housing Corporation who set sub-regional themes that we work towards. Sub-regional funding for special need/supported housing has been very low but this is determined by the Housing Corporation. A further factor is the Supporting People Suffolk body who manage revenue funding for supported housing, and they have not had sufficient revenue funds to support schemes.	Noted.
07.12.06	Peter Gudde, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 1, Para 1.6	Why is the list of SDPs restricted to two – affordable housing and section 106 developer contributions? Issues such as sustainable construction, climate change, biodiversity and water seem equally of value. If the two proposed SPDs are to form part of a family which will be developed with time then an explanation of the process of topic selection and publication should be provided.	The Council's agreed Local Development Scheme lists the proposed SPD's. The most recent LDS, March 2007, still has not been approved. It is awaiting confirmation from GO-East. It no longer proposes any SPD to be prepared in the period 2007 - 2010.
07.12.06	Peter Gudde, SEBC Env. Health	App. 1, Indicator 83	The BC no longer owns social housing. This indicator should be withdrawn.	Agree. This Indicator was deleted.
07.12.06	Peter Gudde, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 3, General	The selection of over 140 indicators will allow detailed analysis of specific components but may make measuring overall performance of the LDF difficult. It will not be possible to make an objective comparison between Env., social and economic sustainability. A separate but complementary way of measuring overall success could be provided by ecological foot printing.. (as) it allows unrelated areas of policy to be compared in an objective manner. The currency of measurement is the global hectare, the equivalent amount of land required to sustain the level of consumption for the area under consideration. ... Associated with this method is the measurement of carbon and material flow and arising from production and consumption behaviours caused but the policy decision or activity being	The Scoping Report and SA has been prepared to an agreed format that is adopted across Suffolk. It is not appropriate at this time to incorporate the suggested methodology.

			assessed. ... Work to measure carbon emission in Suffolk ... is underway with the intention of developing a carbon footprint of Suffolk and LAs. This work along with the SEI methodology could form the basis for measuring the overall performance of the LDF and making relative comparisons of policy decisions.	
07.12.06	Peter Gudde, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 3, Para 3.61	This section disregards the critical importance of water in the future development of the Eastern Region. Rainfall in the East of England is less than 65% of that for England and Wales and there is increasing competition for scarce water resources. Availability of water resources is likely to restrict the long term economic and social growth of the Eastern region with a changing climate. There is no mention of the need to adapt communities and the Borough's infrastructure (e.g. the road and rail networks) to severe weather events including drought, heat and fluvial/groundwater flooding likely with a changing climate.	Both issues of strained water resources and the need to adapt to the expected climate changes have been included in the Issues table.
07.12.06	Peter Gudde, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 3, Para 3.64	This section deals only with the quality of under-developed urban land. This ignores the state of land under agricultural productivity and soil resources in semi-natural environments. There is no consideration for example of soil types, their intrinsic characteristics or the impact of human activity on quality, organic matter content, moisture balance or erosion rates. Soils are a finite resource vital to economic activity in terms of agricultural production, to landscape quality and biodiversity as well as having value in themselves, for example the soils of the Brecks.	An over-arching objective of the SA is to maintain and enhance soil quality. However, this can only be achieved within the parameters of the planning system.
07.12.06	Peter Gudde, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 3, Para 3.66	Municipal waste accounts for only 14% of total waste arising in the East of England. This section deals only with municipal waste neglecting the other waste streams, particularly from the commercial and industrial sectors. Redevelopment generates wastes which contribute both to the cost of the build and also to the degradation of the local environment. This section needs refocusing to reflect the need to develop a more sustainable approach to resource efficiency.	This chapter only notes the current situation in respect of the key indicators. It cannot set out objectives for future LDD's.
07.12.06	Peter Gudde, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 3, Para 3.67	The ability for the domestic and commercial sectors to implement micro-renewable energy generation must not be overlooked. There also exists a lack of skilled installers of such technologies. With the potential for demand to increase significantly, driven by several factors including increasing fossil-fuel energy prices, there is an opportunity for stimulating local employment in this service sector in addition to spin-offs for local	This chapter only notes the current situation in respect of the key indicators. It cannot set out objectives for future LDD's.

			manufacture of the installations.	
07.12.06	Peter Gudde, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 3, Para 3.8	The challenge lies in developing new renewable energy generating stations with the support of the local community in which they are to be based.	This chapter only notes the current situation in respect of the key indicators. It cannot set out objectives for future LDD's.
07.12.06	Peter Gudde, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 4, Para 4.1	The following issues have been omitted and should be included: water resources; adapting to changing climate including coping with heat waves, storm events and flooding; resource efficiency and waste	Comment noted and the outline issues have been included in the Issues table.
07.12.06	Peter Gudde, SEBC Env. Health	Chapter 5, Para 5.6	Compatibility of sustainability appraisal objectives – see comment for Section 3, General above.	Noted. The Compatibility Assessment has been reviewed in the Final SAR.

