

[Revised – August 2012]

Appendix 6: Iterations of policies under the Core Strategy

Introduction

- 1.01 This document was produced by Suffolk Coastal District Council to summarise the evolution of core strategy and Development Management policies over the period of plan preparation. Comments about the specific role of SA have been added where the SA specifically assisted the development of the policy for the purposes of this appendix. Over the last few years the SA work has sought to update the previous version of preferred policies, seeking each time to make them more sustainable, often influencing small wording amendments, too numerous to detail.
- 1.02 The Appendix is intended to help demonstrate a summary of the decision making for the Core Strategy policies development and alternative options. Due to the iterative process and various redrafts and renumbering of policies, it is impractical to itemise the history of each policy individually. Instead, this section sets out the key options and decision making relevant to each topic/theme. References are provided [*in square brackets*], where relevant, to historical documents where this can help to evidence the decision making audit trail and specific parts of environmental assessments. A full reference list with webpage addresses to each Sustainability Appraisal document can be found at the end of this Appendix.
- 1.03 The original Core Strategy policy options and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal of each identified option were published in December 2008. The Council has updated the SA assessment at each significant milestone in the Core Strategy production process, so that the potential impacts of policy revisions could be considered in decision making and in public consultation.
- 1.04 In order to consider and compare the full sustainability analysis for each individual policy, reference should be made back to each iteration of the Core Strategy document, and, where relevant, the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. All documents are available via the Council website (www.suffolkcoastal.gov.uk). The reader should also make reference to the Council's historical meeting reports, agendas and minutes also published on the Council website spanning from 2006 to present. In order to help with the use of this Appendix, where relevant, each key policy finding and policy decision has been signposted to the relevant part of previous documents.

Sustainable Development

Current policy numbers – SP1 Sustainable Development

- 1.05 The alternative approach to this was to simply repeat or adopt national / regional policies in relation to sustainable development [*SA, 2008 page 77*]. The preferred approach was to give further thought to local issues within the district and also include these. The policy is broadly similar to that as it was at the early drafting stage. However points in the preferred policy were strengthened regarding reducing poverty and social exclusion, opportunities for employment and bio/geodiversity as a result of the SA comparison with the RSS version at the preferred options stage [*SA, 2008 page 76-77*]. One further change made in November 2010 that added “the best of areas” to (j)

was withdrawn in June 2011 as a result of the concerns raised in the November 2010 update SA [SA, 2010b page 1].

Overall Housing Requirement

Current policy numbers – SP2 Housing Numbers

- 1.06 The considered options for identifying the overall district housing requirement were as follows:

Options considered – District housing requirement

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	A housing requirement rate as established by the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) [SA, 2008 pages 120 – 121] [SA, 2010a Report page 39; Appendix pages 11-12]	Selected as the preferred option as it was fully consistent with the RSS and the evidence base to support it. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 1-4, 11; Minutes page 6] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 29-31; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	An increase in the Ipswich Policy Area houses above that identified in the RSS, and a subsequent reduction in housing allocations in the rest of the district [SA, 2008 pages 121 – 123]	This would reduce the opportunity for new allocations elsewhere in the district and fail to address affordable housing and local circumstances eg. regeneration. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 1-4, 11; Minutes page 6]
Dismissed	An increase in the assumptions of 'windfall' sites potential and a subsequent reduction in the new allocations required for the district [SA, 2008 pages 123 – 125]	An over-reliance on windfall sites is an uncertain strategy and contrary to national planning policy. The Council must positively identify new allocations to meet local housing needs. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 3-4; Minutes page 6]

- 1.07 It was concluded that the preferred option to meet RSS identified housing rates would require 7,710 new homes between 2008 – 2025. [SA, 2008 pages 120-121] [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 1-4; Minutes page 6]
- 1.08 An update of the housing requirements in the Core Strategy – Interim Planning Policy document resulted in a minor change to the overall housing numbers so that from 2009 – 2026 the district requirement would be 7,660 homes. [CPP 21-01-10 App 1 page 22] [CAB 24-02-10 App 1 page 22; Minutes page 71] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 page 29; Minutes pages 77-78]
- 1.09 The Reviewed Core Strategy housing requirement was based on a 'bottom up' approach. This included looking at specific local data on social and economic trends and comparing this with considerations on environmental capacity. The result was a further update to the overall housing numbers and meant an overall housing requirement of 7,590 homes from 2010 – 2027. [CAB 02-11-10 Report pages 6-9; Minutes page 39]

