Stage A: Presentation of Baseline Data – As of 31st March 2004 - Additional SA/SEA Indicators

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

SOCIAL BASELINE DATA

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it improve access to high quality, health facilities?							
SB	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (DfT accessibility indicators)	BDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (SCC) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (DfT accessibility indicators)	FHDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (SCC) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (DfT accessibility indicators)	IBC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (SCC) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (DfT accessibility indicators)	MSDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (SCC) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (DfT accessibility indicators)	SEBC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (SCC) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (DfT accessibility indicators)	SCDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (SCC) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (DfT accessibility indicators)	WDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (SCC) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to hospital or GP or dentist surgery (DfT accessibility indicators)	Suffolk	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (SCC) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
SB	Overall death rate by all causes (PCT)	BDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 560.5 2002: 565.1 2001: 582.2	Lowest in Suffolk.	Decreasing trend since 2001.		☺ Relatively low for Suffolk, and decreasing.
SB	Overall death rate by all causes (PCT)	FHDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 674.9 2002: 673.2 2001: 649.8	Highest in Suffolk.	Increasing trend since 2001.	Increasing age standardised mortality ratio.	☹ Relatively high for Suffolk, and increasing.
SB	Overall death rate by all causes (PCT)	IBC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 645.0 2002: 661.8 2001: 650.3	2nd highest in Suffolk.	Decreased since last year, and lowest since 2001.		😐 Relatively high for Suffolk, but decreased last year.
SB	Overall death rate by all causes (PCT)	MSDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 612.9 2002: 585.3 2001: 579.2		Increasing trend since 2001.	Increasing age standardised mortality ratio.	☹ Increasing trend, and above average for Suffolk this year.
SB	Overall death rate by all causes (PCT)	SEBC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 602.5		Decreasing trend since 2001.		☺ Decreasing trend, and below

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			2002: 623.3 2001: 627.1				average for Suffolk this year. Good improvement.
SB	Overall death rate by all causes (PCT)	SCDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 567.7 2002: 561.1 2001: 601.2	2nd lowest in Suffolk.	Increased this year, but still lower than 2001.		☺ Relatively low for Suffolk, though increased this year.
SB	Overall death rate by all causes (PCT)	WDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 640.3 2002: 623.6 2001: 640.4		Variable - decreased last year but this year has almost returned to 2001 figures.	Increasing age standardised mortality ratio last year.	☹ Above average for Suffolk, and has increased this year.
SB	Overall death rate by all causes (PCT)	Suffolk	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 609.6 2002: 608.7 2001: 615.7		Increased this year, but still lower than 2001.		😐 Mortality ratio increased this year, but still lower than 2001.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
SB	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	BDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 107.6 2002: 104.2 2001: 111.0	2nd lowest in Suffolk.	Increased this year but remained below 2001 figure.		☺/😐 Relatively low for Suffolk. Increased this year but remained below 2001 figure. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	FHDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 138.3 2002: 144.1 2001: 84.3	Highest in Suffolk.	Decreased this year but still much higher than 2001 figure.	Monitor whether increase in cancer deaths this year represents long term trend.	☹/😐 Relatively high for Suffolk. Decreased this year but still much higher than 2001 figure, and significantly higher than other districts. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	IBC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 117.7 2002: 113.8 2001: 113.3		Increasing trend.	Monitor whether increase in cancer deaths this year represents long term trend.	☹/😐 Around average for Suffolk, but with an increasing trend. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	MSDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 119.2 2002: 111.4 2001: 98.1		Increasing trend.	Monitor whether increase in cancer deaths this year represents long term trend.	☹/😐 Above average for Suffolk this year, and with an increasing trend. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	SEBC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 118.0 2002: 110.5 2001: 116.0		Increased this year, and now higher than 2001 figure.	Monitor whether increase in cancer deaths this year represents long term trend.	☹/😐 Above average for Suffolk this year, and increased. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	SCDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 112.0 2002: 102.4 2001: 99.4	Lowest in Suffolk.	Decreasing trend.		☺/😐 Relatively low for Suffolk, and with a decreasing trend. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
							determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	WDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 117.8 2002: 109.2 2001: 135.2		Increased this year, but still lower than 2001 figure.		😐 Rate increased this year, but still lower than in 2001. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Cancer deaths (malignant neoplasms) under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	Suffolk	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 114.7 2002: 110.4 2001: 112.7		Increased this year, and now higher than 2001 figure.	Monitor whether increase in cancer deaths this year represents long term trend.	☹/😐 Increased this year, and now higher than in 2001. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
SB	Heart Disease deaths under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	BDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 43.8 2002: 44.0 2001: 46.9		Decreasing trend.		☺ Decreasing trend, and around average for Suffolk this year. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Heart Disease deaths under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	FHDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 51.7 2002: 55.1 2001: 74.2		Decreasing trend.		☺ Decreasing trend, though above average for Suffolk this year. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Heart Disease deaths under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	IBC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 47.5 2002: 69.1 2001: 62.9		Decreased this year.		☺/😐 Last year had highest mortality rate from heart disease in Suffolk - has fallen this year but still above average for county. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Heart Disease deaths under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	MSDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 52.5 2002: 48.6 2001: 48.9	Highest in Suffolk. Only district to have increased mortality from heart disease this year.	Increased this year.	Mortality from heart disease is highest in Suffolk, and only district to have increased this year.	☹ High for Suffolk and only district to have increased mortality from heart disease this year.
SB	Heart Disease deaths under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	SEBC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 37.1 2002: 45.7 2001: 50.5	2nd lowest in Suffolk.	Decreasing trend.		☺ Decreasing trend, and relatively low for Suffolk. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Heart Disease deaths under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	SCDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 29.0 2002: 41.2 2001: 52.0	Lowest in Suffolk.	Decreasing trend.		☺ Decreasing trend, and relatively low for Suffolk. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Heart Disease deaths under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	WDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 52.4 2002: 53.7 2001: 61.0	2nd highest in Suffolk.	Decreasing trend.		☺/😐 Relatively high for Suffolk, though decreasing trend, Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Heart Disease deaths under 75 per 100,000 population (PCT)	Suffolk	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 43.6 2002: 50.9 2001: 55.5		Decreasing trend.		☺ Decreasing trend. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SB	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT)	BDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 59.9 2002: 53.2 2001: 57.0	Lowest in Suffolk.	Increased this year and now higher than 2001 figure.	Monitor whether increase in respiratory deaths this year represents long term trend.	☺/😐 Increased this year and now higher than 2001 figure. However, still lowest district in Suffolk. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT)	FHDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 83.8 2002: 74.5 2001: 72.7	Highest in Suffolk.	Increasing trend.	Increasing trend in respiratory deaths.	☹ Relatively high for Suffolk, and increasing trend. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT)	IBC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 82.8 2002: 69.5 2001: 76.9	2nd highest in Suffolk.	Increased this year, but lower than 2001 figure.	Monitor whether increase in respiratory deaths this year represents long term trend.	☹ Relatively high for Suffolk, and increased this year. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT)	MSDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 63.5 2002: 60.5 2001: 62.6	2nd lowest in Suffolk.	Increased this year, but lower than 2001 figure.	Monitor whether increase in respiratory deaths this year represents long term trend.	☺/😐 Relatively low for Suffolk, but increased this year. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT)	SEBC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 74.1 2002: 64.2 2001: 70.0		Increased this year, and now higher than 2001 figure.	Monitor whether increase in respiratory deaths this year represents long term trend.	☹/😐 Above average for Suffolk, and increased this year. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT)	SCDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 65.6 2002: 61.4 2001: 57.5		Increasing trend.	Increasing trend in respiratory deaths.	☹/😐 Increasing trend, though still below average for Suffolk. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT)	WDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 68.6 2002: 80.7 2001: 68.2		Decreased this year, and now below the 2001 figure.		☺/😐 Only district to record a decrease this year, though still above average for Suffolk. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
SB	Respiratory disease deaths (all ages) per 100,000 population (PCT)	Suffolk	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 70.1 2002: 66.4 2001: 65.7		Increasing trend.	Increasing trend in respiratory deaths.	☹/😐 Increasing trend. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends. Consider deleting if not a concern in area.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
SB	Deaths from self harm and injury undetermined per 100,000 population (PCT)	BDC	Age standardised mortality ratio: 2003: 7.4 2002: 11.7 2001: 6.8		Decreased this year, but still higher than 2001 figure.		☺/😐 Decreased this year, and below average for Suffolk. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
							determine trends.
SB	Deaths from self harm and injury undetermined per 100,000 population (PCT)	FHDC	*Age standardised mortality ratio:* 2003: 15.1 2002: N/A 2001: 8.9		Decreased compared to 2001 this year.		☺/😐 Decreased this year, now around average for Suffolk. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends.
SB	Deaths from self harm and injury undetermined per 100,000 population (PCT)	IBC	*Age standardised mortality ratio:* 2003: 13.2 2002: 12.3 2001: 6.8	Highest in Suffolk.	Increasing trend.	Increase in self harm/undetermined deaths. Highest of any district in Suffolk.	☹/😐 Increasing trend and relatively high for Suffolk. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends.
SB	Deaths from self harm and injury undetermined per 100,000 population (PCT)	MSDC	*Age standardised mortality ratio:* 2003: 6.3 2002: N/A 2001: 8.9	2nd lowest in Suffolk.	Decreased compared to 2001 this year.		☺/😐 Decreased this year, and below average for Suffolk. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends.
SB	Deaths from self harm and injury undetermined per 100,000 population (PCT)	SEBC	*Age standardised mortality ratio:* 2003: 7.2 2002: 9.5 2001: 5.4		Decreased this year, but still higher than 2001 figure.		☺/😐 Decreased this year, and below average for Suffolk. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends.
SB	Deaths from self harm and injury undetermined per 100,000 population (PCT)	SCDC	*Age standardised mortality ratio:* 2003: 10.7 2002: 3.5 2001: 9.5	2nd highest in Suffolk.	Increased this year, and now higher than 2001 figure. Very low in 2002.	Monitor whether increase in self harm/undetermined deaths this year represents long term trend.	☹/😐 Increased this year and relatively high for Suffolk. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends.
SB	Deaths from self harm and injury undetermined per 100,000 population (PCT)	WDC	*Age standardised mortality ratio:* 2003: 4.9 2002: 15.8 2001: 8.1	Lowest in Suffolk.	Decreased this year, and lower than 2001 figure.		☺/😐 Decreased this year, and relatively low for Suffolk. Figures fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends.
SB	Deaths from self harm and injury undetermined per 100,000 population (PCT)	Suffolk	*Age standardised mortality ratio:* 2003: 8.7 2002: 8.9 2001: 8.7		Relatively stable over last 3 years, small fluctuation.		☺/😐 Has remained relatively stable since 2001. Figures for individual districts fluctuate, so may take longer to determine trends.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
SB	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (SCC)	BDC	2004 RTA casualties: Fatal: 7 Serious: 47	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005)	Decrease in both fatal and serious casualties compared to 2003 figures. Similar figures to 2001 for serious casualties but fatalities have decreased.	No longer-term reduction in number of serious road traffic accident casualties.	😐 The increase in road casualties reported in 2003 has been reversed this year. Fewer fatalities but no longer-term reduction in serious casualties compared to 2001.
SB	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (SCC)	FHDC	2004 RTA casualties: Fatal: 8 Serious: 40	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005)	Decrease in both fatal and serious casualties compared to 2003 figures. Fewer serious casualties in 2004 than any year since 2001. (2 fewer fatalities recorded in 2002).		☺ Decrease in both fatal and serious road casualties in 2004 compared to previous years. Fewer serious casualties in 2004 than any year since 2001.
SB	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (SCC)	IBC	2004 RTA casualties: Fatal: 3 Serious: 54	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005)	More serious, casualties than last year (1 fewer fatality). Serious casualties higher in 2004 than have been in any year since 2001.	Increase in number of serious road traffic accident casualties this year.	☹ Fatalities remain low, but number of serious casualties currently higher than in any year since 2001.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SB	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (SCC)	MSDC	2004 RTA casualties: Fatal: 5 Serious: 41	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005)	Decrease in both fatal and serious casualties compared to 2003 figures. Fewer fatal and serious casualties in 2004 than in any year since 2001.		☺ Decrease in both fatal and serious road casualties in 2004 compared to previous years. Fewer fatal and serious casualties in 2004 than any year since 2001.
SB	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (SCC)	SEBC	2004 RTA casualties: Fatal: 8 Serious: 58	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005)	Small increase in fatal and serious casualties since last year. However, longer-term trend shows fewer fatal and serious casualties in 2004 than in 2001.	Small increase in number of fatal and serious road traffic accident casualties this year.	😐 Small increase in number of fatal and serious road traffic accident casualties this year. However, longer-term trend shows a decrease since 2001.
SB	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (SCC)	SCDC	2004 RTA casualties: Fatal: 6 Serious: 65	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005)	One less fatality than last year, but no change in serious. Longer-term trend shows decrease in serious casualties since 2001 but fatalities remained almost constant at 6 or 7.	No reduction in serious road traffic accident casualties this year, which may need to be monitored, and no longer-term decrease in fatalities.	😐 Serious casualties have decreased since 2001. However, no decline in fatalities over time and serious casualties did not decrease last year.