## Appendix F - Consultation Comments on Initial Sustainability Appraisal (Issues and Options Report)

**Table F.1 - Consultation comments on St Edmundsbury Core Strategy Issues and Options Initial SAR**

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
<b>Mrs Joanne Ince, Oustden Parish Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	Yes	Comment noted but unable to take specific action pertaining to this comment without further information regarding the indicators that this consultee considers should be included.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	Yes	Comment noted but unable to take specific action pertaining to this comment without further information regarding the adverse effects that this consultee considers should be included.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
<b>Mrs D Haycock, Coney Weston Parish Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	No	Comment noted.

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	Re-cycling points e.g. bottle banks can be very unpopular with nearby residents.	Comment noted. However, given the high, strategic level of assessment of the compatibility of the Core Strategy objectives with the SA objectives, potential conflicts between recycling points and local residents cannot be reflected within the compatibility assessment.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Mr Gordon Mussett, Haverhill Town Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	No	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	Housing density levels can result in development which contributes to poor health factors.	Addressed in the revised compatibility assessment.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	Not known	Comment noted.
<b>Ms N Bertoya, Stoke-by-Clare Parish Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	No - Indicator of water quality is insufficient here	SA Framework has been amended to include two indicators on water quality under SA Objective 9.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	Criteria used by EA and Defra to classify the status of rivers in line with the 'Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the Community action in the field of water policy. (EU Water Framework Directive ) should be used. Close contact should be maintained by the Council with the relevant basin management authorities to participate in the planning processes	Comment noted. The SA Framework now includes an indicator on water quality in rivers.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Jayne Brock, Great Wratting Parish Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal	No - Not at all sure at this stage.	Comment noted but it cannot be addressed



Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
indicators?		because of the lack of specific recommendations.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	Not sure, other than balance developments with the surroundings and services.	Comment noted. Balancing development with the surroundings and services formed part of considerations in the development of the Core strategy Policies and their assessment.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	No - not sure	Comment noted but unable to take specific action pertaining to this comment without further information regarding the inadequacies that this consultee considers are in the assessment.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	Pollution	Issues of pollution are addressed through SA objectives 1 (population health), 9 (water and air quality), 13 (effects of traffic on the environment) and 14 (contributions to climate change), and are therefore integrated within the SA framework.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes - In part	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	Not sure	Comment noted.
<b>R Mills, A V Mills &amp; Sons</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	No	Comment noted.

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes - broadly yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	Risk to small communities by not permitting controlled growth	Comment noted. The Core Strategy does not seek to prevent controlled growth and as such this adverse effect is not considered likely to occur.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Mrs Linda Harley, Gt Barton Parish Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	We don't believe so	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	Not assessed	Comment noted but unable to take specific action pertaining to this comment without further information regarding the inadequacies that this consultee considers in the assessment.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	Not assessed	Comment noted but unable to take specific action pertaining to this comment without further information regarding the inadequacies that this consultee considers are in the assessment.
<b>Cllr Christopher Spicer, St Edmundsbury Borough Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	No	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	Option 4 - the growth of Bury St Edmunds must not allow the absorption of surrounding villages - Great Barton, Fornhams, Westley, Roughm and Thurston.	Comment noted. Preserving settlements' identity and not allowing coalescence of the towns with nearby villages was a material consideration in developing the Core Strategy Policies and their assessment, as well as in the detailed assessment of strategic sites.
<b>The Risby Trust, Brown and Scarlett</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	<i>No comment</i>	

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	<p>These comments should be read in relation to question 10, 11, 12 and question 4 in the Sustainability Appraisal. In common with some other Agents in the town we are concerned that there is an over emphasis on housing in what is perceived to be the sustainable major centres such as Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill. This can lead to a virtual stagnation of the vast majority of the network of villages which form the backbone of rural Suffolk life. The Local Development Framework professes to serve the whole of the community but it's over reliance on development in the major centres across the projected Plan period will leave our existing villages as little more than museum pieces.</p> <p>Option 4, the option which we are supporting in our submission would allow for development in key service centres and rural services centres. This will clearly allow for those existing village facilities to be maintained. We read daily of local pubs, shops, schools and post offices under threat and to fail to locate development in the village setting will lead to the inevitable demise of what are universally acknowledged as being vital facilities and ones which provide and secure the sustainable nature of many villages across the county.</p>	<p>Comment noted and appreciated. Positive as well negative effects of new development in rural areas have been considered as part of the strategic options assessment. The need for certain level of development in the rural area is recognised and is recommended to be a consideration in the development of the preferred option. The Core Strategy Policy 1 (Spatial Strategy) directs a proportion of new development to the rural areas.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
	<p>If we continue to limit village development to a very few centres, allowing only exception sites being allowed for social housing in the rest, we will create a polarising of the housing market within these settlements where either the very rich or the very poor can live but with nothing for the ordinary family in between.</p> <p>We believe that the existing village network, including those beyond the existing rural service centre status should continue to have an allocation for either infill, where possible, or minor expansion and these could be allocated with design briefs to ensure an appropriate mix and house size.</p>	
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Mr Michael Surridge</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?		
<b>Mrs Susan Hindry, Bury St Edmunds Town Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	Constant reviews	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
<b>Mrs Barbara Surridge</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	The number of large trucks that are routed down unsuitable, narrow lanes (Presumably directed by Sat Nav)	SA Framework includes an indicator on Traffic volumes in key locations.