Housing Distribution

Current policy numbers – SP2 Housing Numbers, SP3 New Housing

1.10 The considered options for establishing the housing distribution were as follows:

Options considered – housing distribution

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	Development to be concentrated at the major centres of Ipswich Policy Area and Felixstowe, with a remaining number of houses spread over the market towns and larger villages [SA, 2008 page 125] [SA, 2010 Report page 39; Appendix pages 11-13]	Selected as the preferred option as it was consistent with growth in sustainable locations and also provided opportunities for appropriate growth in smaller rural communities. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 4-12; Minutes page 6] [CAB 21-10-08 App 1 page 47-53; Minutes page 28] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 31-34; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	Development to be only concentrated in the major centres and shared equally between Ipswich Policy Area and Felixstowe [SA, 2007 page 83] [SA, 2008 page 127]	This would reduce the opportunity for new allocations elsewhere in the district and would fail to address affordable housing and local circumstances eg. regeneration. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 4-12; Minutes page 6] [CAB 21-10-08 App 1 page 47-53; Minutes page 28]
Dismissed	Development to be concentrated at major centres of Ipswich Policy Area and Felixstowe, with a remaining number of houses to be allocated to market towns [SA, 2007 page 83]	This would reduce the opportunity for new allocations elsewhere in the district and would fail to address affordable housing and local circumstances eg. rural vitality. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 4-12; Minutes page 6] [CAB 21-10-08 App 1 page 47-53; Minutes page 28]

1.11 In 2007, the Council considered the indicative distribution concept in relation to the overall district housing requirements set out in the then draft of the East of England Plan [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 4-12; Minutes pages 5-6]. The draft distribution of new housing allocations was:

- East of Ipswich – 970
- Felixstowe – 1,620
- Market Towns – 400
- Key & Local Service Centres - 200

1.12 Following further consideration, it was concluded that the draft preferred option for distribution of new allocated housing across the district would consist of: [LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 page 9] [LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 page 10]

- Ipswich Policy Area – 1,050
- Felixstowe Peninsula – 1,720
- Rest of district - 680

1.13 A review of the overall housing approach prior to the Core Strategy – Interim Planning Policy document (March 2010), resulted in changes to the proposed new allocation distribution across the district [LDFTG 16-06-09 App 3 pages 6-26] [CAB 07-07-09 App 1 pages 40-61; App 2 pages 7-25] [CPP 21-01-10 Report pages 6-7; App 1 pages 21-29; 55-82; Minutes pages 36-44] [CAB 24-02-10 Report pages 6-7, 13-19, 28; Addendum pages 3-12; App 1 pages 21-29, 55-82; App 4 pages 1-3, 7-13; Minutes 65-69, 71] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 28-38, 65-92] [SA, 2009 pages 5-15] [AA, 2009 pages 8-9, 20-27, 35]. This was primarily driven by a number of factors. In the Ipswich Policy Area there was a need to provide proper infrastructure improvements, coupled with socio-economic factors and a ‘critical mass’ to ensure a sustainable community [LDFTG 16-06-09 App 2 pages 4-5, 17-19, 21; App 3 page 7; Minutes pages 3-5] [CAB 07-07-09 App 1 pages 42-45] [CPP 21-01-10 Report pages 6-7; App 1 pages 61-65] [CAB 24-02-10 Report pages 17, 20-23; Addendum pages 3-7; App 1 pages 61-65; App 4 pages 7-10; Minutes pages 65-69, 71] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 70-74] [SA, 2009 pages 5-7]. At Felixstowe, there was recognition of a lag in economic growth, but the housing proposals would still ensure a significant contribution to addressing local regeneration needs [LDFTG 16-06-09 App 2 pages 4-5, 17-19, 21; App 3 pages 7-8; Minutes pages 3-5] [CAB 07-07-09 App 1 pages 45-49] [CPP 21-01-10 Report pages 6-7; App 1 pages 65-69] [CAB 24-02-10 Report pages 24-26; App 1 pages 65-69; App 4 pages 10-12] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 74-78] SA, 2009 pages 5, 7-10]. More generally, there was also a more practical assumption of ‘windfall’ development, and a stronger objective to ensure that rural areas are able to benefit from appropriate growth [LDFTG 16-06-09 App 3 pages 3-4, 9-10; Minutes page 3] [CPP 21-01-10 Minutes pages 38-39, 41] [CAB 24-02-10 Addendum pages 7-12; App 2 pages 1-2; Minutes 65-66].

1.14 The basic principles of sustainable development, locating proposed housing close to proposed jobs and ensuring deliverable infrastructure remained [LDFTG 28-07-08 Minutes pages 11-12] [LDFTG 16-06-09 App 3 pages 6-26] [CAB 07-07-09 App 1 pages 40-61; App 2 pages 7-25] [CPP 21-01-10 Report pages 6-7; App 1 pages 21-29; 55-82; Minutes pages 36-44] [CAB 24-02-10 Report pages 6-7, 13-19, 28; Addendum pages 3-7, 7-12; App 1 pages 21-29, 55-82; App 4 pages 1-4, 7-13; Minutes 65-69, 71] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 28-38, 65-92] [SA, 2009 pages 5-15] [AA, 2009 pages 8-9, 20-27, 35]. This resulted in a new distribution of proposed new housing allocations which maximised benefits to existing and future residents:

- Ipswich Policy Area – 2,000
- Felixstowe Peninsula – 1,000
- Market Towns – 950
- Key & Local Service Centres - 490