SB	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (SCC)	WDC	2004 RTA casualties: Fatal: 5 Serious: 50	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005)	Decrease in both fatal and serious casualties compared to 2003 figures. Fewer serious casualties in 2004 than in any year since 2001. Fatalities lowest since 2002, and equalled 2001 figure this year.		☺ Decrease in both fatal and serious road casualties in 2004 compared to previous years. Fewer serious casualties in 2004 than any year since 2001.
SB	Number of people killed and seriously injured in road traffic accidents per 100,000 population (SCC)	Suffolk	2004 RTA casualties: Fatal: 42 Serious: 355 (Totals for county)	Target for Suffolk of no more than 354 people killed or seriously injured in 2004. (337 for 2005)	Decrease in both fatal and serious casualties compared to 2003 figures. Fewer fatal and serious casualties in 2004 than in any year since 2001.	The target for 2004 was not met and further improvement is required.	☺ Decrease in both fatal and serious road casualties in 2004 compared to previous years. Fewer fatal and serious casualties in 2004 than any year since 2001. However the target for 2004 was not met and further improvement is required.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it reduce death rates?							
SB	Life expectancy (SDA)	BDC	2001-2003: Male 78.7 years Female 82.4 years	East of England Average: Male 77.3 years Female 81.4 years Longest life expectancy in Suffolk for both men and women.	Life expectancy has increased each monitoring period since 1998-2000.		☺ Life expectancy is good, and has increased each monitoring period since 1998-2000.
SB	Life expectancy (SDA)	FHDC	2001-2003: Male 77.2 years Female 80.5 years	East of England Average: Male 77.3 years Female 81.4 years Shortest life expectancy for females in Suffolk.	Life expectancy has increased for males but decreased for females since 1999-2001.	Low life expectancy for females, and decreasing trend, should be addressed.	😐 Life expectancy has increased for males but decreased for females since 1999-2001.
SB	Life expectancy (SDA)	IBC	2001-2003: Male 76.6 years Female 81.3 years	East of England Average: Male 77.3 years Female 81.4 years Shortest life expectancy for males in Suffolk, and 2nd shortest for females.	No change in life expectancy since last monitoring period, but longer-term trend shows an increase.	Life expectancy is relatively low for Suffolk, but increasing.	😐 No change in life expectancy since last monitoring period, but longer-term trend shows an increase. Relatively low life expectancy for Suffolk.
SB	Life expectancy (SDA)	MSDC	2001-2003: Male 78.4 years Female 82.3 years	East of England Average: Male 77.3 years Female 81.4 years	Life expectancy has decreased for females this monitoring period, but longer-term trend shows an increase,		☺ Relatively long life expectancy for Suffolk. Life expectancy has decreased for females this monitoring

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
				2nd longest life expectancy in Suffolk for males.	and has increased for males each monitoring period since 1998-2000.		period, but longer-term trend shows an increase, and has increased for males each monitoring period since 1998-2000.
SB	Life expectancy (SDA)	SEBC	2001-2003: Male 77.3 years Female 81.7 years	East of England Average: Male 77.3 years Female 81.4 years	Life expectancy has increased each monitoring period since 1998-2000.		☺ Average life expectancy for Suffolk, and increasing each monitoring period since 1998-2000.
SB	Life expectancy (SDA)	SCDC	2001-2003: Male 78.3 years Female 82.3 years	East of England Average: Male 77.3 years Female 81.4 years 2nd longest life expectancy in Suffolk for females.	Life expectancy has decreased for females since last monitoring period, but longer-term trend shows an increase.		☺ Relatively long life expectancy for Suffolk. Decreased for females since last monitoring period, but longer-term trend shows an increase.
SB	Life expectancy (SDA)	WDC	2001-2003: Male 77.1 years Female 81.5 years	East of England Average: Male 77.3 years Female 81.4 years 2nd shortest life expectancy for males in Suffolk.	Life expectancy has decreased for females this monitoring period, but longer-term trend shows an increase, Male life expectancy has increased each monitoring period since 1998-2000.	Life expectancy is relatively low for Suffolk, but increasing.	😐 /☺ Relatively short life expectancy for Suffolk. Life expectancy has decreased for females this monitoring period, but longer-term trend shows an increase, Male life expectancy has increased each monitoring period since 1998-2000.
SB	Life expectancy (SDA)	Suffolk	N/A	East of England Average: Male 77.3 years Female 81.4 years	N/A		N/A
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Census/SSAG)	BDC	2001 Census: 8.9% foot, 2.7% cycle		No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information.
SB	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Census/SSAG)	FHDC	2001 Census: 10.6% foot, 4.6% cycle		No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information.
SB	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Census/SSAG)	IBC	2001 Census: 13.9% foot, 5.7% cycle Willis (Ipswich) Employee Travel Survey 2004: 10.1% foot, 1.5% cycle	Largest % of foot/cycle travel in Suffolk.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information. In 2001 Ipswich had highest % in Suffolk of walking/cycling to work.
SB	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Census/SSAG)	MSDC	2001 Census: 6.9% foot, 3.8% cycle MSDC Employee Travel Survey 2004: 5.6% foot, 2.8% cycle	Lowest % of foot/cycle travel in Suffolk.	No other comparable data recorded.	Low use of walking/cycling to travel to work in 2001 census.	😐 No trend information. In 2001 Mid Suffolk had lowest % in Suffolk of walking/cycling to work. Small sample size (36) in employee travel survey.
SB	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Census/SSAG)	SEBC	2001 Census: 11.9% foot, 3.5% cycle SEBC Employee Travel Survey 2004: 10.4% foot, 1.5% cycle		No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information. Small sample size (67) in employee travel survey.
SB	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Census/SSAG)	SCDC	2001 Census: 8.0% foot, 5.4% cycle SCDC Employee Travel Survey 2004: 6.9% foot, 1.7% cycle BT (Martlesham Heath) Travel Survey 2004: 19.0% foot, 6.9% cycle		BT (Martlesham Heath) Travel Survey 2003: 2.8% foot, 12.1% cycle No other comparable data recorded.		😐 Small sample size (116) in SCDC employee travel survey.
SB	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Census/SSAG)	WDC	2001 Census: 9.7% foot, 8.4% cycle WDC Employee Travel Survey 2004:	2nd largest % of foot/cycle travel in Suffolk in 2001 Census.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information. Small sample size (40) in employee travel

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			7.5% foot, 0% cycle				survey.
SB	Proportion of journeys to work on foot or by cycle (Census/SSAG)	Suffolk	2001 Census: 10.1% foot, 5.0% cycle Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2004: 9.8% foot, 4.1% cycle		Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2003: 11.8% foot, 4.8% cycle No other comparable data recorded.		😐 Limited trend information. An decrease has been recorded in use of walking/cycling by Suffolk employees but is this representative of the wider population?
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB	How do children travel to school? (QOL/BVPI)	BDC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
SB	How do children travel to school? (QOL/BVPI)	FHDC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
SB	How do children travel to school? (QOL/BVPI)	IBC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
SB	How do children travel to school? (QOL/BVPI)	MSDC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
SB	How do children travel to school? (QOL/BVPI)	SEBC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
SB	How do children travel to school? (QOL/BVPI)	SCDC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
SB	How do children travel to school? (QOL/BVPI)	WDC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
SB	How do children travel to school? (QOL/BVPI)	Suffolk	2004 survey: 41% walk, 18% bus, 6% cycle, 35% car.	Suffolk target of 23% by bus in 2004	Awaiting trend data from Terry Dodman, Suffolk		
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB	Obesity in the population (PCT)	BDC	No data for baseline but anticipate will be available in the future (LAA etc).				
SB	Obesity in the population (PCT)	FHDC	No data for baseline but anticipate will be available in the future (LAA etc).				
SB	Obesity in the population (PCT)	IBC	No data for baseline but anticipate will be available in the future (LAA etc).				
SB	Obesity in the population (PCT)	MSDC	No data for baseline but anticipate will be available in the future (LAA etc).				
SB	Obesity in the population (PCT)	SEBC	No data for baseline but anticipate will be available in the future (LAA etc).				
SB	Obesity in the population (PCT)	SCDC	No data for baseline but anticipate will be available in the future (LAA etc).				
SB	Obesity in the population (PCT)	WDC	No data for baseline but anticipate will be available in the future (LAA etc).				
SB	Obesity in the population (PCT)	Suffolk	No data for baseline but anticipate will be available in the future (LAA etc).				
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (SSAG 5-year review)	BDC	Under review.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SB	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (SSAG 5-year review)	FHDC	Under review.				
SB	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (SSAG 5-year review)	IBC	Under review.				
SB	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (SSAG 5-year review)	MSDC	Under review.				
SB	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (SSAG 5-year review)	SEBC	Under review.				
SB	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (SSAG 5-year review)	SCDC	Total outdoor playing space (adult, youth and children) 2004 : = 264.46 ha.				
SB	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (SSAG 5-year review)	WDC	Youth and adult play space 2003/4: = 110.73 ha.				
SB	Change in existing provision of outdoor playing space (youth and adult space) (SSAG 5-year review)	Suffolk	Under review.				
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB	Change in existing provision of children's play space (SSAG 5-year review)	BDC	Under review.				
SB	Change in existing provision of children's play space (SSAG 5-year review)	FHDC	Under review.				
SB	Change in existing provision of children's play space (SSAG 5-year review)	IBC	Under review.				
SB	Change in existing provision of children's play space (SSAG 5-year review)	MSDC	Under review.				
SB	Change in existing provision of children's play space (SSAG 5-year review)	SEBC	Under review.				
SB	Change in existing provision of children's play space (SSAG 5-year review)	SCDC	Total outdoor play space (adult, youth and children) 2004 : = 264.46 ha.				
SB	Change in existing provision of children's play space (SSAG 5-year review)	WDC	Children's play space 2003/4: = 60.87ha				
SB	Change in existing provision of children's play space (SSAG 5-year review)	Suffolk	Under review.				
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB	Change in provision of open space (District open space assessments)	BDC	Data not yet available.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SB	Change in provision of open space (District open space assessments)	FHDC	Data not yet available.				
SB	Change in provision of open space (District open space assessments)	IBC	Data not yet available.				
SB	Change in provision of open space (District open space assessments)	MSDC	Data not yet available.				
SB	Change in provision of open space (District open space assessments)	SEBC	Data not yet available.				
SB	Change in provision of open space (District open space assessments)	SCDC	Data not yet available.				
SB	Change in provision of open space (District open space assessments)	WDC	Data not yet available.				
SB	Change in provision of open space (District open space assessments)	Suffolk	Data not yet available.				
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
SB	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Suffolk BVPI)	BDC	N/A				
SB	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Suffolk BVPI)	FHDC	N/A				
SB	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Suffolk BVPI)	IBC	N/A				
SB	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Suffolk BVPI)	MSDC	N/A				
SB	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Suffolk BVPI)	SEBC	N/A				
SB	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Suffolk BVPI)	SCDC	N/A				
SB	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Suffolk BVPI)	WDC	N/A				
SB	% of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (Suffolk BVPI)	Suffolk	2004/5 survey: 59%	Target for the county of 62% for 2004/5 and 63% for 2005/6.	2003/4: 60.5% 2002/3: 57.4% 2001/2: 48% Improving trend since 2001 but decreased slightly this year.	% of easy to use paths has decreased this year and did not meet target. Improvement needed to meet 2005/6 target	☹ % of easy to use paths has decreased this year and did not meet 2004/5 target. Improvement required to meet next years target.
Headline Objective: To improve the health of the population overall							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?							
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	BDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it may be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	FHDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it may be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	IBC	No data for baseline but anticipate it may be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	MSDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it may be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	SEBC	No data for baseline but anticipate it may be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	SCDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it may be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	WDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it may be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	Suffolk	No data for baseline but anticipate it may be available in the future.				
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?							
SB	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	BDC	2004: 66.6%	Target? Highest % in Suffolk.	Trend shows increase from 64.1% in 2001, though is currently less than the 68.1% recorded in 2002.		☺ Good performance. Trend shows increase from 64.1% in 2001, though is currently less than the 68.1% recorded in 2002.
SB	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	FHDC	2004: 59.3%	Target?	Trend shows performance is improving each year. % has increased from 43.4% in 2001.		☺ Trend shows performance is improving each year. % has increased from 43.4% in 2001.
SB	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	IBC	2004: 63.5%	Target?	Trend shows performance is improving each year. % has increased from 48.3% in 2001		☺ Trend shows performance is improving each year. % has increased from 48.3% in 2001
SB	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	MSDC	2004: 55.4%	Target? 2nd lowest in Suffolk.	Performance is lowest since 2001, reversing an improving trend from 2001-2003. Low for Suffolk this year.	GCSE attainment is relatively low for Suffolk, and has decreased.	☹ Performance is lowest since 2001, reversing an improving trend from 2001-2003. Low for Suffolk this year.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SB	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	SEBC	2004: 65.0%	Target?	Performance is improving each year. % has increased from 59.4% in 2001		☺ Performance is relatively high for Suffolk and improving each year. % has increased from 59.4% in 2001
SB	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	SCDC	2004: 66.1%	Target? 2nd highest in Suffolk.	Performance is currently lower than the 71.5% recorded last year.		☺ Performance is good for Suffolk, although currently lower than the 71.5% recorded last year.