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes - written descriptions more easy to understand than face icons	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	Status quo of small hamlets without service guaranteed in all five options. Yet implementation of any of the options could negate this statement this statement by just swallowing them up.	Comment noted.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Status quo of small hamlets without service guaranteed in all five options. Yet implementation of any of the options could negate this statement this statement by just swallowing them up.	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Mr John Pelling</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	No	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
<b>Linda Bevan</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	No	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted
<b>BypassFarmPartnership, Bidwells</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes - Allocating land for new housing and employment development at the most appropriate scale in the right location will help to achieve the council's objectives in tables 1(a) and 1(c)	Comment noted
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	<i>No comment</i>	



Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	No - Assessing likely impact on people and environment can only be undertaken at the local scale and in site specific terms. Notwithstanding the statutory requirement that the council needs to undertake such an exercise in a policy context.	Comment noted. However, a compatibility assessment of the Core Strategy objectives with the SA framework is a statutory requirement when undertaking an SA.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	As per question 3.	Comment noted.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>S W Cross and Sons, Bidwells</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes - allocating land for new housing and employment development at the most appropriate scale in the right location will help to achieve the Council's objectives in tables 1 (a) to 1(c)	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	No - assessing likely impact on people and environment can only be undertaken at the local scale and in Site Specific terms. Notwithstanding the statutory requirement that the Council needs to undertake such an exercise in a policy context.	Comment noted. However, a compatibility assessment of the Core Strategy objectives with the SA framework is a statutory requirement when undertaking an SA.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects	Assessing likely impact on people and	Comment noted. However, a compatibility

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
which have not been identified?	environment can only be undertaken at the local scale and in Site Specific terms. Notwithstanding the statutory requirement that the Council needs to undertake such an exercise in a policy context.	assessment of the Core Strategy objectives with the SA framework is a statutory requirement when undertaking an SA.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Dr Simone Bullion, Suffolk Wildlife Trust</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes - with regard to biodiversity	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	No - there are too many crosses 'objective does not apply'. This should be re-evaluated with a more realistic assessment. For example under biodiversity Objective 'A' is likely to be a negative effect, but 'B' should be a positive effect. D and E are probably neutral, but F is positive.	Assessment updated in the revised compatibility assessment.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	<i>No comment</i>	

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Mrs C Wiseman, Withersfield Parish Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	Not sure - other than balanced developments with the surroundings and services.	Comment noted. Balancing development with the surroundings and services formed part of considerations in the development of the Core strategy Policies and their assessment.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	Not sure	Comment noted.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Mr Roger Davison, Lacy Scott &amp; Knight</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	No	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the	Yes – Broadly agree	Comment noted.

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?		
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	Risk to small communities by not permitting controlled growth.	Comment noted. The Core Strategy does not seek to prevent controlled growth and as such this adverse effect is not considered likely to occur.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	Not sure	Comment noted.
<b>Alan Robinson</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	No	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
<b>Mrs Joan Garrett, Whepstead Parish Council</b>		

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Mr Keith Ringrose</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	No - There are probably too many and I would suggest selecting about fifteen key indicators and making the rest secondary indicators.	Comment noted. However, the structure of the SA Framework will be retained, as it follows the Suffolk SA Framework structure.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment	<i>No comment</i>	

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?		
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Mr Nick Laughton, Ixworth and Ixworth Thorpe Parish Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	No	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Doctor Brian Keeble, Suffolk Primary Care Trust</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes - The health indicator should include a commitment to reduce health inequalities as it is quite possible to improve overall health but see the health of the worst off decline.	Comment noted. SA Objective 1 has been amended to address this comment.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability	<i>No comment</i>	

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
impacts of the plan more accurately?		
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	No - I think you need to recognise the potential on health and wellbeing of A, B, C, E, F, G, and H as well as D and I.	Assessment updated in the revised compatibility assessment.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	Yes	Comment noted but unable to take specific action pertaining to this comment without further information regarding the inadequacies that this consultee considers are in the assessment.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
<b>Ruth Hood, Market Weston Parish Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	<i>No comment</i>	

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
<b>Mr Ronald Knight</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	No	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
<b>Mr M Reed</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	Not that I know of	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.



Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	No	Comment noted.
<b>Cllr Mrs Anne Gower, St Edmundsbury Borough Council</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	No	Comment noted.
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	Possibly the effects of housing density levels on the communities.	Comment noted.
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	Not that I can see	Comment noted.
<b>Cornell, Access 1307</b>		
Q1. Do you agree with the proposal indicators?	Yes	Comment noted.

Consultee	Summary of Consultees Comments	Response to the Comment
Q2. Are there any further indicators which could be used to monitor the sustainability impacts of the plan more accurately?	Transport infrastructure	Comment noted. It is believed that relevant indicators are included under SA Objectives 5 (Access to Key Services) and 13 (Traffic effects).
Q3. Do you agree with the assessment of the spatial objectives set out in Appendix A?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q4. Are there any possible adverse effects which have not been identified?	<i>No comment</i>	
Q5. Do you agree with the initial assessment of spatial options consultation questions set out in Appendix B?	Yes	Comment noted.
Q6. Do any of the options have the potential to cause adverse impacts which have not been identified?	Impact on the growth of Haverhill on the residents of villagers either side of the A1307	Comment noted. Preserving settlements' identity and not allowing coalescence of the towns with nearby villages was a material consideration in developing the Core Strategy Policies and their assessment, as well as in the detailed assessment of strategic sites.

# Appendix G - Consultation Comments on Preferred Options and Strategic Sites Issues and Options SAR

**Table G.1 – Consultation comments on St Edmundsbury Core Strategy Preferred Options and Strategic Sites Issues and Options SAR**

Date	Consultee	Report Section	Summary of Consultees Comments (includes proposed changes)	How the comment was dealt with
05.01.09	Michael Wilks, Suffolk County Council	10. The Spatial Vision - Preferred Option	<p>Some amendments are suggested for paragraphs 10.7 and 10.12 and Appendix D. It should be clear that Table 1 presents the Options as scored in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal and that the Appendix B referred to is in this report. The scoring in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal is done differently from the current Sustainability Appraisal and this means the results cannot be directly transcribed. Initially only five categories were used (BSE, HAV, KSC, Other Villages &amp; Countryside) – this then expanded to six (BSE, HAV, KSC, SC, Infill Villages &amp; Countryside).</p> <p>Secondly there is some inconsistency in the anticipated impact of ostensibly the same policy. For example 'To Use Water &amp; Mineral Resources Efficiently...' was scored negatively in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal for BSE, but positively when judged in the current Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>In light of the above comments, it may not be appropriate to state in Paragraph 10.12 that the preferred option has been 'demonstrated' as being the most sustainable as the other options have not been evaluated in the same way. It is suggested for purposes of completeness that Appendix D is supplemented with a Sustainability Appraisal of all the options. Only then can one option be 'demonstrated' as being the most sustainable. As the Sustainability Appraisal is being used to give a comparative indication of sustainability of different growth options, Appendix D only evaluating one option is not currently conducive to this.</p>	The assessment of strategic spatial options has been reviewed in order to improve clarity and consistency of its results. The full assessment table is included in the Appendices and the summary results are presented and discussed in the relevant section of the SAR.
05.01.09	Michael Wilks, Suffolk County Council	Appendix B - SA Framework Objectives and	<p>Cambs now have adopted Core Strategies which should be similarly consulted.</p> <p>In light of the recommendations made on the Core Strategy</p>	<p>Comment noted and appreciated.</p> <p>All the suggested indicators are now</p>

	Council	Indicators	<p>Objectives, the Sustainability Appraisal would have to be amended accordingly to align with this. Likewise the Objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal cannot be achieved if they are not represented in the Core Strategy – absence of reference to the Historic Environment, for example. The Indicators identified in Appendix B remain fit for purpose, although some modification is suggested in order to evaluate progress made against a revised Objective H (Sustainable Construction) and J (Climate Change). The suggestion is that the following indicators may be appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Percentage of buildings achieving desired rating against national building standards such as CSH or BREEAM</li> <li>b. Proportion of people travelling by sustainable modes of transport to their place of work</li> <li>c. Percentage of new development which sources a percentage of energy from low carbon or renewable sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Onsite</li> <li>ii. Offsite</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. Number of properties receiving grants to increase energy efficiency in their homes (e.g. from CERT or Warm Front)</li> </ul> <p>These indicators, in addition to those already referred to, will provide evidence as to progress being made in the Borough in reducing green house gas emissions through increasing energy efficiency in both new and old development, decreasing dependence on fossil fuels and reducing transport emissions.</p> <p>The lack of baseline data should not preclude the adoption of certain indicators. For ‘contemporary’ planning issues such as climate change, there will, by definition, be an absence of data. As stated in the Scoping Opinion SEBC is committed to gathering data on new issues as they emerge, subject to temporal and fiscal constraints. SCC hopes that baseline data on indicators that would demonstrate a commitment to combating climate change would be a priority.</p>	<p>covered by the SA Framework.</p> <p>Additional baseline data on the level of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the borough have been added to the baseline tables.</p>
--	---------	------------	--	---