1.15 Following the announcement by the Coalition Government to abolish the RSS and subsequent statutory housing requirements, the Council was minded to undertake a review of the local housing requirements [CL 27-05-10 Minutes pages 2-3] [CAB 02-11-10 Minutes pages 38-39]. The Government also revised the definition on previously development land (PPS3, June 2010 and

further replacement in June 2011) which could have a significant impact upon the Council's supply of 'brownfield' land [CAB 02-11-10 Report pages 1-10; Minutes pages 38-39]. The Council accordingly updated the Local Development Framework Evidence Base as set out above in 'overall housing requirement' summary. The requirement for new housing allocations was also amended to account for a significant change in previously developed land available and to provide certainty of proposed development in Felixstowe. The reviewed distribution of new housing allocations was as below:

- Eastern Ipswich Plan Area – 2,100
- Felixstowe Peninsula – 1,440
- Market Towns – 940
- Key & Local Service Centres – 780

- 1.16 At each significant evolution of housing policy, an updated SA and AA analysis have been produced to consider the potential impacts [SA, 2007] [SA, 2008] [SA, 2009] [SA, 2010a] [SA, 2010b] [SA, 2011a] [AA, 2008] [AA, 2009] [AA, 2010] [AA, June 2011a] [AA, 2011b]. With the input from the SA and AA analysis, the preferred policy has become more sustainable over time and possible negative implications such as pressure on the environment, waste and traffic generation have been considered and mitigated by other policies and proposals. The SA process has also had consideration to the simultaneous environmental assessments and mitigation proposals which have been undertaken in the Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment. [SA, 2011a Report pages 9, 30-33, 57, 66]

Strategic Housing Areas:

Current policy numbers – SP20 Area East of Ipswich, SP21 Felixstowe/Walton and Trimley Villages

- 1.17 The principle for the criteria of scale for strategic Greenfield housing sites was established at an early stage in the LDF process [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 13; Minutes pages 5-6]. This was that in choosing locations for the release of greenfield land in order to meet housing requirements, to seek to identify one, or at most two, strategic sites within each settlement. Further distribution of strategic housing options was therefore discounted and considered unrealistic as it would be unlikely to deliver comprehensive infrastructure requirements [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 13; Minutes pages 5-6] [LDFTG 28-07-08 Minutes pages 11-12] [LDFTG 04-08-08 Minutes pages 20-23] [CAB 24-02-10 Addendum page 5].
- 1.18 The Council later considered broad options for strategic housing areas in the major centres of Ipswich Policy Area and Felixstowe. A strategic appraisal was completed on all areas [SA, 2007 page 84] [SA, 2008 pages 38 – 41; 86 – 93; 93 - 96] [LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 pages 10-14; App 8 pages 1-17] [LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 pages 11-16; App 8 pages 1-15] however a broad range of factors needed to be taken into consideration and the decisions by the Council were as follows. In the Ipswich Policy Area, the options were:

Options considered – Ipswich Policy Area, strategic housing areas

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	Area 4 - South of Old Martlesham / East of A12 [SA, 2007 page 84] [SA, 2008 pages 86-88] [LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 pages 10-14; App 8 pages 8-9]	Whilst there are recognised environmental sensitivities, this location had significant advantages of close proximity to key infrastructure facilities (road, public transport, schools, shops etc) and a strategic employment site. Mitigation proposals to manage potential impacts can be accommodated. [LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 pages 3-4] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 70-75; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	Area 1 - Ipswich boundary Westerfield to Rushmere St Andrew (village) [SA, 2007 page 84] [SA, 2008 pages 88-89] [LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 pages 10-14; App 8 pages 2-3]	Recognised as good transport links into Ipswich, however access roads were minor and likely to cause localised traffic bottlenecks. Less well related to a strategic employment area and danger of coalescence to Westerfield and Rushmere St Andrew. [LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 page 2]
Dismissed	Area 2 - North of A1214, Woodbridge Road [SA, 2007 page 84] [SA, 2008 pages 89-90] [LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 pages 10-14; App 8 pages 4-5]	Good links to transport services and network. However, development north of the A1214 would significantly alter the character of the area as there is presently little development this side of the road and there is a lack of existing breadth of facilities. [LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 page 2]
Dismissed	Area 3 - South of Kesgrave & Martlesham Heath [SA, 2007 page 84] [SA, 2008 pages 90-92] [LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 pages 10-14; App 8 pages 6-7]	The close proximity of Foxhall Stadium to this area would likely cause significant noise issues on part of the site and would not be a good neighbour. In addition, the only access would be Foxhall Road, which would likely suffer significant traffic problems. Existing facilities at Kesgrave are not sufficiently developed to support further strategic growth, and the existing community has already experienced substantial recent housing growth. [LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 page 3]
Dismissed	Area 5 - North west of A14 [SA, 2008 pages 92-93] [LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 pages 10-14; App 8	Realistically, there is only land available for a limited amount of housing due to existing developed

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
	<i>pages 10-11]</i>	areas. The location does not have a substantial community centre and facilities, and the Suffolk Showground (Trinity Park) would detach any new strategic housing growth from the existing built up areas. To relocate the Showground would be practically difficult. <i>[LDFTG 28-07-08 App 1 page 3]</i>

In the Felixstowe area, the strategic housing area options were:

Options considered – Felixstowe Peninsula, strategic housing areas

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	Dispersal of housing sites across the wider Felixstowe area and where possible, avoiding the best and most versatile agricultural land. <i>[SA, 2008 pages 93-95]</i>	This option was identified as the preferred option, following extensive debate, as it was considered to have the best overall community benefit by providing general housing growth across the wider Felixstowe area (including the Trimley villages) and spreading the potential adverse impacts. However, it was noted that infrastructure provision may be more difficult and will need to be addressed in detail in the Area Action Plan to be produced. <i>[LDFTG 04-08-08 Minutes pages 21-23] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 74-78; Minutes pages 70-78]</i>
Dismissed	Area 1 - North East of A14 <i>[SA, 2007 page 84] [LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 pages 11-16; App 8 pages 2-3]</i>	The area benefits from good road transport links, however, there is a potential negative impact upon the AONB as well as potential isolation due to a lack of existing community facilities to the north of Felixstowe across the A14. <i>[LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 pages 2-3]</i>
Dismissed	Area 2 - Land between Trimley villages, north of railway line and south of A14 <i>[SA, 2007 page 84] [LDFTG 04-08-08 App1 pages 11-16; App 8 pages 4-6]</i>	Strategic scale housing development in this area has the potential negative impact on the character and coalescence of the Trimley villages and upon nearby AONB and SSSI sites. Likely to generate local road congestion. <i>[LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 page 3]</i>
Dismissed	Area 3 - South of Dockspur Roundabout between Walton and	Risk of coalescence between Trimley villages and Felixstowe

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
	Trimley St Mary [SA, 2007 page 84] [LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 pages 11-16; App 8 pages 7-8]	[including Walton] as well as loss of prime agricultural land. Potential noise and air quality issues associated the A14 and railway [LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 page 3]
Dismissed	Area 4 - North of Candlett Road [SA, 2007 page 84] [LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 pages 11-16; App 8 pages 9-11]	The area benefits from good road transport links, however, there is a potential negative impact upon the AONB, community facilities and prime agricultural land as well as potential isolation due to a lack of existing key facilities to the north of Felixstowe. [LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 page 3]
Dismissed	Area 5 - North of Felixstowe [SA, 2007 page 84] [LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 pages 11-16; App 8 pages 12-13]	Strategic scale housing would risk potential negative impacts upon the AONB to the north of Felixstowe as is exposed in landscape terms. The area is a considerable distance from strategic employment opportunities at the Port and the local road network is less suited to significant traffic. [LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 pages 3-4]
Dismissed	Area 6 - Innocence Lane, 'Trimley All Saints' [LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 pages 11-16; App 8 pages 14-15]	This location was included as a potential option for assessment following public consultation suggestions. The area is isolated away from the main built up area of the Felixstowe and would fail to make a substantial aid to regeneration. Lack of existing facilities. [LDFTG 04-08-08 App 1 page 4]

Settlement Policies

Current policy numbers – SP19 Settlement Policy

- 1.19 The district has a large and diverse range of settlements from dense urban and sub-urban areas to small villages and hamlets. In general correlation with their size, comes a greater or lesser degree of community services and sustainability. The Council needs to identify which areas are to be considered suitable for growth, as well as the areas where growth will be constrained in order to protect against inappropriate development. A number of options were considered:

Options considered - settlement hierarchy

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	An approach which considers the function of an area and how settlements relate to each other, the facilities and services they provide and their physical size. The settlements across the district were classed into 6 categories: [SA, 2007 pages 24, 81] [SA, 2008 pages 79-80] [SA, 2010 Report pages 42; Appendix pages 33-34] * Major Centres * Towns * Key Service Centres * Local Service Centres * Other villages * Countryside	This option was identified as the preferred option as it considers the local circumstances in each settlement and groups them into a limited range of categories where there are shared characteristics. There is adequate distinction between urban areas and more rural areas. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 1 pages 1-4; App 2 pages 2-3; Minutes pages 5-7] [LDFTG 01/10/08 App 2 pages 21-23; Minutes page 28] [CAB 21-10-08 App 1 pages 123-127; Minutes page 28] [LDFTG 16-06-09 App 3 page 17] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 65-69; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	A settlement hierarchy based upon physical size rather than sustainability criteria [SA, 2007 pages 24, 81] [SA, 2008 pages 80-82]	Simple in approach, but fails to analyse the local circumstances and facilities unique to each settlement as well as how settlements relate to each other for services and facilities etc. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 1 pages 1-4; App 2 pages 2-3; Minutes pages 5-7]
Dismissed	A settlement hierarchy based upon sustainability criteria, but with less categories. [SA, 2007 pages 24, 81] [SA, 2008 pages 82-83]	Likely to be too simple as would not identify key planning differences between some groups of settlement. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 1 pages 1-4; App 2 pages 2-3; Minutes pages 5-7]
Dismissed	A settlement hierarchy based upon sustainability criteria, but with more categories. [SA, 2007 pages 24, 81] [SA, 2008 pages 83-85]	Likely to be over complicated as many settlements share general planning characteristics and can be grouped. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 1 pages 1-4; App 2 pages 2-3; Minutes pages 5-7]

Affordable Housing

Current policy numbers – SP3 New Housing, DM1 Affordable Housing on Exception Sites, DM2 Affordable Housing on Residential Sites

- 1.20 A number of policy options were considered for setting the overall level of affordable housing in the district. These were considered in the context of the Local Housing Assessment (LHA) in 2007.