SB	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	WDC	2004: 50.2%	Target? Lowest in Suffolk.	Lowest performing District for last 3 years. Trend shows improvement from 2001-2003, but has decreased this year.	GCSE attainment is relatively low for Suffolk, and has decreased.	☹ Performance is low for Suffolk, and has been lowest performing District for last 3 years. Trend shows improvement from 2001-2003, but has decreased this year.
SB	% of year 11 pupils gaining 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	Suffolk	2004: 57.3%	Target?	Trend shows performance is improving each year. % for county has increased annually from 54.3% in 2001.		☺ Trend shows performance is improving each year. % for county has increased annually from 54.3% in 2001, although some districts perform better and/or have improved more than others.
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?							
SB	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	BDC	Average score 2004: 283.7	Target? 2nd highest in Suffolk.	Performance has improved from 222 in 2002.		☺ Performance is good for Suffolk and has improved in 2004 Data from 2002 onwards not comparable to previous data as method of calculating points score has changed.
SB	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	FHDC	Average score 2004: 270.1	Target?	Performance has decreased from 278.1 in 2002.	Performance is below average for Suffolk, and has decreased.	☹ Performance is below average for Suffolk, and has decreased in 2004. Data from 2002 onwards not comparable to previous data as method of calculating points score has changed.
SB	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	IBC	Average score 2004: 273.8	Target?	Performance has improved from 239.6 in 2002.		☺ Performance has improved from in2004. Data from 2002 onwards not comparable to previous data as method of calculating points score has changed.
SB	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	MSDC	Average score 2004: 250.1	Target? 2nd lowest in Suffolk.	Performance has decreased from 254.7 in 2002.	Performance is relatively low for Suffolk, and has decreased.	☹ Performance is relatively low for Suffolk, and has decreased in 2004. Data from 2002 onwards not comparable to previous data as method of calculating points score has changed.
SB	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	SEBC	Average score 2004: 275.9	Target?	Performance has improved from 263.5 in 2002.		☺ Performance is above average for Suffolk and has improved in 2004. Data from 2002 onwards not comparable to previous data as method of calculating points score has changed.
SB	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	SCDC	Average score 2004: 294.9	Target? Highest in Suffolk.	Performance has improved from 286.3 in 2002.		☺ Performance is good and has improved in 2004. Data from 2002 onwards not comparable to previous data as method of calculating points

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
							score has changed.
SB	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	WDC	Average score 2004: 247.9	Target? Lowest in Suffolk.	Performance has increased from 210.7 in 2002.	Performance is low for Suffolk but has increased.	😐 Performance is low for Suffolk but has increased in 2004. Data from 2002 onwards not comparable to previous data as method of calculating points score has changed.
SB	Average point score per student at A and AS level. (District Wide SDA / BVPI)	Suffolk	Average score 2004: 264.9	Target?	Performance has improved from 236.3 in 2002.		☺ Performance has improved in 2004. Data from 2002 onwards not comparable to previous data as method of calculating points score has changed.
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of adults?							
SB	Proportion of the population with no qualifications (Census)	BDC	2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 27.8%	England average: 28.9% 2nd lowest in Suffolk.	No trend data.		☺ Proportion is relatively low.
SB	Proportion of the population with no qualifications (Census)	FHDC	2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 30.5%	England average: 28.9%	No trend data.	Proportion of the population with no qualifications is relatively high.	☹ Proportion is relatively high.
SB	Proportion of the population with no qualifications (Census)	IBC	2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 33.6%	England average: 28.9% 2nd highest in Suffolk.	No trend data.	Proportion of the population with no qualifications is relatively high.	☹ Proportion is relatively high.
SB	Proportion of the population with no qualifications (Census)	MSDC	2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 27.9%	England average: 28.9%	No trend data.		☺ Proportion is relatively low.
SB	Proportion of the population with no qualifications (Census)	SEBC	2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 28.1%	England average: 28.9%	No trend data.		☺ Proportion is relatively low.
SB	Proportion of the population with no qualifications (Census)	SCDC	2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 26.9%	England average: 28.9% Lowest in Suffolk.	No trend data.		☺ Proportion is relatively low, and less than other Districts in Suffolk.
SB	Proportion of the population with no qualifications (Census)	WDC	2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 35.8%	England average: 28.9% Highest in Suffolk.	No trend data.	Proportion of the population with no qualifications is relatively high.	☹ Proportion is relatively high, and higher than other Districts in Suffolk.
SB	Proportion of the population with no qualifications (Census)	Suffolk	2001 Census, % of population aged 16-74 with no qualifications: 27.8%	England average: 28.9%	No trend data.	Proportion of the population with no qualifications is relatively high.	☹ Proportion is relatively high for Suffolk compared to England average, though varies between Districts.
Headline Objective: To maintain and improve levels of education and skills in the population overall							
Will it improve qualifications and skills of adults?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SB	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher (Suffolk Observatory)	BDC	February 2005: 24.0%		Feb 2004: 24.1% Feb 2003:22.2% Feb 2002: 22.2%		☺ Around average % for Suffolk. Trend shows improvement since 2003. Little change from last year.
SB	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher (Suffolk Observatory)	FHDC	February 2005: 24.8%		Feb 2004: 20.1% Feb 2003: 17.1% Feb 2002: -		☺ Around average % for Suffolk. Trend shows regular improvement since 2003.
SB	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher (Suffolk Observatory)	IBC	February 2005: 22.3%	2nd lowest in Suffolk	Feb 2004: 22.9% Feb 2003: 13.6% Feb 2002: 18.1%		😐 Below average % for Suffolk, but trend shows regular improvement since 2003.
SB	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher (Suffolk Observatory)	MSDC	February 2005: 33.9%	Highest in Suffolk	Feb 2004: 28.5% Feb 2003: 23.3% Feb 2002: 29.5%		☺ Above average % for Suffolk. Trend shows regular improvement since 2003.
SB	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher (Suffolk Observatory)	SEBC	February 2005: 23.9%		Feb 2004: 17.2% Feb 2003: 21.2% Feb 2002: 26.5%	Declining trend prior to this year, so should be monitored to ensure improvement is maintained.	😐 Around average % for Suffolk. Trend shows regular decrease since 2002, but this was reversed this year, and now highest since 2003.
SB	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher (Suffolk Observatory)	SCDC	February 2005: 28.8%	2nd highest in Suffolk	Feb 2004: 28.9% Feb 2003: 26.3% Feb 2002: 27.2%		😐 Above average % for Suffolk. Trend shows some fluctuation but little change since 2002.
SB	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher (Suffolk Observatory)	WDC	February 2005: 14.0%	Lowest in Suffolk	Feb 2004: 17.7% Feb 2003: 14.6% Feb 2002: 14.5%	Low % of population with NVQ level 1-4 or higher. Declining trend.	☹ Below average % for Suffolk. Improvement shown in 2004 has not been sustained, and levels are now lowest since 2002.
SB	Proportion of the population with NVQ level 4 or higher (Suffolk Observatory)	Suffolk	February 2005: 24.2%		Feb 2004: 22.9% Feb 2003: 19.8% Feb 2002: 21.6%		☺ Trend shows regular improvement in Suffolk since 2003.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce actual levels of crime?							
SSAG	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (SSAG)	BDC	2004 57.7	Below average for county.	2001 46.8 2002 49.9 2003 51.6 The figure has shown a small increase each year over the recording period.	The crime rate has increased steadily each year, however it remains relatively low for Suffolk	☹ The crime rate has increased steadily each year, however it remains relatively low for Suffolk
SSAG	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (SSAG)	FHDC	2004 88.6	Above average for county.	2001 72.7 2002 84.9 2003 76.4 The figure has fluctuated, but is highest this year.	Figure for 2003/4 is higher than previously recorded in recent years so the trend will need monitoring	😐 There are currently a number of projects in the District aimed at reducing crime.
SSAG	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (SSAG)	IBC	2004 138.5	Highest crime rate in Suffolk. Above average for county.	2001 97.3 2002 115.9 2003 125.5 Starting with the highest baseline in the county, the figure has also shown a	The crime rate has increased steadily each year, and it is high for Suffolk, consistently higher than other districts.	☹ As the main town in the area serving a wide catchment it is inevitable that Ipswich will experience higher levels of recorded crime than more rural parts of the county.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
					dramatic increase during the recording period.		
SSAG	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (SSAG)	MSDC	2004 42.7	Lowest crime rate in Suffolk. Approximately half the average for the county.	2001 34.1 2002 37.1 2003 35.7 The figure has fluctuated, but is highest this year.	Figure for 2003/4 is higher than previously recorded in recent years so the trend will need monitoring	☺ Significantly below county average, and lowest crime rate in the county, despite small increase this year. Good design of housing estates to reduce crime attributes to this low figures.
SSAG	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (SSAG)	SEBC	2004 71.7	Below average for county	2001 67.4 2002 70.7 2003 73.3 Previous years showed a trend of increasing crime rate but rate has decreased this year.		☺ Decreased this year and below county average.
SSAG	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (SSAG)	SCDC	2004 56.7	Below average for the county, 2nd lowest rate in Suffolk.	2001 45.6 2002 48.8 2003 48.4 The figure has fluctuated, but is highest this year.	Figure for 2003/4 is higher than previously recorded in recent years so the trend will need monitoring	☺ Significantly below county average, and second lowest crime rate in the county, despite small increase this year.
SSAG	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (SSAG)	WDC	2004 92.8	Above average for county. 2nd highest rate in Suffolk.	2001 77.0 2002 82.0 2003 82.8 A higher baseline than the more rural districts.	The crime rate has increased steadily each year, and it is high for Suffolk.	☹ The crime rate has increased steadily each year. However, this may be due to increased reporting.
SSAG	Recorded Crime per 1000 population (SSAG)	Suffolk	2004 80.3		2001 64.1 2002 ---- 2003 72.4 Substantially lower baseline than the national figure (113 in 2004)	The crime rate has increased steadily each year	☹ The crime rate has increased steadily each year. As well as a relatively low crime rate Suffolk has one of the highest success rates in the country for solving crime. This may lead to an increase in the level of reported crime.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce actual levels of crime?							
SG	Burglary Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	BDC	2004: 7.1	Below average for the county.	Increased each year since 2002, rising from 6.4 in 2002.	Burglary rate is below average for Suffolk, but increasing annually.	😐 Burglary rate has increased annually in recent years, but is still relatively low.
SG	Burglary Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	FHDC	2004: 9.5	About average for the county.	2004 figure is lower than previous 2 years, decreasing from a rate of 10.1 in 2003.		☺ Average for the county, and has decreased this year.
SG	Burglary Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	IBC	2004: 16.7	Above average for the county. Highest burglary rate in Suffolk.	2004 figure is higher than previous 2 years, increasing from a rate of 9.6 in 2003.	Highest burglary rate in Suffolk and higher than the national average.	☹ Highest burglary rate in Suffolk and increased this year. Currently higher than the national average.
SG	Burglary Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	MSDC	2004: 5.9	Below average for the county. Lowest burglary rate in Suffolk.	2004 figure is lower than previous 2 years, decreasing from a rate of 6.6 in 2003.		☺ Relatively low burglary rate, and has decreased this year.
SG	Burglary Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	SEBC	2004: 8.4	Below average for the county.	2004 figure is lower than previous 2 years, falling from 9.1 in 2003.		☺ Below average for the county, and has decreased this year.
SG	Burglary Rate per 1000 population	SCDC	2004: 6.5	Below average for the county. 2nd	Burglary rate has increased since 2003	Burglary rates generally low, although	☺ Relatively low burglary rate,

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	(SDA)			lowest burglary rate in Suffolk.	(a rate of 5.6), and now matches 2002 figures.	should monitor whether rate continues to increase next year.	although has increased slightly this year.
SG	Burglary Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	WDC	2004: 11.5	Above average for the county. 2nd highest burglary rate in Suffolk.	2004 figure is lower than previous 2 years, decreasing from a rate of 13.7 in 2003.	Burglary rate is relatively high for Suffolk, but is below national average and has decreased this year.	☹ 2nd highest burglary rate in Suffolk, although has improved this year.
SG	Burglary Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	Suffolk	2004: 9.6	Below England and Wales average of 15.6.	2004 figure is higher than previous 2 years, increasing from a rate of 8.8 in 2003.	Burglary rates generally low, although should monitor whether rate continues to increase next year.	😐 Burglary rate has increased in 2004, but is still relatively low compared to the national average, and is particularly low in the more rural districts.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce actual levels of crime?							
SG	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	BDC	2004: 8.9	Below average for the county.	Rate has increased each year since 2002. Has more than doubled from 4.0 in 2002.	Violent crime increasing annually, more than doubling since 2002, although still relatively low.	☹ Violent crime has increased annually since 2002, although rates are still relatively low.
SG	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	FHDC	2004: 14.9	A little below average for the county.	Rate has increased each year since 2002. Has more than doubled from 6.5 in 2002.	Violent crime increasing annually, more than doubling since 2002, although still relatively low.	☹ Violent crime has increased annually since 2002, although rates are still below average.