05.01.09	Michael Wilks, Suffolk County Council	1. Non-Technical Summary	<p>SCC recognises the rapid evolution of planning policy, but would like to point out several documents which it believes should be of a material consideration in assessing both the sustainability of the Core Strategy and its alignment with National Policy. These publications were not in circulation at the time of the Initial Scoping Report, but play a key role in sustainable planning at the current time and recognition of their importance would contribute to the soundness of the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. PPS1 Supplement Climate Change</li> <li>b. Building a Greener Future (Policy Statement)</li> <li>c. Homes for the Future: More Affordable, More Sustainable (Housing Green Paper)</li> <li>d. Government Strategy on Sustainable Construction</li> <li>e. Energy White Paper</li> <li>f. Building Sustainable Transport in to New Developments (Specifically designed for designated Growth Points)</li> <li>g. Manual for Streets</li> </ul> <p>It is also worth pointing out that two neighbouring districts (Mid Suffolk &amp; South Cambs) now have adopted Core Strategies which should be similarly consulted.</p> <p><a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/ppsclimatechange">http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/ppsclimatechange</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/buildinggreener">http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/buildinggreener</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/pdf/439986.pdf">http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/pdf/439986.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file46535.pdf">http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file46535.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file39387.pdf">http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file39387.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/sustainabletransnew.pdf">http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/sustainabletransnew.pdf</a></p>	Comment noted. The suggested documents have been reviewed and included in Table 4.1 – Relevant Plans and Programmes.
----------	--	--------------------------	---	--

			<a href="http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/manforstreets/pdfmanforstreets.pdf">http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/manforstreets/pdfmanforstreets.pdf</a>	
05.01.09	Michael Underwood	13. Conclusion and Next Steps	Aside from an earlier comment we question whether this is correct.	Comment noted but unable to take specific action pertaining to this comment without further information regarding the reservations of this consultee.
05.01.09	Michael Underwood	11. Core Strategy Policies	Aside from an earlier comment we question whether this is correct.	Comment noted. The Core Strategy Policies have been significantly revised and re-appraised in this SAR.
05.01.09	Michael Underwood	10. The Spatial Vision - Preferred Option	Aside from an earlier comment we question whether this is correct.	Assessment of spatial options has been reviewed in order to improve its clarity and consistency.
05.01.09	Michael Underwood	9. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoring System	We do not believe that the scoring system is correctly balanced.	Comment noted. The assessment scale has been aligned with SA best practice.
05.01.09	Michael Underwood	8. Core Strategy Objectives	We believe that some items are excluded from this which should be included and vice versa.	Comment noted but unable to take specific action pertaining to this comment in the absence of more specific comments/recommendations. However, it should be noted that SA Framework included in this SAR has been revised.
05.01.09	Michael Underwood	7. The Sustainability Appraisal Framework	We believe this is incomplete.	Comment noted but unable to take specific action pertaining to this comment in the absence of more specific comments/recommendations. However, it should be noted that SA Framework included in this SAR has been revised.
05.01.09	Mr. Tim Holt-Wilson,	Appendix F - Sustainability	Should include the revised set of SA Objectives established by the SSAG in 2007.	Comment noted. Assessment of Core Strategy Policies was undertaken