Options considered – affordable housing

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	To plan for 24% of the total new housing growth to be affordable housing [SA, 2007 page 85] [SA, 2008 pages 128-130] [SA, 2010 Report page 39; Appendix pages 12-13]	This option was identified as the preferred option as it was consistent with the findings of the 2006 LHA study. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 13-14] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 36-37; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	To plan for 33% of the total new housing growth to be affordable housing [SA, 2007 page 85] [SA, 2008 pages 130-131]	This was considered to represent an inefficient over supply of affordable housing need, and was not supported by the Evidence Base. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 13-14]
Dismissed	To plan for 66% of the total new housing growth to be affordable housing [SA, 2007 page 85] [SA, 2008 pages 131-133]	This was considered to represent an inefficient over supply of affordable housing need, and was not supported by the Evidence Base. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 13-14]

1.21 The SA identified the benefits of the alternatives but advised that decision should be made on the basis of the Local Needs Survey which as been the case [SA, 2008 pages 128-133] [SA, 2010a page 52].

1.22 The more site specific approach to affordable housing required through planning applications was considered in the context of the overall approach.

Options considered - affordable housing on exception sites

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	An approach which allows for affordable housing sites to be built where development would not normally be allowed. Where demonstrated support from a community led plan (eg. parish plan) or process (eg. Community Right to Build), a scheme may include a maximum of one in three open market housing. [SA, 2008 pages 160-162] [SA, 2010 Report page 59; App pages 49-50]	This option was identified as the preferred option as it would assist rural communities to secure affordable housing development. The open market housing allowance would act as a locally derived incentive for a landowner to release suitable land. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 13-14; Minutes pages 4-6] [LDFTG 22-06-09 App 1 pages 27-28; Minutes pages 9-10] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 97-98; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	An approach which allows for affordable housing sites to be built where development would not normally be allowed. However there would be a limited upon the size of site. [SA, 2008 pages 162-163]	Provides opportunities for rural affordable housing, but lacks the flexibility communities may need to suit their local circumstances. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 13-14; Minutes pages 4-6].

Options considered - onsite affordable housing requirement

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	A continuation of the recently adopted Local Plan Saved Policies approach requiring a one in three affordable housing requirement. The requirement would be triggered by a threshold of schemes consisting of 3 or more houses in villages and 6 or more houses in market towns. [SA, 2008 pages 163-164] [SA, 2010a Report page 59; App pages 50-51]	This option was identified as the preferred option as it would ensure a significant contribution of affordable housing in new developments, as well as having an established credible evidence base relating to viability. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 13-14; Minutes pages 4-6] [LDFTG 22-06-09 App 1 page 28; Minutes page 10] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 98-99; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	An approach which continued the village / town development size thresholds, but the onsite affordable housing requirement would be lowered to 24% in accordance with the LHA study findings. [SA, 2008 pages 165-166]	This option would fail to meet the district overall housing requirement. As not every scheme would meet the relevant thresholds requiring affordable housing, the schemes which did trigger this need to provide a sufficient level of provision to meet demand. The existing thresholds have recently been adopted – 2006 – and it is still early days in terms of monitoring the impacts. [LDFTG 11-09-07 App 1 pages 13-14; Minutes pages 4-6].

Housing in the Countryside

Current policy numbers – SP28 Other Villages, SP29 The Countryside, DM3 Housing in the Countryside, DM4 Housing in Clusters in the Countryside

1.23 The Council's general approach to the countryside was as follows:

Options considered - general approach to the countryside

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	An approach which protects the countryside for its own sake and restricts development in non-sustainable areas, but allows flexibility for communities to bring forward affordable housing and sympathetic small schemes to meet local needs. [SA, 2008 pages 110-112] [SA, 2010 Rep pages 44, 59; App pages 45-48, 51-52]	Following substantial debate, this option was identified as the preferred option as it would provide smaller rural communities with the flexibility to seek small growth which met local housing need. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 2 page 6; Minutes pages 5-7] [LDFTG 11-09-07 Report pages 2-3; Minutes pages 4-5] [LDFTG 03-12-07 Report App 1 pages 4-12;

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
		<i>Minutes pages 9-10</i> [LDFTG 26-02-08 App 1 pages 1-4; <i>Minutes pages 15-17</i>]. [LDFTG 22-06-09 App 1 pages 29-31; <i>Minutes pages 9- 10</i>] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 88-92, 100-101; <i>Minutes pages 70-78</i>] This approach is consistent with the principles of the new national Community Right to Build scheme.
Dismissed	An approach which is entirely restrictive on development in the countryside outside of the established national policy exceptions. [SA, 2008 pages 112-113]	Failed to give rural communities the opportunities to secure practical local need housing. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 2 page 6; <i>Minutes pages 5-7</i>] [LDFTG 11-09-07 Report pages 2-3; <i>Minutes pages 4-5</i>] [LDFTG 03-12-07 Report App 1 pages 4-12; <i>Minutes pages 9-10</i>] [LDFTG 26-02-08 App 1 pages 1-4; <i>Minutes pages 15-17</i>].