SG	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	IBC	2004: 23.0	Above average for the county, and for England and Wales. Highest rate in Suffolk.	Rate has increased annually from 17.1 in 2002.	Violent crime rates are high, and increasing annually.	☹ Violent crime rates are above average for Suffolk, and for England and Wales, and are increasing annually.
SG	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	MSDC	2004: 8.0	Below average for the county. Lowest rate in Suffolk.	Rate decreased from 5.2 to 4.7 in 2001 to 2002, but has increased in 2004. Currently higher than previous 2 years.	Violent crime has increased this year, although still relatively low.	😐 Violent crime has increased in 2004, although rates are still relatively low.
SG	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	SEBC	2004: 13.5	Below average for the county.	Rate decreased from 15.3 to 11.6 in 2001 to 2002, but has increased in 2004. Currently only district with rate lower than 2002 figure.	Violent crime has increased this year, although still relatively low and improved compared to 2002.	😐 Violent crime has increased in 2004, although rates are still relatively low and less than in 2002.
SG	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	SCDC	2004: 8.1	Below average for the county. 2nd lowest rate in Suffolk.	Rate has increased annually from 6.5 in 2002.	Violent crime increasing annually since 2002, although still relatively low.	☹ Violent crime has increased annually since 2002, although rates are still relatively low.
SG	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	WDC	2004: 19.2	Above average for the county. Highest rate in Suffolk.	Rate has increased annually from 13.6 in 2002.	Violent crime rates are relatively high, and increasing annually.	☹ Violent crime rates are above average for Suffolk, and are increasing annually, although still lower than England and Wales average.
SG	Violent Crime Rate per 1000 population (SDA)	Suffolk	2004: 15.6	Below averages of 16.9 for the East of England, and of 21.1 for England and Wales.	Rate has increased annually from 10.2 in 2002.	Violent crime has increased across the county since 2002. Most districts have shown an annual rise.	☹ Violent crime has increased in Suffolk in recent years. However it is still below the average rates for the Eastern region and for England and Wales.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce the fear of crime?							
SG	Fear of Crime (QOL, Suffolk Speaks, British Crime Survey)	BDC	% of respondents who feel safe in the area where they live: 94% % of respondents who feel their area	Joint highest in Suffolk.	N/A		😐 No trend information. Perception of safety and crime/disorder is high for Suffolk.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			is safe with low levels of crime and disorder: 71% (Suffolk Speaks, 2005)				
SG	Fear of Crime (QOL, Suffolk Speaks, British Crime Survey)	FHDC	% of respondents who feel safe in the area where they live: 73% % of respondents who feel their area is safe with low levels of crime and disorder: 45% (Suffolk Speaks, 2005)	Lowest in Suffolk. Lowest in Suffolk.	N/A		😐 No trend information. Perception of safety and crime/disorder is low for Suffolk.
SG	Fear of Crime (QOL, Suffolk Speaks, British Crime Survey)	IBC	% of respondents who feel safe in the area where they live: 76% % of respondents who feel their area is safe with low levels of crime and disorder: 48% (Suffolk Speaks, 2005)	2nd lowest in Suffolk. 2nd lowest in Suffolk.	N/A		😐 No trend information. Perception of safety and crime/disorder is low for Suffolk.
SG	Fear of Crime (QOL, Suffolk Speaks, British Crime Survey)	MSDC	% of respondents who feel safe in the area where they live: 94% % of respondents who feel their area is safe with low levels of crime and disorder: 77% (Suffolk Speaks, 2005)	Joint highest in Suffolk. Highest in Suffolk.	N/A		😐 No trend information. Perception of safety and crime/disorder is high for Suffolk.
SG	Fear of Crime (QOL, Suffolk Speaks, British Crime Survey)	SEBC	% of respondents who feel safe in the area where they live: 91% % of respondents who feel their area is safe with low levels of crime and disorder: 65% (Suffolk Speaks, 2005)		N/A		😐 No trend information. Perception of safety and crime/disorder is high for Suffolk, perception of crime/disorder is a little above average.
SG	Fear of Crime (QOL, Suffolk Speaks, British Crime Survey)	SCDC	% of respondents who feel safe in the area where they live: 93% % of respondents who feel their area is safe with low levels of crime and disorder: 72% (Suffolk Speaks, 2005)	2nd highest in Suffolk.	N/A		😐 No trend information. Perception of safety and crime/disorder is high for Suffolk.
SG	Fear of Crime (QOL, Suffolk Speaks, British Crime Survey)	WDC	% of respondents who feel safe in the area where they live: 88% % of respondents who feel their area is safe with low levels of crime and disorder: 51% (Suffolk Speaks, 2005)		N/A		😐 No trend information. Perception of safety is around average for Suffolk, perception of crime/disorder is low.
SG	Fear of Crime (British Crime Survey)	Suffolk	Suffolk police force area. Respondents very worried about: Burglary 6% Car crime 9% Violent crime 14% Respondents perceiving local levels of disorder as high: 8%	England and Wales average. Respondents very worried about: Burglary 13% Car crime 15% Violent crime 16% Respondents perceiving local levels of disorder as high: 17%	No trend data available.		😊 Fear of crime is low compared to national average and other counties in the East of England, particularly for burglary and car crime. Perceived levels of local disorder also much lower than national average.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			% of respondents who feel safe in the area where they live: 87% % of respondents who feel their area is safe with low levels of crime and disorder: 61% (Suffolk Speaks, 2005)				
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce noise and odour concerns?							
SG	Number of domestic noise complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	BDC	2004: 262 domestic complaints		Relatively stable from 227 in 2002 to 224 in 2003, but increased this year. 2004 figure is highest since 2002.	Number of noise complaints is higher than 2002/3 figures.	☹ Number of noise complaints is higher than 2002/3 figures.
SG	Number of domestic noise complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	FHDC	2004: 219 domestic complaints	Lowest number of complaints in Suffolk.	Decreased from 235 in 2002 to 208 in 2003, but increased this year. There were fewer complaints in 2004 than 2002.	The number of complaints has decreased since 2002 and is low overall, but need to monitor whether the increase recorded this year continues in the future.	😐 Number of noise complaints is lower than 2002 figure, but has increased this year.
SG	Number of domestic noise complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	IBC	2004: 903 domestic complaints	Highest number of complaints in Suffolk.	Decreased from 920 in 2002 to 821 in 2003, but increased again this year. There were fewer complaints in 2004 than 2002.	The number of complaints has decreased since 2002 but it is still relatively high, and need to monitor whether the increase recorded this year continues in the future.	☹ /😐 Number of noise complaints is lower than 2002 figure, but has increased this year and is relatively high for Suffolk.
SG	Number of domestic noise complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	MSDC	2004: 241 domestic complaints		Increased slightly from 200 in 2002 to 208 in 2003, and increased again this year. 2004 figure is highest since 2002.	Number of noise complaints has increased annually since 2002.	☹ Number of noise complaints has increased annually since 2002.
SG	Number of domestic noise complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	SEBC	2004: 486 domestic complaints	2nd highest number of complaints in Suffolk.	Decreased from 563 in 2002 to 426 in 2003, but increased again this year. There were fewer complaints in 2004 than 2002.	The number of complaints has decreased since 2002 but it is still relatively high, and need to monitor whether the increase recorded this year continues in the future.	☹ /😐 Number of noise complaints is lower than 2002 figure, but has increased this year and is relatively high for Suffolk.
SG	Number of domestic noise complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	SCDC	2004: 232 domestic complaints	2nd lowest number of complaints in Suffolk.	Decreased from 248 in 2002 to 219 in 2003, but increased this year. There were fewer complaints in 2004 than 2002.	The number of complaints has decreased since 2002 and is low overall, but need to monitor whether the increase recorded this year continues in the future.	😐 Number of noise complaints is lower than 2002 figure, but has increased this year.
SG	Number of domestic noise complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	WDC	2004: 402 domestic complaints		Increased from 371 in 2002 to 424 in 2003, but decreased this year. Opposite trend to most districts and only one to record a decrease in 2004. However there were still more complaints in 2004 that 2002.	The number of complaints has decreased this year but is still higher than 2002 figures. Need to monitor whether complaints continue to decrease.	😐 Number of noise complaints has fallen this year, but remains higher than 2002 baseline.
SG	Number of domestic noise complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	Suffolk	2004: 2745 domestic complaints (total for county)		Decreased from 2,764 in 2002 to 2,530 in 2003, but increased again this year. There were slightly fewer complaints in 2004 than 2002.	The number of complaints has decreased since 2002 but need to monitor whether the increase recorded this year continues in the future.	😐 Number of noise complaints is lower than 2002 figure, but has increased this year.
Headline Objective: To reduce crime and anti-social activity							
Will it reduce noise and odour concerns?							
	Number of odour complaints (Environmental Health Depts	BDC	Each District/Borough to do.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	Districts)						
	Number of odour complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	FHDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of odour complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	IBC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of odour complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	MSDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of odour complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	SEBC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of odour complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	SCDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of odour complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	WDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of odour complaints (Environmental Health Depts Districts)	Suffolk	Each District/Borough to do.				
Headline Objective: To reduce poverty and social exclusion							
Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?							
SB	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Suffolk)	BDC	IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 0% population Most deprived 25% = 0% population				Low levels of deprivation.
SB	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Suffolk)	FHDC	IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 0% population Most deprived 25% = 0% population				Low levels of deprivation.
SB	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Suffolk)	IBC	IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 7% popn Most deprived 25% = 32% popn	Highest % of people in most deprived areas of any district/borough in Suffolk		Relatively high levels of deprivation in areas of Ipswich.	Relatively high levels of deprivation for Suffolk.
SB	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Suffolk)	MSDC	IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 0% population Most deprived 25% = 0% population				Low levels of deprivation.
SB	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Suffolk)	SEBC	IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 0% population Most deprived 25% = 0% population				Low levels of deprivation.
SB	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Suffolk)	SCDC	IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 0% popn Most deprived 25% = 1% popn	Higher than other rural districts in Suffolk (but much lower than Ipswich or Waveney)		Relatively high levels of deprivation in areas of Saxmundham only.	Relatively high levels of deprivation in Saxmundham. Low levels in rest of district.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SB	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Suffolk)	WDC	IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 7% popn Most deprived 25% = 20% popn	2nd highest % of people in most deprived areas of any district/borough in Suffolk		Relatively high levels of deprivation in areas of Lowestoft only.	Relatively high levels of deprivation for Suffolk. All of the 25% most deprived areas are in Lowestoft. Low levels in rest of district.
SB	Proportion of the population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and 25% of wards in the country (Suffolk)	Suffolk	IMD 2004: Most deprived 10% = 2% popn Most deprived 25% = 9% popn	Much lower than national average		Areas in some Suffolk towns experience relatively high levels of deprivation (particularly Ipswich and Lowestoft and to a lesser extent Saxmundham), but levels are low for county as a whole.	County as a whole has relatively low proportion of population in the most deprived areas. However deprivation is relatively high in towns of Ipswich, Lowestoft and to a lesser extent Saxmundham.
Headline Objective: To reduce poverty and social exclusion							
Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?							
SB	Housing benefit recipients (LAs)	BDC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
SB	Housing benefit recipients (LAs)	FHDC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
SB	Housing benefit recipients (LAs)	IBC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
SB	Housing benefit recipients (LAs)	MSDC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
SB	Housing benefit recipients (LAs)	SEBC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
SB	Housing benefit recipients (LAs)	SCDC	2004/5: 5,318 2003/4: 4,814 2002/3: 4,689 2001/2: 4,778		Claimants have increased each year since 2003. 2004/5 figures are highest since 2001/2.	Increase in number of claimants in recent years - check whether this in proportion to total population growth.	Number of claimants has increased in recent years.
SB	Housing benefit recipients (LAs)	WDC	Feb 2005: 10237 May 2004: 9188 Aug 2003: 10725				
SB	Housing benefit recipients (LAs)	Suffolk	Awaiting data from districts.				
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to key local services?							