	GeoSuffolk	Appraisal of Development Control Policies		against the revised SA Framework.
05.01.09	Mr. Tim Holt-Wilson, GeoSuffolk	Appendix E - Sustainability Appraisal of Core Strategy Policies	Should include the revised set of SA Objectives established by the SSAG in 2007.	Comment noted. Assessment of Core Strategy Policies was undertaken against the revised SA Framework.
05.01.09	Mr. Tim Holt-Wilson, GeoSuffolk	Appendix D - Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Option	Should include the revised set of SA Objectives established by the SSAG in 2007.	Comment noted. Assessment of Core Strategy Policies was undertaken against the revised SA Framework.
05.01.09	Mr. Tim Holt-Wilson, GeoSuffolk	Appendix B - SA Framework Objectives and Indicators	Appendix B. SA Framework Objectives and Indicators Table 1(b) Should include the revised set of Objectives and Indicators established by the SSAG in 2007.	Comment noted. SA Framework included in this SAR has been revised.
05.01.09	Mr. Tim Holt-Wilson, GeoSuffolk	9. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoring System	The revised objectives should be 'To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity'.	SA Objective 16 has been amended in light of this comment.
05.01.09	Mr. Tim Holt-Wilson, GeoSuffolk	7. The Sustainability Appraisal Framework	As a result of the policy direction of PPS9, in 2007 the Suffolk Sustainability Appraisal Group (SSAG) revised and updated the Objectives and Indicators to include Geodiversity.	SA Objective 16 has been amended in light of this comment. Additional baseline information regarding geology and geodiversity has also been added.
05.01.09	Mr. Tim Holt-Wilson, GeoSuffolk	1. Non-Technical Summary	As stated in PPS9, 'Development plan policies and planning decisions should be based upon up to date information about the environmental characteristics of their areas. These characteristics should include the relevant biodiversity and geological sources of the area' (Key Principles 1i).	Comment noted. The baseline includes information regarding sites internationally, nationally and locally designated for their ecological or geological value.



05.01.09	Mr. John Cahill, Kedington Parish Council	13. Conclusion and Next Steps	It is important that the Sustainability Appraisal continues to be an iterative process with policies being reviewed during its progress.	Comment noted. The SA process has been and will continue be an iterative process.
05.01.09	Mr. John Cahill, Kedington Parish Council	11. Core Strategy Policies	New policy CS4 should stand as it provides protection for the quality and distinctiveness of existing settlements.	The revised Core Strategy Policy 5 (Settlement Hierarchy and Identity) aims to deliver this objective.
05.01.09	Mr. John Cahill, Kedington Parish Council	10. The Spatial Vision - Preferred Option	10.13 More work needs to be done in identifying suitable villages as Key Service Centres. Size is not necessarily important - it is the number of suitable facilities available and a robust infrastructure that count also. At present, the Kedington Parish Council doubts whether the village sufficiently meets the proposed criteria.	Comment has been taken in account in the development of the revised Core Strategy Policy 5 (Settlement Hierarchy and Identity).
05.01.09	Mr. John Cahill, Kedington Parish Council	8. Core Strategy Objectives	The Core Strategy Objectives should stand.	Comment noted. The set of Core Strategy objectives have been slightly amended to improve their clarity and to address other comments received.
05.01.09	Mr. John Cahill, Kedington Parish Council	5. The Sustainability Appraisal Process	Establishing an accurate picture of economic, social and environment trends within the borough is essential, as is involving the public and authorities with the appropriate responsibilities in the assessment process.	Comment noted. Existing trends have been established in the baseline data table and the likely future trends have been set out in Table 7.2 – SA Current and Predicted Future Baseline Data Trends.  The second part of the comment is addressed through undertaking a number of rounds of public consultations throughout the SA process.
05.01.09	Mr. John Cahill,	5. The Sustainability	Policy CS4 is vital for conserving the context, character and setting of settlements and maintaining the quality of existing	Comment has been taken in account in the development of the revised Core

	Kedington Parish Council	Appraisal Process	settlements.	Strategy Policy 5 (Settlement Hierarchy and Identity).
05.01.09	Mr. John Cahill, Kedington Parish Council	1. Non-Technical Summary	It is important that 'Baseline Data' is reviewed regularly as things have changed and will continue to change since the original data was collected.	Comment noted. This SAR includes the updated baseline data.
05.01.09	Hewett	10. The Spatial Vision - Preferred Option	<p>Development should be focussed on Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill with little or no development of any of the villages other than limited infill.</p> <p>The reality of the Rural Service Centres is that they have little or no scope for employment as a matter of practical economic reality. Existing services for education and healthcare are limited and used to capacity. Retail facilities are useful but limited. Major shopping is undertaken by car.</p> <p>The villages are essentially rural and scope for development of previously used land is limited or non existent. Realistically any development would have to be on greenfield land which is unsustainable</p> <p>The majority of residents of these villages commutes to Bury St Edmunds or further afield using the A14. Adding to the housing in the villages will simply add to the number of vehicle movements. In addition, the essential rural quality of the villages which is part of the unique heritage of Suffolk will be destroyed. Many are already little more than dormitory villages for commuters. Increased development will only speed the process of destruction of the rural community.</p>	Comment. These considerations have been taken on board in the revised strategic options assessment and in the development of the preferred option.
04.01.09	Cllr David Ray, St. Edmundsbury Borough Council	1. Non-Technical Summary	I find it surprising that the positive impact of the internet on sustainability receives no mention at all in this document, either using its current or potential capabilities. The internet can now allow people to work from home, to shop from home, and to access information and services from home, thus making a significant contribution to reducing the need to	Comment noted. It is considered that access to the internet is partially covered by the SA indicator on Number / percentage of people working from home as main place of work. No more detailed data (i.e. Percentage of