1.24 In order to further promote opportunities for sustainable development in rural areas, the Council explored options as below for a more flexible approach to local housing need in the countryside.

Options considered – development in housing clusters

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	Where a small infill development is located within a 'cluster' of existing houses, and within close proximity of a settlement identified as Major Centre, Town, Key / Local Service Centre, flexibility may be given to allow housing for local need. [SA, 2008 pages 170-172] [SA, 2010a Report page 59; App pages 52-53]	This option was identified as the preferred option as it would provide smaller rural communities with the flexibility to seek small growth which met local housing need. However, it is also sufficiently robust to maintain a control on inappropriate or non-sustainable development in rural areas. [LDFTG 11-09-07 Report pages 3; <i>Minutes pages 4-5</i>] [LDFTG 03-12-07 Report App 1 pages 4-12; <i>Minutes pages 9-10</i>] [LDFTG 26-02-08 App pages 4-5; <i>Minutes pages 16-17</i>] [LDFTG 22-06-09 App 1 pages 31-32; <i>Minutes page 10</i>] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 100-101; <i>Minutes pages 70-78</i>]
Dismissed	A similar approach of flexibility towards a small infill development, in close proximity to a identified sustainable settlement, but	This approach would be less flexible to assist communities meet their individual local needs and stifle reasonable opportunities.

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
	applying a sequential approach. [SA, 2008 pages 172-173]	[LDFTG 11-09-07 Report pages 3; Minutes pages 4-5] [LDFTG 03-12-07 Report App 1 pages 4-12; Minutes pages 9-10] [LDFTG 26-02-08 App pages 4-5; Minutes pages 16-17]

Economic Development

Current policy numbers – SP5 Employment Land, SP7 Economic Development in Rural Areas

1.25 The overall approach to employment creation in the district was considered as below:

Options considered - employment Land

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	Provide for 8.5 ha of employment land to contribute towards a goal of 30,000 new jobs in the Suffolk Haven Gateway area over the plan period. To recognise Felixstowe Port, Martlesham Heath and Ransomes Europark as strategic employment areas. [SA, 2008 pages 137-139] [SA, 2010 Report pages 39-40; Appendix pages 15-16]	Not originally a preferred option (the alternative was). However, this option was subsequently identified as the preferred option as it would provide stronger growth and diversity of the district economy. This was evidenced by the Employment Land Review study and supported by the SA. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 1 pages 1-2; App 2 pages 1-6; Minutes pages 7-8] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 2 pages 13-14; Minutes 28] [CAB 21-10-08 App 1 pages 56-57; Minutes page 28] [LDFTG 22-06-09 App 1 pages 14-16; Minutes pages 8, 10] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 38-40; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	A similar approach of providing 8.5 ha of new employment land but only recognising the general areas of Felixstowe Port and Martlesham as strategic employment areas. [SA, 2007 pages 26-27, 86] [SA, 2008 pages 136-137]	This option was not considered to recognise the full economic potential of the district. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 1 pages 1-2; App 2 pages 1-6; Minutes pages 7-8] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 2 pages 13-14; Minutes 28] [CAB 21-10-08 App 1 pages 56-57; Minutes page 28] [LDFTG 22-06-09 App 1 pages 14-16; Minutes pages 8, 10]

1.26 When considering the approach to development in the rural areas, the Council considered two options:

Options considered - economic development in rural areas

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	General support for economic development in the rural areas, particularly for local employment where environment and sustainability impacts are considered acceptable. [SA, 2007 page 87] [SA, 2008 page 139-140] [SA, 2010 Report pages 40; Appendix pages 17-19]	This option was identified as the preferred option as it would provide opportunities for sustainable economic growth whilst also protecting the environmental quality of the rural areas in the district. It was considered to better reflect the diversity which already exists. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 1 page 2; App 2 pages 6-7; Minutes pages 7-8] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 2 pages 13-14; Minutes page 28] [CAB 21-10-08 App 1 pages 57-58; Minutes page 28] [LDFTG 22-06-09 App 1 pages 16-17; Minutes pages 8,10] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 41-42; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	A strict approach presuming against rural economic development and protection of the environment. [SA, 2007 page 87] [SA, 2008 pages 141-142]	This option was not considered to best recognise the sustainability benefits of economic development in rural locations and balance social, economic and environmental objectives. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 1 page 2; App 2 pages 6-7; Minutes pages 7-8] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 2 pages 13-14; Minutes page 28] [CAB 21-10-08 App 1 pages 57-58; Minutes page 28] [LDFTG 22-06-09 App 1 pages 16-17; Minutes pages 8,10]

Tourism

Current policy number – SP8 Tourism

1.27 The considered options for tourism in the District were as follows:

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred option	Determine by capacity to absorb new development in specified locations. Divide district into areas where tourism potential managed, encouraged or resisted and linked to the hierarchy of settlements. [SA, 2007 pages 28,88] [SA, 2008 pages 144 -145] [SA, 2010 Report page 40; Appendix pages 19-20]	Considered to be flexible to the district and an environmentally sensitive approach once strengthened with the requirement for biodiversity and habitat assessments as a result of the SA comments. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 1 page 3; App 2 pages 8-11; Minutes page 8] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 2 pages 14-15; Minutes page 28] [CAB 21-10-08 App 1 pages 59-60; Minutes page 28] [LDFTG