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	BDC	Total Rural Population **45,561** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **18,921** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **41.5**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services Highest % in Suffolk	% of rural population with access to all five listed facilities has halved - **64% recorded in 2002/3 (no data for 2001/2).**	Rapid loss of rural services during last year is a concern.	☹ There has been a significant decrease this year indicating a rapid decrease in rural service provision. Not on track to meet target. Needs to be monitored and improved in the future.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	FHDC	Total Rural Population **9384** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **N/A** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **N/A**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services Lowest % in Suffolk in 2002/3	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: **4.4% (no data for 2001/2).**		😐 The source of population data has changes and so figures are not directly comparable.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	IBC	Total Rural Population **0** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **N/A** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **N/A**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services			IBC does not have a rural population, therefore this indicator is not applicable
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	MSDC	Total Rural Population **60,987** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **26,312** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **43.1%**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: 39.8% 2001/2: 49.8% A 7% decrease since 2001/2, but has increased since last year.		😐 Not currently on track to meet target, but has increased this year. The adoption of SPG to safeguard pubs, shops and post offices have sought to protect access to these key services.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	SEBC	Total Rural Population **40,961** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **19,580** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **47.8**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: 51.6% 2001/2: 41.6% Figure increased in 2002/3, but a small decrease recorded this year. Currently higher than 2001/2 baseline.		😐 There has been a small decrease this year. However rural service provision is currently higher than 2001/2 baseline, so still on track to meet target.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	SCDC	Total Rural Population **47,401** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **21,090** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **44.5**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: 29.8% 2001/2: 29.6% Has increased significantly this year from a previously stable 30%		☺ There has been a significant increase this year indicating an increase in rural service provision. On track to meet target.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	WDC	Total Rural Population **13,486** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **1602** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **8.9**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: 11.9% 2001/2: 33.8% Decrease due to Kessingland, previously included as a rural parish but now grown to become 'urban'.	Loss of rural services during last year is a concern.	☹ There has been a decrease this year indicating a further decrease in rural service provision. Not on track to meet target. Needs to be monitored and improved in the future.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	Suffolk	Total Rural Population **208,396** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 87,505 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 42.0 **(Total excludes FHDC)**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: **43.2**% 2001/2: 41.0% Appears to have been a slight decrease in provision of rural services over the past year. However this does not include FHDC, which had lowest % last year, so actual decrease may in fact be greater.		😐 The source of population data has changed and so figures are not directly comparable. Not all districts returned data for each year, therefore not accurate to compare.
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to key local services?							
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG)	BDC	% of rural households 2003/4: 33.0%	To achieve a one-third increase in % of households in rural areas within about 10 minutes walk of hourly or better bus	2002/3: 25.2% 2001/2: 30%		😐 New indicator in 2001/2, and results have varied since then with no

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
				service by 2010 (Transport Ten Year Plan, 2000).	After decrease in 2002/3, indicator is now higher than it has been in last 3 years. Above average for Suffolk.		clear directional trend.
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG)	FHDC	% of rural households 2003/4: 54.2%	To achieve a one-third increase in % of households in rural areas within about 10 minutes walk of hourly or better bus service by 2010 (Transport Ten Year Plan, 2000). Highest % in Suffolk.	2002/3: 35.1% 2001/2: 35.0% Previously remained stable but large increase recorded this year. Highest % coverage in Suffolk, more than twice the average for the county.		☺ Target increase has been achieved based on this year's figure. Large increase this year. New indicator in 2001/2.
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG)	IBC	No rural areas.	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).	No rural areas.		
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG)	MSDC	% of rural households 2003/4: 15.3%	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). 2nd lowest % in Suffolk.	2002/3: 9.9% 2001/2: 10% Previously remained stable, but has increased this year by over 50%. However coverage is still low as this is based on lowest baseline figure in Suffolk, and it is below average for the county.	Proportion of rural households within 13 mins of an hourly bus route is low compared to the rest of the county.	😐 New indicator in 2001/2. Has increased this year by target amount but coverage is still low. Problems encouraging new bus service routes due to rural locality.
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG)	SEBC	% of rural households 2003/4: 24.3%	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).	2002/3: 22.7% 2001/2: 23% Small increase this year but has remained relatively stable. Below average for the county.		☹ Levels have increased slightly which is encouraging but doesn't help towards achieving the target set. New indicator in 2001/2.
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG)	SCDC	% of rural households 2003/4: 33.3%	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). 2nd highest in Suffolk	2002/3: 36.6% 2001/2: 37% Levels of coverage have previously have remained stable, but have decreased this year. Still above average for the county.	Proportion of rural households within 13 mins of an hourly bus route is decreasing.	☹ Decrease in coverage of hourly bus routes in rural areas this year (though levels are still relatively high for Suffolk). New indicator in 2001/2.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG)	WDC	% of rural households 2003/4: 12.7%	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). Lowest in Suffolk	2002/3: 16.8% 2001/2: 16% Levels of coverage have previously have remained stable, but have decreased this year. Below average for the county (current figure is less than half the county average).	Proportion of rural households within 13 mins of an hourly bus route is low compared to the rest of the county, and decreasing.	☹ Decrease in coverage of hourly bus routes in rural areas this year, and levels are also low for Suffolk. This was a new indicator in 2001/2 so monitoring required over a longer time period to come to any clearer conclusions on progress.
SSAG	Percentage of Rural Households within 13 minutes' Walk of an Hourly Bus Service (SSAG)	Suffolk	% of rural households 2003/4: 26.0%	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).	2002/3: 22.7% 2001/2: 23% Levels of coverage have previously have remained stable, but have increased this year.		😐 A small increase has been recorded this year for the county as a whole, but this is not reflected in all districts. However, the level of increase is on track to meet the target. New indicator in 2001/2.
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to key local services?							
SB	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators)	BDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators)	FHDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators)	IBC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators)	MSDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators)	SEBC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators)	SCDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators)	WDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to key local services (eg GP, post office) (DfT accessibility indicators)	Suffolk	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to shopping facilities?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
HH	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (AMR)	BDC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
HH	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (AMR)	FHDC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
HH	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (AMR)	IBC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
HH	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (AMR)	MSDC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
HH	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (AMR)	SEBC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
HH	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (AMR)	SCDC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
HH	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (AMR)	WDC	Each LA to complete for own area.				
HH	New Retail Floor Space in Town Centres (AMR)	Suffolk	Awaiting data from Districts.				
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve accessibility to shopping facilities?							
SB	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators)	BDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators)	FHDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators)	IBC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators)	MSDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators)	SEBC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators)	SCDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators)	WDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			clearly.				
SB	Proportion of population with access to a food shop (DfT accessibility indicators)	Suffolk	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
Headline Objective: To improve access to key services for all sectors of the population							
Will it improve access to childcare?							
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5 (Mark Parker)	BDC	Waiting info from County – Ken Sanderson				
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5 (Mark Parker)	FHDC	Waiting info from County – Ken Sanderson				
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5 (Mark Parker)	IBC	Waiting info from County – Ken Sanderson				
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5 (Mark Parker)	MSDC	Waiting info from County – Ken Sanderson				
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5 (Mark Parker)	SEBC	Waiting info from County – Ken Sanderson				
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5 (Mark Parker)	SCDC	Waiting info from County – Ken Sanderson				
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5 (Mark Parker)	WDC	Waiting info from County – Ken Sanderson				
HH	Number of child care places per thousand children under 5 (Mark Parker)	Suffolk	Waiting info from County – Ken Sanderson				
Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment							
Will it reduce unemployment overall?							
SSAG	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR)	BDC	April 2003 1.4 July 2003 1.4 October 2003 1.2 January 2004 1.5	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England <u>East of England:</u> April 2003 1.8 July 2003 1.8 October 2003 1.7 January 2004 1.8 <u>Great Britain:</u> April 2003 2.6 July 2003 2.5 October 2003 2.4 January 2004 2.6 Source- ONS [From Nomis 21 Jan	Quarterly unemployment levels (%) **1.5** **Unemployment rate fluctuating but remaining low and staying below regional rates and well below national rates**		☺ Consistent very low unemployment.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
				2005]			
SSAG	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR)	FHDC	April 2003 0.9 July 2003 0.9 October 2003 0.9 January 2004 1.0	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England <u>East of England:</u> April 2003 1.8 July 2003 1.8 October 2003 1.7 January 2004 1.8 <u>Great Britain:</u> April 2003 2.6 July 2003 2.5 October 2003 2.4 January 2004 2.6 Source- ONS [From Nomis 21 Jan 2005]	Quarterly unemployment levels (%) **1** **Unemployment rate remaining low and staying well below regional rates and very much below national rates. Forest Heath has the lowest levels in Suffolk**		☺ Consistent very low unemployment.
SSAG	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR)	IBC	April 2003 3.8 July 2003 3.8 October 2003 3.6 January 2004 3.6	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England <u>East of England:</u> April 2003 1.8 July 2003 1.8 October 2003 1.7 January 2004 1.8 <u>Great Britain:</u> April 2003 2.6 July 2003 2.5 October 2003 2.4 January 2004 2.6 Source- ONS [From Nomis 21 Jan 2005]	Quarterly unemployment levels (%) **3.8** **Overall decrease identified but rates still exceed regional and even national rates**		☹ Encouraging, if slight, decrease in rate identified but it remains at double the average for the region as a whole.
SSAG	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR)	MSDC	April 2003 1.2 July 2003 1.2 October 2003 1.1 January 2004 1.2	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England <u>East of England:</u> April 2003 1.8 July 2003 1.8 October 2003 1.7 January 2004 1.8 <u>Great Britain:</u> April 2003 2.6 July 2003 2.5 October 2003 2.4 January 2004 2.6 Source- ONS [From Nomis 21 Jan 2005]	Quarterly unemployment levels (%) **1.2** **Unemployment rate stable and remains well below regional and national levels**		☺ Stable low unemployment levels.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR)	SEBC	April 2003 1.3 July 2003 1.2 October 2003 1.2 January 2004 1.2	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England <u>East of England:</u> April 2003 1.8 July 2003 1.8 October 2003 1.7 January 2004 1.8 <u>Great Britain:</u> April 2003 2.6 July 2003 2.5 October 2003 2.4 January 2004 2.6 Source- ONS [From Nomis 21 Jan 2005]	Quarterly unemployment levels (%) **1.4** **Trend of slight decrease identifiable over time. Rate for SEBC remains well below regional and national levels**		☺ The slight fluctuations hide low and relatively stable levels of unemployment.
SSAG	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR)	SCDC	April 2003 1.6 July 2003 1.4 October 2003 1.4 January 2004 1.5	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England <u>East of England:</u> April 2003 1.8 July 2003 1.8 October 2003 1.7 January 2004 1.8 <u>Great Britain:</u> April 2003 2.6 July 2003 2.5 October 2003 2.4 January 2004 2.6 Source- ONS [From Nomis 21 Jan 2005]	Quarterly unemployment levels (%) **1.7** **Trend of slight decrease identifiable over time. Rate remains below regional and well below national levels**		☺ Stable low unemployment levels.
SSAG	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR)	WDC	April 2003 3.1 July 2003 2.9 October 2003 3.0 January 2004 3.7	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England <u>East of England:</u> April 2003 1.8 July 2003 1.8 October 2003 1.7 January 2004 1.8 <u>Great Britain:</u> April 2003 2.6 July 2003 2.5 October 2003 2.4 January 2004 2.6 Source- ONS [From Nomis 21 Jan 2005]	Quarterly unemployment levels (%) **3.4** **Level for WDC has fluctuated quite considerably, with an overall increase evident and a sharp rise from 2003 – 4. Rates consistently well above regional levels and even exceed national levels**		☺ Hopefully given the amount of regeneration work and EU funding coming into the district this situation should continue to improve.
SSAG	Unemployment rate (SSAG/AMR)	Suffolk	April 2003 2.0 July 2003 2.0 October 2003 1.9	Target to ensure that Suffolk's unemployment levels do not exceed those in the East of England	Quarterly unemployment levels (%) **2.1** **The Suffolk average rate remains**		😐 Overall unemployment rates are slightly higher than East of England

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			January 2004 2.1	East of England: April 2003 1.8 July 2003 1.8 October 2003 1.7 January 2004 1.8 Great Britain: April 2003 2.6 July 2003 2.5 October 2003 2.4 January 2004 2.6 Source- ONS [From Nomis 21 Jan 2005]	**slightly higher than regional rates (but substantially lower than national rates). Slight fluctuations seen but overall rate has remained stable**		totals, but remain stable.
Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment							
Will it reduce long-term unemployment?							
RC	Long-term unemployment (Nomis)	BDC	April 2004: 0.2% / 18.8% April 1999: 0.5% / 25.1% Unemployment 12 month duration (% of total workforce/% of unemployed) [from Nomis on 15 February 2005]		Downward trend.		☺ Long-term unemployement rates have fallen in the district since 1999 for overall unemployment. The percentage of unemployed, who are also long-term unemployed, has also fallen.
RC	Long-term unemployment (Nomis)	FHDC	April 2004: 0.1% / 7.5% April 1999: 0.3% / 21.9% Unemployment 12 month duration (% of total workforce/% of unemployed) [from Nomis on 15 February 2005]		Downward trend.		☺ Long-term unemployement rates have fallen in the district since 1999 for overall unemployment. The percentage of unemployed, who are also long-term unemployed, has also fallen significantly.
RC	Long-term unemployment (Nomis)	IBC	April 2004: 0.7% / 22.2% April 1999: 1.2% / 27.5% Unemployment 12 month duration (% of total workforce/% of unemployed) [from Nomis on 15 February 2005]		Downward trend.		☺ Long-term unemployement rates have fallen in the district since 1999 for overall unemployment. The percentage of unemployed, who are also long-term unemployed, has also fallen.
RC	Long-term unemployment (Nomis)	MSDC	April 2004: 0.1% / 14.8% April 1999: 0.2% / 16.1% Unemployment 12 month duration (% of total workforce/% of unemployed) [from Nomis on 15 February 2005]		Downward trend.		☺ Long-term unemployement rates have fallen in the district since 1999 for overall unemployment. The percentage of unemployed, who are also long-term unemployed, has also fallen.