			travel.	households with broadband internet connection) is currently available at the borough level.
31.12.08	Mr. John Cahill	11. Core Strategy Policies	New Policy CS4 must be adhered to in order to protect Settlement Identity and prevent coalescence of urban extensions with nearby villages. The historical context, character and setting of existing settlements must be preserved.	Comment has been taken in account in the development of the revised Core Strategy Policy 5 (Settlement Hierarchy and Identity) and its assessment as well as in the detailed assessment of strategic sites.
31.12.08	Mr. John Cahill	10. The Spatial Vision - Preferred Option	It is vital that new development for Haverhill and Bury St Edmunds is not allowed to destroy the identity and individuality of nearby villages. It is also necessary to regularly review facilities that exist in the proposed Key Service Centres. That which is present today may not be in months to come so the suitability of the villages proposed may be irrelevant.	Comment has been taken in account in the development of the revised Core Strategy Policy 5 (Settlement Hierarchy and Identity).
31.12.08	Mr. John Cahill	5. The Sustainability Appraisal Process	It is imperative that a proper Sustainability Appraisal is conducted as there is no current baseline on the infrastructure of villages such as Kedington. Facilities, amenities, drainage, sewerage and liability of flooding must all be considered properly. None of these things have been addressed for previous one-off developments.	Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Appraisal Study prepared in parallel with the SA has informed both the development of the Core Strategy Policies and their appraisal.
31.12.08	Mr. Stephen Spencer	1. Non-Technical Summary	<p>My comments relate to various chapters and I shall address them fully in a letter.</p> <p>3.3 The consultation has been undertaken in a way which demonstrates poor governance.</p> <p>5.2 The process and its timing has sought to minimise public involvement.</p> <p>6.4 29 responses cannot be said to be the majority of 800 residents.</p> <p>8.2.F The scheme will further promote car dependency</p> <p>9.1 The scheme will increase environmental damage by cars</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is believed that undertaken public consultations were wide in scope and met the requirements of the SEA Regulations.</p> <p>Avoiding further reliance on the private car was a key consideration in the sustainability appraisal of the Core strategy Options and Policies.</p>

29.12.08	Mr. Peter Chrisp	5. The Sustainability Appraisal Process	The baseline data (some of which is quite old) will have changed as a result of the massive global economic upheaval of the last year and they should be updated and the plan reworked.	The baseline has been updated with more recent data where it is available.
29.12.08	Mr. Peter Chrisp	1. Non-Technical Summary	Considerable economic change has occurred since October 2006 when baseline data was summarised. This should be revisited to adjust for any significant changes relation to the Borough.  1.7 does not take account of trends and opportunities in the industries in the Borough e.g. agriculture.	The baseline has been updated with more recent data where it is available.
24.12.08	Ms. Rachael Bust, The Coal Authority	1. Non-Technical Summary	Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.	Comment noted.
24.12.08	Dr. Alison Collins, Natural England – Norfolk & Suffolk Government Team	Appendix B - SA Framework Objectives and Indicators	We agree with all of the indicative measurements listed under Objective Section "To conserve and enhance biodiversity" but again we have to question what these will be measured against if no baseline figure has been set out. In addition, the new National Indicator (NI)197 – condition of County Wildlife Sites – needs to be specified as an indicator against which the Councils performance will in future be measured.	Comment noted. A new indicator on condition of County Wildlife Sites has been added to the revised SA Framework. More baseline data on ecological designations have included in the revised SAR.
24.12.08	Dr. Alison Collins, Natural England – Norfolk & Suffolk Government Team	1. Non-Technical Summary	We raised concerns over the baseline information contained in the consultation draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report in December 2006, when we said of the landscape and biodiversity content of the Profile of St Edmundsbury "This is an inadequate description – even as a brief summary! There is no biodiversity content at all." We were unable to find evidence that the environmental baseline has been improved since the draft Scoping Report was published, as a revised, post-consultation Scoping Report did not appear on the web-site. There is again no evidence base with the Sustainability Appraisal published with the current consultation.	Comment noted. Information on designated sites (including the condition of SSSI), BAP habitats and species and landscape character has been added to the baseline tables and baseline section.