		22-06-09 App 1 pages 17-18; Minutes pages 8,10] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 42-43; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	Proposals assessed against impact on the environment and local community. Resist large scale in the AONB. [SA, 2007 page 88] [SA, 2008 pages 145 - 146]	Not considered to apply sustainability criteria adequately or facilitate consideration of cumulative effects. [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 1 page 3; App 2 pages 8-11; Minutes page 8] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 2 pages 14-15; Minutes page 28] [CAB 21-10-08 App 1 pages 59-60; Minutes page 28] [LDFTG 22-06-09 App 1 pages 17-18; Minutes pages 8,10]

Transport

Current policy numbers – SP10 A14 & A12

- 1.28 The A12 and A14 roads are key strategic transport routes which are vital to strategic economic activity locations in the district such as Felixstowe Port and Adastral Park, Martlesham. There were no alternatives considered to the policy approach taken for the A12 / A14 [SA, 2007 page 90] [SA, 2008 pages 115-118] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 2 pages 16-17; Minutes pages 27-28] [CAB 21-10-08 App 1 pages 43-46; Minutes page 28] [LDFTG 22-06-09 App 1 pages 12-14; Minutes 7-8, 10]. The policy identified the importance of both the A12 and A14 roads as well as recognising the issues concerning these roads Support is expressed for possible improvements and in particular a proposed by-pass in the Farnham area of the A12. A later iteration of the policy also set out the need to manage capacity of the road network. [CL 18-03-10 Appendix 1 pages 47-49]

Environmental Protection

Current policy numbers – SP12 Climate Change, SP13 Nuclear Energy, SP14 Biodiversity & Geodiversity, SP15 Landscape & Townscape

- 1.29 The district is abundant with a wide variety of environmental designations covering landscape, wildlife and habitat. The coast and estuary areas in particular, are recognised internationally as important wildlife and habitat areas – covered by the EU Habitats Directive. Similarly, the district is more vulnerable to the effects of climate change and the risks of further exposure to adverse impacts such as flooding, coastal erosion and extreme weather, should be avoided or minimised. There is a rich collection of historic interests native to the district.
- 1.30 The Council therefore does not feel there are any realistic alternatives to protecting and where possible enhancing, landscape character, environmental assets and climate change resilience [SA, 2007 pages 91-92] [SA, 2008 pages 102-104, 150-156] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 2 pages 17-19; Minutes page 28] [CAB 21-10-08] App 1 pages 61-67; Minutes page 28] [LDFTG 22-06-09 App 1 pages 19-22; Minutes 8-10]. It is acknowledged that

a compromise has to be made to achieve sustainable development which protects the environment and promotes socio-economic growth. Observations from the SA have helped strengthen the policy wording for example regarding national and international sites.

- 1.31 In relation to nuclear power, the Council has set out an approach for local considerations, should a confirmed proposal for a new nuclear station at Sizewell come forward. The criteria for this have been amplified as a result of the SA. [SA, 2007 page 92] [SA, 2008 pages 102-104] [LDFTG 23-07-07 App 1 page 3; App 2 page 7; Minutes pages 7-8] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 2 pages 18-19; Minutes page 28]

Community Needs

Current policy numbers – SP16 Sport & Play, SP17 Green Space, SP18 Infrastructure, DM30 Key Facilities, DM31 Public Facilities, DM32 Sport & Play, DM33 Allotments

- 1.32 The existing infrastructure network in the district is close to capacity and in some instances insufficient. If growth is to occur, significant infrastructure improvements will be necessary to support this. The Council also places a high value on the significance which sports area provision and open space can contribute to a healthy and attractive place to live.
- 1.33 The Council considers there to be no realistic local alternative options to the principles that suitable community provision should be sought in order to compliment development with local needs eg, sports areas, green space and key infrastructure. Green space in particular, has been identified in the LDF Evidence Base (Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Study) as a key provision in order to ensure that the levels of growth proposed are well supported, but also that environmental designations do not incur unacceptable adverse impact. This has also been picked up and further analysed in the Appropriate Assessment of the Core Strategy.
- 1.34 A number of more detailed, local level community need policy options were considered:

Options considered - Key facilities

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	An approach which when looking at redevelopment of a key facility, requires the applicant to liaise with the local community who will have the opportunity to put forward a realistic option for maintaining the business. [SA, 2008 pages 235-237] [SA, 2010a Report page 63; Appendix pages 85-86]	This option was identified as the preferred option as it would provide a greater opportunity for the community to have ownership and involvement in local issues. [LDFTG 19-06-08 App 1 page 17; Minutes pages 5-6] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 3 page 19; Minutes page 28] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 page 123; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	An approach which would not require the applicant to liaise with the local community for expressions of operational interest ('do nothing' and rely on PPS7	Fails to acknowledge the role of the community in addressing their local issues.