RC	Long-term unemployment (Nomis)	SEBC	April 2004: 0.1% / 10.8% April 1999: 0.4% / 19.7% Unemployment 12 month duration (% of total workforce/% of unemployed) [from Nomis on 15 February 2005		Downward trend.		☺ Long-term unemployement rates have fallen in the district since 1999 for overall unemployment. The percentage of unemployed, who are also long-term unemployed, has also fallen.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
RC	Long-term unemployment (Nomis)	SCDC	April 2004: 0.2% / 15.6% April 1999: 0.4% / 19.6% Unemployment 12 month duration (% of total workforce/% of unemployed) [from Nomis on 15 February 2005		Downward trend.		☺ Long-term unemployement rates have fallen in the district since 1999 for overall unemployment. The percentage of unemployed, who are also long-term unemployed, has also fallen.
RC	Long-term unemployment (Nomis)	WDC	April 2004: 0.6% / 16% April 1999: 1.7% / 31.1% Unemployment 12 month duration (% of total workforce/% of unemployed) [from Nomis on 15 February 2005]		Downward trend.		☺ Long-term unemployement rates have fallen in the district since 1999 for overall unemployment. The percentage of unemployed, who are also long-term unemployed, has also fallen significantly.
RC	Long-term unemployment (Nomis)	Suffolk	April 2004: 0.3% / 17.1% April 1999: 0.7% / 25.6% Unemployment 12 month duration (% of total workforce/% of unemployed) [from Nomis on 15 February 2005]		Downward trend.		☺ Long-term unemployement rates have fallen for county since 1999 for overall unemployment. The percentage of unemployed, who are also long-term unemployed, has also fallen.
Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment							
Will it provide job opportunities for those most in need of employment?							
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Census)	BDC	2001: Long term ill – 32.6% Lone parent – 62.5%		No trend data available.	A difficult indicator to collect data for, data is only easily available via the census – table references ST021 and KS022.	😐 No comparable data. However, proportions of lone parents who are economically active is quite a high figure and can affect quality of life targets.
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Census)	FHDC	2001: Long term ill – 35.8% Lone parent – 64.4%		No trend data available.	A difficult indicator to collect data for, data is only easily available via the census – table references ST021 and KS022.	😐 No comparable data. However, proportions of lone parents who are economically active is quite a high figure and can affect quality of life targets.
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Census)	IBC	2001: Long term ill – 29.5% Lone parent – 48.4%		No trend data available.	A difficult indicator to collect data for, data is only easily available via the census – table references ST021 and KS022.	😐 No comparable data. However, proportions of lone parents who are economically active is quite a high figure and can affect quality of life targets.
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Census)	MSDC	2001: Long term ill – 34.5% Lone parent – 60.2%		No trend data available.	A difficult indicator to collect data for, data is only easily available via the census – table references ST021 and KS022.	😐 No comparable data. However, proportions of lone parents who are economically active is quite a high figure and can affect quality of life targets.
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Census)	SEBC	2001: Long term ill – 35.3% Lone parent – 63.8%		No trend data available.	A difficult indicator to collect data for, data is only easily available via the census – table references ST021 and KS022.	😐 No comparable data. However, proportions of lone parents who are economically active is quite a high figure and can affect quality of life targets.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Census)	SCDC	2001: Long term ill – 32.2% Lone parent – 59.4%		No trend data available.	A difficult indicator to collect data for, data is only easily available via the census – table references ST021 and KS022.	😐 No comparable data. However, proportions of lone parents who are economically active is quite a high figure and can affect quality of life targets.
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Census)	WDC	2001: Long term ill – 25.6% Lone parent – 48.6%		No trend data available.	A difficult indicator to collect data for, data is only easily available via the census – table references ST021 and KS022.	😐 No comparable data. However, proportions of lone parents who are economically active is quite a high figure and can affect quality of life targets.
RC	Proportion of lone parents and long term-ill who are economically active (Census)	Suffolk	2001: Long term ill – 31.3% Lone parent – 56.1%		No trend data available.	A difficult indicator to collect data for, data is only easily available via the census – table references ST021 and KS022.	😐 No comparable data. However, proportions of lone parents who are economically active is quite a high figure and can affect quality of life targets.
Headline Objective: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment							
Will it help to improve earnings?							
RC	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR)	BDC	April 2004: £24,554 April 2002: £26,339 [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]	The only decrease in wages for Suffolk	Downward trend		☹ Average earnings have fallen (-6.7%) since 2002. However, wages still remain relatively high and only just below the county average.
RC	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR)	FHDC	April 2004: £23,473 April 2002: £19,986 [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]		Upward trend		☺ Average earnings have increased 17.4% since 2002.
RC	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR)	IBC	April 2004: £22,647 April 2002: £21,635 [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]		Upward trend		☺ Average earnings have increased 4.6% since 2002.
RC	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR)	MSDC	April 2004: £28,335 April 2002: £21,794 [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]	Highest increase in Suffolk.	Upward trend		☺ Average earnings have increased 30% since 2002. The highest increase in the county.
RC	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR)	SEBC	April 2004: £26,304 April 2002: £26,242 [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]		Upward trend		☺ Average earnings have increased 0.2% since 2002.
RC	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR)	SCDC	April 2004: £27,418 April 2002: £25,132		Upward trend		☺ Average earnings have increased 9.0% since 2002.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			[Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]				
RC	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR)	WDC	April 2004: £20,478 April 2002: £19,244 [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]		Upward trend		☺ Average earnings have increased 6.4% since 2002.
RC	Average Earnings (Inland revenue/AMR)	Suffolk	April 2004: £24,940 April 2002: £23,194 [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2002/2004]		Upward trend		☺ Average earnings have increased 7.5% since 2002.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it reduce homelessness?							
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations)	BDC	2003/04 285		2000/01 272 2001/02 275 2002/03 282 Upward trend.		☹ upward trend New BVPI for 05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homeless cases prevented, so numbers expected to decrease.
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations)	FHDC	2003/04 85 (FHDC Housing Strategy 2004-2007)		2000/01 109 2001/02 139 2002/03 86 Downward trend.		☺ downward trend New BVPI for 05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homeless cases prevented, so numbers expected to decrease.
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations)	IBC	2003/04 1322		2001/02 1054 2002/03 1249 Upward trend		☹ upward trend New BVPI for 05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homeless cases prevented.
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations)	MSDC	2003/04 226		2000/01 210 2001/02 238 2002/03 225 Generally a downward trend		☺ generally a downward trend New BVPI for 05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homeless cases prevented, so numbers expected to decrease.
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations)	SEBC	2003/04 818 (164*) (This figure includes Housing Advice)		2000/01 659 (132*) 2001/02 616 (123*) 2002/03 752 (150*) (These figures include Housing Advice) Upward trend		☹ upward trend. *Until April 2004 Homelessness Presentation figures have included Housing Advice. Now being recorded separately. Homelessness Officers consider that approx one fifth of the figure is actually presentations and for the financial year 04/05 there have been 235 to date (10/03/05). New BVPI for 05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homelessness cases prevented, so numbers expected to

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
							decrease.
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations)	SCDC	2003/04 454		2000/01 391 2001/02 385 2002/03 413 Upward trend		☹ upward trend New BVPI for 05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homelessness cases prevented, so numbers expected to decrease.
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations)	WDC	2003/04 544		2001/02 256 2002/03 436 Upward trend.		☹ upward trend New BVPI for 05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homelessness cases prevented, so numbers expected to decrease..
DR	Homelessness (districts homelessness presentations)	Suffolk	2003/04 3080		2001/02 2470 2002/03 2841 Upward trend		☹ upward trend (see note for St.Eds) New BVPI for 05/06 (BVx16) focuses on number of homelessness cases prevented, so numbers expected to decrease.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it provide enough housing?							
SSAG	Housing Stock (SSAG)	BDC	Housing stock 31/03/04: 36,960 Total since 1996: 2,360 Annual rate: 305	Structure Plan overall requirement 1996-2016: 6,990 Annual rate required 1996-2016: 345 Annual rate now required: 370 So far the annual rate of change is below target.	The annual rate required in 2000-2004 has fluctuated ranging from 341 to a peak this year at 370. It has been above that identified in the Structure Plan (345) since 2001.	Additional housing stock is required. Trend shows that rate of increase has fallen below that required to meet Structure Plan requirements in recent years.	☹ Additional housing is required at increased rate.
SSAG	Housing Stock (SSAG)	FHDC	Housing stock 31/03/04: 24,960 Total since 1996: 1,140 Annual rate: 145	Structure Plan overall requirement 1996-2016: 5,200 Annual rate required 1996-2016: 260 Annual rate now required: 330 So far the annual rate of change is below target. (Largest shortfall in annual change in Suffolk)	The annual rate required in 2000-2004 has been consistently higher than that identified in the Structure Plan (260), ranging from 292 to 330 this year.	Additional housing stock is required. Trend shows that rate of increase has been below that required to meet Structure Plan requirements in recent years.	☹ The shortfall in building rates is due primarily to the time it has taken to complete S106 agreements relating to the major housing development at Red Lodge. Additional housing is required at increased rate.
SSAG	Housing Stock (SSAG)	IBC	Housing stock 31/03/04: 53,220 Total since 1996: 2,430 Annual rate: 315	Structure Plan overall requirement 1996-2016: 8,000 Annual rate required 1996-2016: 400 Annual rate now required: 455 So far the annual rate of change is below target. (2nd largest shortfall in annual change in Suffolk)	The annual rate required in 2000, 2001 and 2003 had become increasingly higher than that identified in the Structure Plan (400), ranging from 415 to 461. Slight improvement this year but still below target.	Additional housing stock is required. Trend shows that rate of increase has been below that required to meet Structure Plan requirements in recent years.	☹ Additional housing is required at increased rate.
SSAG	Housing Stock (SSAG)	MSDC	Housing stock 31/03/04: 38,060 Total since 1996: 3,210 Annual rate: 415	Structure Plan overall requirement 1996-2016: 8,100 Annual rate required 1996-2016: 405 Annual rate now required: 400 So far the annual rate of change is on target.	The annual rate required in 2000-2004 has consistently remained just under that identified in the Structure Plan (405), ranging from 393 to 404. The rate of increase has consistently met Structure Plan requirements in recent years.	None, housing is being completed within the District levels required by the Structure Plan.	☺ Housing is being completed within the District levels required by the Structure Plan. However, additional housing is still required.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Housing Stock (SSAG)	SEBC	Housing stock 31/03/04: 44,000 Total since 1996: 3,790 Annual rate: 490	Structure Plan overall requirement 1996-2016: 8,800 Annual rate required 1996-2016: 440 Annual rate now required: 410 So far the annual rate of change is above target.	The annual rate required in 2000, 2001 and 2003 has become increasingly less than that identified in the Structure Plan (440), ranging from 435 to 410, and has levelled off this year. The rate of increase has consistently exceeded Structure Plan requirements in recent years.	Housing is being completed within the borough above the levels required by the Structure Plan. Need to monitor the situation as there may be a need to take action to ensure all development does not take place too early in the Plan period.	☺ Housing is being completed within the borough above the levels required by the Structure Plan. However, additional housing is still required.
SSAG	Housing Stock (SSAG)	SCDC	Housing stock 31/03/03: 54,490 Total since 1996: 4,260 Annual rate: 550	Structure Plan overall requirement 1996-2016: 9,400 Annual rate required 1996-2016: 470 Annual rate now required: 420 So far the annual rate of change is above target. (Highest annual change above target rate in Suffolk)	The annual rate required in 2000-2004 has become increasingly less than that identified in the Structure Plan (470), ranging from 456 to 420. The rate of increase has consistently exceeded Structure Plan requirements in recent years.	Housing is being completed within the borough above the levels required by the Structure Plan. Need to monitor the situation as there may be a need to take action to ensure all development does not take place too early in the Plan period.	☺ Housing is being completed within the District above the levels required by the Structure Plan. However, additional housing is still required.
SSAG	Housing Stock (SSAG)	WDC	Housing stock 31/03/04: 53,110 Total since 1996: 3,080 Annual rate: 395	Structure Plan overall requirement 1996-2016: 6,700 Annual rate required 1996-2016: 335 Annual rate now required: 295 So far the annual rate of change is above target. (2nd highest annual change above target rate in Suffolk)	The annual rate required in 2000 was 387. In 2001-2004 the rate has improved and become increasingly lower than that identified in the Structure Plan (335), at 324 to 295. The rate of increase has consistently exceeded Structure Plan requirements in recent years.	Housing is being completed within the borough above the levels required by the Structure Plan. Need to monitor the situation as there may be a need to take action to ensure all development does not take place too early in the Plan period.	☺ Housing is being completed within the District above the levels required by the Structure Plan. Additional housing is still required.
SSAG	Housing Stock (SSAG)	Suffolk	Housing stock 31/03/04: 304,90 Total since 1996: 20,270 Annual rate: 2,615	Structure Plan overall requirement 1996-2016: 53,100 Annual rate required 1996-2016: 2,655 Annual rate now required: 2,680 So far the annual rate of change is below target.	Overall, the annual rate required in 2000-2004 has been higher than that identified in the Structure Plan (2,655). However the general trend is that the gap has narrowed required annual rates decreasing from 2,721 to 2,677 last year., increasing slightly at 2,680 in 2004.	Additional housing stock is required in the county. Trend shows that rate of increase in Suffolk as a whole has been below that required to meet Structure Plan requirements in recent years.	☹ Overall, housing stock in the county is below target, but the situation is improving as the deficit has narrowed. Slight increase this year should be monitored. Additional housing is still required.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it provide enough housing?							