			<p>The evidence base should include statutory and non-statutory sites designated for their biodiversity and/or geodiversity interests, ancient woodlands, ecological networks, BAP habitats and species and wildlife audits of Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill. Landscape character assessment also needs to be included in the evidence base.</p> <p>The lack of information on the landscape and biodiversity of the Borough is unacceptable. It still appears to be the case that the only hard „evidence“ for data presented in the SA regarding landscape and biodiversity is the single comment in Appendix A – "data would appear to indicate that most SSSI in the borough are in an unfavourable or mixed condition" There is no indication what this "data" consists of, or from where it has been obtained.</p>	
22.12.08	Rose Freeman, The Theatres Trust	8. Core Strategy Objectives	<p>We note Objective D To maintain and develop leisure, culture, educational and community facilities to meet the needs of residents and visitors but for consistency please note that the word 'culture' is written as 'cultural' in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document and we recommend that this word be amended so that it appears the same in both documents.</p> <p>The East of England RSS Topic Report 4 Community and Wellbeing states that 'Increased and sustainable participation in sport, recreation and cultural activity should be encouraged by local authorities, public agencies and their partners through Local Development Documents and other measures to improve the overall standard of fitness, enhance cultural diversity and enrich the overall quality of life.'</p> <p>The Theatres Trust would like to ensure that cultural matters are taken into account in this document because protection of cultural facilities contributes to the Government's programme of creating sustainable communities and we believe that theatres are therefore essential for inclusion in Planning for Sustainable Development. The cultural industries promote popular local and environmental activities as a way to engage socially excluded young people and then raise awareness</p>	<p>Comment noted. Consistency in wording of Core strategy Objectives in the Core Strategy and the SAR will be ensured.</p> <p>The revised SA Framework includes new indicators under Objective 8: <i>Participation in sport and active recreation (National Indicator 8)</i> and <i>Percentage of adults who have either attended an arts event or participated in an arts activity at least three times in the past 12 months (NI 11 Engagement in the arts)</i> to address the comment.</p>

			<p>about other opportunities for healthy lifestyles, community safety, education and skills.</p> <p>We would therefore expect that the development of sustainable cultural activities should be included in this Sustainability Appraisal and the Core Strategy Preferred Options.</p>	
05.11.08	Mr. Ralph Carpenter	Appendix D - Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Option	<p>p.49 No negative impacts on the countryside - this is not true. Increased concentration of people in urban areas ignores the fact that rural populations become increasingly pushed onto the fringes with a greater sense of isolation, and resulting poverty of opportunity.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This issue was considered in the assessment of the strategic options and in the development and the assessment of the Core Strategy Policies.</p>
05.11.08	Mr. Ralph Carpenter	Appendix B - SA Framework Objectives and Indicators	<p>p.41 Travel - this is suspect - Suffolk Acre has shown that travel distances are greater amongst urban dwellers, than rural dwellers. The underlying basis for deciding that people living in the countryside travel for key services assume that they are unable to provide for their own needs within their communities. This is increasingly NOT the case. The cocktail effect of suggests that patterns of behaviour are affected by more subtle and un-measurable influences, and ultimately car journeys are caused by this cocktail effect.</p> <p>p.41 No mention of OIL consumption - obviously more difficulty to measure as it travels in, BUT there is a need to push for conversion from oil to natural energy sources such as biomass, particularly for heating in the rural stock.</p> <p>Need to be clear that generating capacity includes energy for heating and not just electricity.</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is agreed that movement patterns may be also shaped by more subtle influences. SA Objective 13 includes a number of indicators to capture the effects arising from the implementation of the Core strategy Policies on the levels of traffic.</p> <p>Indicators under SA Objective 14 have been revised to address this comment.</p>
05.11.08	Mr. Ralph Carpenter	9. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoring System	<p>p.24 Bullet point 6</p> <p>The wording on climate change needs to be reconsidered in view of the commitment by the current sec of state (Ed Milliband) to reduce carbon emissions significantly further. St Eds therefore needs to push for DRAMATIC reductions in carbon emissions from all development</p>	<p>Comment noted and appreciated. The revised Core Strategy objective J includes commitment to carbon emissions reduction, which should be delivered through the implementation of the Core Strategy Policies in the sustainable design and transport. The need to reduce GHG emissions was a</p>

				key consideration in the sustainability appraisal of the strategic options and sites and the Core Strategy Policies.
--	--	--	--	--

This page has been left intentionally blank.



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

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

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

Atkins Limited  
Woodcote Grove  
Epsom, U.K.  
KT18 5BW

**Contact:** **Cristina West**  
**Telephone number:** +44 (0) 1372 756931  
**Fax number:** +44 (0) 1372 756608

**Email:** [cristina.west@atkinsglobal.com](mailto:cristina.west@atkinsglobal.com)  
**Web address:** [www.atkinsglobal.com/environment](http://www.atkinsglobal.com/environment)