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
	policies). [SA, 2008 pages 237-238]	

Options considered - public buildings

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	An approach which would allow the change of use of a public building in the exceptional circumstance that recreational or community use cannot be achieved or is appropriate. [SA, 2008 pages 238-239] [SA, 2010a Report page 63; Appendix pages 86-87]	This option was identified as the preferred option as it would provide flexibility to preserve important local buildings where they may otherwise deteriorate. [LDFTG 19-06-08 App 1 page 17; Minutes pages 5-6] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 3 page 20; Minutes page 28] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 page 124; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	Do not allow any change of use of public buildings ('do nothing' and rely on PPS7 policies). [SA, 2008 pages 239-241]	This may result in the deterioration of important local buildings which can add to the character of a settlement. It would also represent a poor use of resources.

Options considered - sport & play

Decision	Option policy / approach	Comments
Preferred Option	An approach which identifies the local context and criteria for dealing with the creation and loss of sport/play provision areas. [SA, 2008 pages 241-242] [SA, 2010a Report pages 63; Appendix pages 87-88]	This option was identified as the preferred option as it is recognised as a local priority and sport/play areas makes a significant contribution to local communities. Goes beyond the national policy and sets out local factors, including the need to provide facilities for all age groups. [LDFTG 19-06-08 App 1 pages 17-18; Minutes pages 5-6] [LDFTG 01-10-08 App 3 page 20; Minutes page 28] [CL 18-03-10 App 1 pages 124-125; Minutes pages 70-78]
Dismissed	Have no policy and rely upon the national planning policy (PPG17). [SA, 2008 pages 243-244]	Not considered to set out enough detail to represent local circumstances.

Policies with no alternatives:

The following is a list of policies the Council has drafted and felt there are no realistic alternatives. This is because either a policy is simply further detail to a higher strategic policy/objective, or the alternatives are already covered by or not consistent with national/regional planning policy.

SP4 – Gypsies and Travellers
SP6 – Regeneration
SP11 – Accessibility
SP12 – Climate Change
SP17 – Green Space
SP18 – Infrastructure
SP23 – Framlingham
SP24 – Leiston
SP25 – Saxmundham
SP26 – Woodbridge

SP28 – Other Villages
SP30 – The Coastal Zone
DM7 – Infilling & backland development
DM8 – Extensions to residential curtilages
DM16 – Farm shops
DM23 – Residential Amenity
DM27 – Biodiversity
DM28 – Flood Risk
DM29 – Telecoms
DM33 – Allotments

Committee abbreviations:

All Council committee reports, appendices and minutes are available on the Council's website at:

<http://www.suffolkcoastal.gov.uk/yourcouncil/meetings/>

LDFTG – Local Development Framework Task Group

CAB – Cabinet

CL – Full Council

CPP – Community, Customers and Partners Scrutiny Committee

Key committee milestones:

LDF Task Group 30th January 2006 → Cabinet 5th December 2006 → LDF Task Group 11th September 2007 → LDF Task Group 17th January 2008 → LDF Task Group 19th June 2008 → LDF Task Group 28th July 2008 → LDF Task Group 4th August 2008 → Cabinet 21st October 2008 → LDF Task Group 16th June 2009 → Cabinet 7th July 2009 → Full Council 18th March 2010 → Full Council 27th May 2010 → Cabinet 2nd November 2010 → Full Council 27th July 2011.

Full Document References for historic Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment

Sustainability Appraisal

- SA, 2007. Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal - December 2007 ('Issues & Options stage') Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2a/SAReporDec2007.pdf>
- SA, 2008. Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal - December 2008 ('Preferred Options stage'). Republished for consultation from receipt of Oct '08 document. Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2a/SAReporDec08.pdf>
- SA, 2009. Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal – September 2009 ('Updated Preferred Option stage'). Republished for consultation from receipt of July '09 document. Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2a/SASept09.pdf>

- SA, 2010a. Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal – June 2010 ('Interim Policies stage'). Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2a/SAJune2010.pdf>
- SA, 2010b. Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal – November 2010 ('Reviewed Policies stage'). Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/G1/SANov2010.pdf>
- SA, 2011a. Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal – June 2011 ('Reviewed Policies stage'). Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2a/SAReportJune2011.pdf>

Appendices:

<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2a/SAAppendicesJune2011.pdf>

- SA, 2011b. Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal – August 2011 ('Reviewed Policies stage'). Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2a/SAReportAugust2011.pdf>

Appendices:

<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2a/SAAppendicesAugust2011.pdf>

Appropriate Assessment

- AA, 2008. Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment: Screening & Scoping – December 2008 ('Preferred Options stage'). Published within the Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal document. Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2a/SAReportDec08.pdf>
- AA, 2009. Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment – September 2009 ('Updated Preferred Option stage'). Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2b/AAReportSept09.pdf>
- AA, 2010. Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment: Clarification Summary – January 2010 ('Updated Preferred Option stage'). Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2b/AAClarificationSummary1.pdf>
- AA, 2011a. Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment – June 2011 ('Reviewed Policies stage'). Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2b/AAReportjune2011.pdf>
- AA, 2011b. Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment – August 2011 ('Reviewed Policies stage'). Available at:
<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2b/AAReportAugust2011.pdf>

Appendices:

<http://scdc.onesuffolk.net/assets/Documents/LDF/D2b/AAAppendicesAugust2011.pdf>