SSAG	Housing Land Availability (SSAG)	BDC	Total commitments at end of 2003/4: 3,310 Years supply: 8.9	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 4,540 Shortfall of 1,230 below the 2016 target.	Years supply has fluctuated in recent years. No clear trend.		😐 Housing land supply will fluctuate depending on stage of development of Local Authority's Local Plan.
SSAG	Housing Land Availability (SSAG)	FHDC	Total commitments at end of 2003/4: 2,920 Years supply: 8.8	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 4,060 Shortfall of 1,140 below the 2016	Years supply has fluctuated in recent years. No clear trend.		😐 Housing land supply will fluctuate depending on stage of development of Local Authority's Local Plan.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
				target.			
SSAG	Housing Land Availability (SSAG)	IBC	Total commitments at end of 2002/3: 7,480 Years supply: 16.4	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 6,108 Surplus of 1,190 above the 2016 target. Years supply = highest in Suffolk. Commitments already exceed the 2016 target.	Years supply recorded in mid 1997, 1999 and 2000 had showed a trend of decreasing supply, falling from 7.7 years in 1997 to 5.5 years in 2000. The 2003 figure was much higher than this at 15.3 years, and has increased again in 2004.	Large supply available. Structure plan levels have already been achieved.	☺ Housing land supply will fluctuate depending on stage of development of Local Authority's Local Plan.
SSAG	Housing Land Availability (SSAG)	MSDC	Total commitments at end of 2003/4: 2,430 Years supply: 6.1	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 4,890 Shortfall of 2,460 below the 2016 target. Largest shortfall in Suffolk.	Current years supply is higher than the 3.6 years recorded in mid 2000 and 5.4 years in 2002/3. However this is well below figures recorded in mid 1997 and 1999 of 12.7-12.8 years.		😐 Housing land supply will fluctuate depending on stage of development of Local Authority's Local Plan. Will need to monitor the situation closely to ensure development meets Structure Plan levels within the Plan period.
SSAG	Housing Land Availability (SSAG)	SEBC	Total commitments at end of 2003/4: Years supply: 12.2	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 5,010 Surplus of 10 above the 2016 target. 2nd highest surplus in Suffolk.	Current years supply is higher than at any time since 1997, and had increased significantly since last year when less than 5 years supply was recorded. Shortfall was highest in Suffolk in 2002/3, but SEBC now has a surplus of 10.	Large supply available. Structure plan levels have already been achieved.	☺ Housing land supply will fluctuate depending on stage of development of Local Authority's Local Plan.
SSAG	Housing Land Availability (SSAG)	SCDC	Total commitments at end of 2003/4: 3,470 Years supply: 8.3	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 5,140 Shortfall of 1,670 below the 2016 target.	Current years supply is slightly lower than last year. Previous results show fluctuation from 9.0 years recorded in 1999 and 10.4 years in 1997.		😐 Housing land supply will fluctuate depending on stage of development of Local Authority's Local Plan.
SSAG	Housing Land Availability (SSAG)	WDC	Total commitments at end of 2002/4: 2,850 Years supply: 9.7	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 3,620 Shortfall of 770 below the 2016 target.	Current years supply is lower than the 10.5 years recorded last year, but higher than supply recorded in mid 1997, 1999 or 2000. Minimum recorded supply of 6.5 years in 1999.	Large supply available. There may be a need to take action to ensure all development does not take place too early in the Plan period	☺ But need to monitor the situation closely as there may be a need to take action to ensure all development does not take place too early in the Plan period.
SSAG	Housing Land Availability (SSAG)	Suffolk	Total commitments at end of 2003/4: 27,470 Years supply: 10.3	Structure Plan requirement 2004-2016: 32,830 Shortfall of 5,360 below the 2016 target.	Years supply recorded in mid 1997, 1999 and 2000 had showed a trend of decreasing supply, falling from 8.9 years in 1997 to 7.3 years in 2000, but this is now reversed. The 2003 figure matched the previous maximum supply for the county of 8.9 years, and this was exceeded this year.	Large supply available, and increasing.	☺ Supply has increased in the last 2 years, reversing a previously decreasing trend. However housing land supply will fluctuate depending on stage of development of Local Authority's Local Plan so long-term trends are difficult to identify.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
SSAG	Affordable Housing (SSAG)	BDC	Net affordable completions 2003/4 = 56 (= 26.4% of total completions)	(i) in settlements below 3,000 pop - 1 in every 3 new dw on sites of 0.1 ha or which propose 3 or more dw. (ii) in settlements above 3,000 pop - on allocated sites and	22.7% of net completions were affordable in 2001/2. Number of affordable approvals has fluctuated since 1997-8, ranging from		😐 Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
				others of 0.5 ha or more in size, capable of accommodating at least 15 dw, 20-35% of new dw (depending on local circumstances). Highest % of affordable completions in Suffolk 2003/4.	0 (2001/2) to 88 (2000/1) (where triggered).		
SSAG	Affordable Housing (SSAG)	FHDC	Net affordable completions 2003/4 - 2/3: 0 (= 0% of total completions)	Seeks 25% affordable dw on developments at or above (I) in towns and villages of more than 3,000 pop, dev of 25 or more dw, or sites of 1 or more hectares.(ii) in rural villages with pop less than 3,000, dev of 15 of more dw or residential sites of 0.5 or more ha. (Cir 6/98 and FH Housing Need Survey 2000) Lowest % of affordable completions in Suffolk 2003/4.	No net completions were affordable in 2003/4. Number of affordable completions was not recorded in 2001/2 , and 3 were completed last year.	Affordable completions have been low in last 2 years	😐 Affordable completions have been low in last 2 years. However, indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.
SSAG	Affordable Housing (SSAG)	IBC	Net affordable completions 2003/4: 107 (= 18.9% of total completions)	30% greenfield 25% brownfield 15% waterfront on sites of 0.5 hectares+ or 15+dwellings (Ipswich Local Plan First Deposit Draft 2001) 2nd highest % of affordable completions 2003/4	% of net completions which were affordable ranged from 6.1% in 2001/2 to 33.5% in 2003/4.		😐 Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.
SSAG	Affordable Housing (SSAG)	MSDC	Net affordable completions 2003/4: 42 (= 12.1% of total completions)	15% (Adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998) seeks provision of 35% affordable housing on (i) 15dw or more or sites of 0.5 ha and above, in settlements of 3,000 pop and above (ii) 5 dw or more or sites of 0.17 ha and above, in settlements of less than 3,000 pop (MS Local Plan 1st Alteration- 1st Deposit - July 2004)	% of net completions which were affordable has increased each year from a minimum of 4.1% in 2001/2.		☺ Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends. Percentage is increasing and will continue to do so once the affordable housing policy (alteration to the adopted Plan) is adopted.
SSAG	Affordable Housing (SSAG)	SEBC	Net affordable completions 2003/4: 27 (= 4.4% of total completions)	40% on: i) sites of 0.5 hectares+ or 15+dwellings, in settlements of 3,000+ ii) sites of 0.17 hectares+or 5+dwellings, in settlements of less than 3000 (Redeposit Replacement Local Plan 2005)	% of net completions which were affordable has decreased each year from a minimum of 20.4% in 2001/2.	Affordable completions have decreased over last 3 years	☹ % of affordable completions have fallen over last 3 years. However, the indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends. Levels of approvals indicate that affordable housing is rising however this will take time to be reflected in the completions.
SSAG	Affordable Housing (SSAG)	SCDC	Net affordable completions 2003/4: 15 (= 3.3% of total completions)	1 in 3 units (33%) for (i) sites of 6 units+ in towns and (ii) sites of 3 units+ in villages.(Local Plan 2nd Alterations 1st Deposit Draft 2004)	3.5% of net completions were affordable in 2001/2. % of affordable completions has varied little since since 2001/2, ranging from		😐 Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
				2nd lowest % of affordable completions in Suffolk.	3.9% (1998/9) to 54 (2000/1) (where triggered).		
SSAG	Affordable Housing (SSAG)	WDC	Net affordable completions 2003/4: 64 (= 12.6% of total completions)	30% on sites of 3 + dwellings (Waveney Interim Local Plan May 2004). The Housing Strategy sets a target of 46 new dwellings per annum. Lowest % of affordable completions in the county.	% of net completions which were affordable ranged from 3.4% in 2002/3 to 12.6% in 2003/4.		😐 Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends. Percentage achieved is also affected by the number of large developments still being completed that were granted permission before the affordable housing policy was implemented. Lack of Housing Corporation funding is a further constraint.
SSAG	Affordable Housing (SSAG)	Suffolk	Total net affordable completions 2003/4: 311 (= 11.2% of total completions)	*No target for county as a whole*	9.4% of net completions were affordable in 2001/2. This years figure has changed little from the 11.3% recorded in 2002/3.		😐 Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns)	BDC	Each District/Borough to do. Needs further definition.				
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns)	FHDC	Each District/Borough to do. Needs further definition.				
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns)	IBC	Each District/Borough to do. Needs further definition.				
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns)	MSDC	Each District/Borough to do. Needs further definition.				
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns)	SEBC	Each District/Borough to do. Needs further definition.				
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns)	SCDC	Each District/Borough to do. Needs further definition.				
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns)	WDC	Each District/Borough to do. Needs further definition.				
SSAG	Special Needs Housing (HIP Returns)	Suffolk	Each District/Borough to do. Needs further definition.				
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG)	BDC	**2003/4 Houses/Bungalows:** Private sector 1 bed: 0 Private sector 2 bed: 25 Private sector 3 bed: 37 Private sector 4+ bed: 21	No target.	**2002/3 Houses/Bungalows:** Not recorded. **2002/3 Flats/Maisonettes:** Private sector 1 bed: 3		😐 New indicator, no data prior to 2001/2. Limited data.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			RSL: None **2003/4 Flats/Maisonettes:** Private sector 1 bed: 3 Private sector 2 bed: 0 Private sector 3 bed: 0 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL: None		Private sector 2 bed: 0 Private sector 3 bed: 1 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL 1 bed: N/R RSL 2 bed: N/R RSL 3 bed: N/R RSL 4+ bed: N/R **2001/2:** Not recorded.		
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG)	FHDC	**2003/4 Houses/Bungalows:** N/A **2003/4 Flats/Maisonettes:** N/A	No target.	**2002/3: Not recorded.** **2001/2 Houses/Bungalows:** Private sector 1 bed: 0 Private sector 2 bed: 11 Private sector 3 bed: 35 Private sector 4+ bed: 57 RSL 1 bed: 0 RSL 2 bed: 11 RSL 3 bed: 11 RSL 4+ bed: 2 **2001/2 Flats/Maisonettes:** Private sector 1 bed: 5 Private sector 2 bed: 16 Private sector 3 bed: 0 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL 1 bed: 5 RSL 2 bed: 0 RSL 3 bed: 0 RSL 4+ bed: 0		😐 Lack of data.
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG)	IBC	**2003/4 Houses/Bungalows:** N/A **2003/4 Flats/Maisonettes:** N/A	No target.	**2002/3 (2001/2) Houses/Bungalows:** Private sector 1 bed: 3 (0) Private sector 2 bed: 30 (37) Private sector 3 bed: 74 (119) Private sector 4+ bed: 52 (76) RSL 1 bed: 0 (0) RSL 2 bed: 26 (24) RSL 3 bed: 6 (7) RSL 4+ bed: 7 (0) **2002/3 (2001/2) Flats/Maisonettes:** Private sector 1 bed: 4 (3) Private sector 2 bed: 51 (40) Private sector 3 bed: 0 (0) Private sector 4+ bed: 0 (0) RSL 1 bed: 7 (12) RSL 2 bed: 3 (22) RSL 3 bed: 0 (4) RSL 4+ bed: 0 (4)		😐 Lack of data.
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG)	MSDC	**2003/4 Houses/Bungalows:** Private sector 1 bed: 3 Private sector 2 bed: 20 Private sector 3 bed: 127 Private sector 4+ bed: 140	No target.	**2002/3 (2001/2) Houses/Bungalows:** Private sector 1 bed: 0 (1) Private sector 2 bed: 34 (41) Private sector 3 bed: 126 (118) Private sector 4+ bed: 132 (120)	A shift towards smaller units would provide a more diverse housing market supply	😐 No data prior to 2001/2. A shift towards smaller units would provide a more diverse housing market supply

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			RSL 1 bed: 0 RSL 2 bed: 7 RSL 3 bed: 8 RSL 4+ bed: 0 **2003/4 Flats/Maisonettes:** Private sector 1 bed: 0 Private sector 2 bed: 19 Private sector 3 bed: 0 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL 1 bed: 0 RSL 2 bed: 0 RSL 3 bed: 0 RSL 4+ bed: 0		RSL 1 bed: 0 (0) RSL 2 bed: 7 (8) RSL 3 bed: 8 (30) RSL 4+ bed: 0 (0) **2002/3 (2001/2) Flats/Maisonettes:** Private sector 1 bed: 0 (0) Private sector 2 bed: 0 (0) Private sector 3 bed: 0 (0) Private sector 4+ bed: 0 (0) RSL 1 bed: 0 (0) RSL 2 bed: 0 (0) RSL 3 bed: 0 (0) RSL 4+ bed: 0 (0) Similar to previous years with slightly more 3 and 4+ bed houses and less 2 beds.		
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG)	SEBC	**2003/4 Houses/Bungalows:** Private sector 1 bed: 8 Private sector 2 bed: 78 Private sector 3 bed: 190 Private sector 4+ bed: 198 RSL 1 bed: 0 RSL 2 bed: 4 RSL 3 bed: 1 RSL 4+ bed: 0 **2003/4 Flats/Maisonettes:** Private sector 1 bed: 52 Private sector 2 bed: 51 Private sector 3 bed: 2 Private sector 4+ bed: 4 RSL 1 bed: 20 RSL 2 bed: 4 RSL 3 bed: 0 RSL 4+ bed: 0	No target.	**2002/3 Houses/Bungalows:** Private sector 1 bed: 11 Private sector 2 bed: 45 Private sector 3 bed: 143 Private sector 4+ bed: 155 RSL 1 bed: 10 RSL 2 bed: 6 RSL 3 bed: 0 RSL 4+ bed: 0 **2002/3 Flats/Maisonettes:** Private sector 1 bed: 16 Private sector 2 bed: 31 Private sector 3 bed: 5 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL 1 bed: 35 RSL 2 bed: 11 RSL 3 bed: 0 RSL 4+ bed: 0 Not recorded for 2001/2. More 1 and 2 bed flats in 2003/4 than last year and, but also more houses in all 2+ bed categories.	Figures do appear to indicate that most completions have been for 3 and 4 bed units. The emphasis perhaps needs to shift towards more smaller units to assist households into the housing market.	😐 New indicator, no data prior to 2001/2.
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG)	SCDC	Not recorded.	No target.	Not recorded for 2001/2 or 2002/3.		😐 No data available.
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG)	WDC	**2003/4 Houses/Bungalows:** Private sector 1 bed: 0 Private sector 2 bed: 52 Private sector 3 bed: 180 Private sector 4+ bed: 170 RSL 1 bed: 1 RSL 2 bed: 21 RSL 3 bed: 4 RSL 4+ bed: 0	No target.	**2002/3 (2001/2) Houses/Bungalows:** Private sector 1 bed: 0 (0) Private sector 2 bed: 58 (73) Private sector 3 bed: 167 (225) Private sector 4+ bed: 157 (198) RSL 1 bed: 0 (0) RSL 2 bed: 8 (17) RSL 3 bed: 7 (11) RSL 4+ bed: 0 (3)	Figures do appear to indicate that most completions have been for 3 and 4 bed units. The emphasis perhaps needs to shift towards more smaller units to assist households into the housing market.	😐 New indicator, no data prior to 2001/2. Figures do appear to indicate that most completions have been for 3 and 4 bed units. The emphasis perhaps needs to shift towards more smaller units to assist households into the housing market.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			2003/4 Flats/Maisonettes: Private sector 1 bed: 4 Private sector 2 bed: 0 Private sector 3 bed: 0 Private sector 4+ bed: 0 RSL 1 bed: 30 RSL 2 bed: 8 RSL 3 bed: 0 RSL 4+ bed: 0		**2002/3 (2001/2) Flats/Maisonettes:** Private sector 1 bed: 0 (1) Private sector 2 bed: 0 (0) Private sector 3 bed: 0 (0) Private sector 4+ bed: 0 (0) RSL 1 bed: 0 (0) RSL 2 bed: 0 (0) RSL 3 bed: 0 (0) RSL 4+ bed: 0 (0) Similar to previous years, though with more 1 and 2 bed flats in 2003/4.		
SSAG	Housing Types and Sizes (SSAG)	Suffolk	**2003/4 Houses/Bungalows (where recorded):** Private sector 1 bed: 0.8% Private sector 2 bed: 13.5% Private sector 3 bed: 41.2% Private sector 4+ bed: 40.8% RSL 1 bed: 0 RSL 2 bed: 2.5% RSL 3 bed: 1.0% RSL 4+ bed: 0 **2003/4 Flats/Maisonettes (where recorded):** Private sector 1 bed: 31.2% Private sector 2 bed: 37.0% Private sector 3 bed: 1.0% Private sector 4+ bed: 2.1% RSL 1 bed: 26.5% RSL 2 bed: 2.1% RSL 3 bed: 0 RSL 4+ bed: 0	No target.	**2002/3 (2001/2) Houses/Bungalows (where recorded):** Private sector 1 bed: 1.1% (0.1%) Private sector 2 bed: 13.0% (13.1%) Private sector 3 bed: 39.7% (40.2%) Private sector 4+ bed: 38.6% (36.5%) RSL 1 bed: 0.7% (0) RSL 2 bed: 3.1% (4.9%) RSL 3 bed: 2.6% (4.8%) RSL 4+ bed: 1.2% (0.4%) **2001/2 Flats/Maisonettes (where recorded):** Private sector 1 bed: 13.8% (8.0%) Private sector 2 bed: 49.1% (50.0%) Private sector 3 bed: 3.6% (0) Private sector 4+ bed: 0 (0) RSL 1 bed: 25.8% (15.2%) RSL 2 bed: 8.6% (19.6%) RSL 3 bed: 0 (3.6%) RSL 4+ bed: 0 (3.6%)		😐 County figures are incomplete, so care should be taken interpreting trends. New indicator, no data prior to 2001/2. It is not possible to identify any long-term trends. Data available shows little difference in house sizes since last year but % of 1 bed flats (especially private sector) has increased.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG)	BDC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 34.96	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. 2nd highest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.	Not recorded for 2001/2 or 2002/3. No data for comparison.		😐 Currently 2nd highest density in Suffolk, but no past trend data for comparison
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG)	FHDC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: N/R	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = 30 dwellings/hectare.	Density last year was recorded at 23.83 dwellings per hectare. Not recorded for 2001/2.		😐 Limited data available.
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG)	IBC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 39	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare.	Density has increased annually in last 2 years, and is now above the recommended guideline.		☺ Highest density in Suffolk and increasing year on year.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
				Highest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.			
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG)	MSDC	Dwellings per hectare 2002/3: 32.34	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare.	Density has decreased since last year, but is still above the recommended guideline. Indicator has fluctuated between 25.0 in 2001/2 and 34.4 in 2002/3.		☺ Decreased this year but above the PPG3 density minimum requirement.
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG)	SEBC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 33.98	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = 30 dwellings/hectare.	Not recorded for 2001/2, but has increased this year from 28.01 in 2002/3. Now above the recommended guideline.		😐 Lack of time related data means it is difficult to discern any trends but the figure for 2003/4 is above the PPG3 density minimum requirement.
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG)	SCDC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 26.80	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. 2nd lowest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.	Density has decreased each year since 2001/2 when a density of 29.29 was recorded, and is below recommended levels.	Density has decreased annually and is consistently below recommended guideline.	😐 Increased this year but still is below the PPG3 density minimum requirement.
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG)	WDC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 23.22	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. Lowest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.	Dwellings per hectare 2001/2: 22.92 Density has decreased since last year, and is consistently below the recommended guideline. Indicator has fluctuated between 24.4 in 2002/3 and 22.92 in 2001/2.	Density is below recommended guideline, and decreased this year.	☹ Decreased this year and is below the PPG3 density minimum requirement. This indicator measures completions on large sites (10+ units) and many of the permissions coming through were granted some years ago. Approvals indicate an improving trend.
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (SSAG)	Suffolk	Excluding BDC: Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 30.39	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare.	Combined density in Suffolk meets the recommended guideline. County totals do not include all districts in previous years so trends are difficult to discern.	Density is below recommended guideline.	😐 Housing meets the recommended guideline for the county as a whole. Varies between districts and data for previous years are incomplete.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?							
SSAG	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG)	BDC	Ratio 2003 / 4-: 6.7	No target.	Ratio 2002 /3: 7.9 Apparent decrease in ratio but it still remains very high and indicates major housing affordability problems.		😐 Income figures based on either small or variable sample and should be treated with caution.
SSAG	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG)	FHDC	Ratio 2003 / 4: 6.7	No target.	Ratio 2002 /3: 5.8 Apparent increase in ratio, as could be expected, for a district with comparatively low income levels. These are lower than the Suffolk average.		😐 Income figures based on either small or variable sample and should be treated with caution.
SSAG	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG)	IBC	Ratio 2003 / 4: 5.6	No target. Has lowest property price / income ratio in Suffolk.	Ratio 2002 /3: 5.8 Apparent slight decrease in ratio but it still remains high and indicates serious housing affordability problems.		😐 Income figures based on either small or variable sample and should be treated with caution.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG)	MSDC	Ratio 2003 / 4: 7.1	No target. Now has 2nd highest property price / income ratio in Suffolk.	Ratio 2002 /3: 7.3 Apparent slight decrease in ratio but it still remains very high and indicates major housing affordability problems.		😐 Income figures based on either small or variable sample and should be treated with caution.
SSAG	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG)	SEBC	Ratio 2003 / 4: 6.7	No target.	Ratio 2002 /3: 6.8 Apparent very slight decrease in ratio but it still remains very high and indicates major housing affordability problems.		😐 Income figures based on either small or variable sample and should be treated with caution.
SSAG	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG)	SCDC	Ratio 2003 / 4: 7.2	No target. Now has highest property price / income ratio in Suffolk.	Ratio 2002 /3: 6.7 Apparent large increase in ratio, to make this even higher and indicates major housing affordability problems.		😐 Income figures based on either small or variable sample and should be treated with caution.
SSAG	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG)	WDC	Ratio 2003 / 4: 6.1	No target. Has 2nd lowest property price / income ratio in Suffolk.	Ratio 2002 / 3: 5.3 Apparent large increase in ratio, to render this noticeably higher and indicates major housing affordability problems. Largest increase seen in Suffolk		😐 Income figures based on either small or variable sample and should be treated with caution.
SSAG	Average property price to income ratio (SSAG)	Suffolk	Ratio 2003 /4: 6.6	No target.	Ratio 2002 /3: 6.0 With most districts showing an increase in their ratios an increase in the county average was likely and the figures do bear this out. Serious housing affordability problems evident across all of the county.		☹ Despite data accuracy uncertainties mentioned above, it seems that the ratio has increased overall but not in all parts of the county.
Headline Objective: To meet the housing requirements of the whole community							
Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?							
HH	Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings (BVPI)	BDC	BVPI 184a Proportion of LA homes which were non-decent - 45	2nd highest proportion recorded in Suffolk.	No trend data available Not a BVPI as of April 2005		😐 No trend data available. Not a BVPI as of April 2005
HH	Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings (BVPI)	FHDC	BVPI 184a Proportion of LA homes which were non-decent - 1	Lowest proportion recorded in Suffolk.	No trend data available Not a BVPI as of April 2005		😐 No trend data available. Not a BVPI as of April 2005
HH	Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings (BVPI)	IBC	BVPI 184a Proportion of LA homes which were non-decent – 31		No trend data available Not a BVPI as of April 2005		😐 No trend data available. Not a BVPI as of April 2005
HH	Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings (BVPI)	MSDC	BVPI 184a Proportion of LA homes which were non-decent - 50	Highest proportion recorded in Suffolk.	No trend data available Not a BVPI as of April 2005		😐 No trend data available. Not a BVPI as of April 2005
HH	Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings (BVPI)	SEBC	BVPI 184a Proportion of LA homes which were non-decent. Not recorded due to transfer of councils housing stock to housing association.		No trend data available Not a BVPI as of April 2005		😐 No trend data available. Not a BVPI as of April 2005
HH	Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings (BVPI)	SCDC	BVPI 184a Proportion of LA homes which were non-decent. Not recorded due to transfer of		No trend data available Not a BVPI as of April 2005		😐 No trend data available. Not a BVPI as of April 2005

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			councils housing stock to housing association?				
HH	Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings (BVPI)	WDC	BVPI 184a Proportion of LA homes which were non-decent – 9	2nd lowest proportion recorded in Suffolk.	No trend data available Not a BVPI as of April 2005		😐 No trend data available. Not a BVPI as of April 2005
HH	Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings (BVPI)	Suffolk	N/A				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve the satisfaction of people with their neighbourhood as a place to live?							
ME	% of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood as a place to live (Suffolk Speaks/ODPM QOL surveys)	BDC	Very Satisfied – 40% Fairly Satisfied – 47% Neither satisfied or dissatisfied – 5% Fairly dissatisfied – 6% Very dissatisfied – 1% Don't Know/not stated - 0 (Suffolk Speaks, April 2004)		No trend data available	The question is not reviewed on a regular basis; SSAG will need to request the Suffolk Speaks Panel to mail this question again, annually?	😐 Baseline data.
ME	% of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood as a place to live (Suffolk Speaks/ODPM QOL surveys)	FHDC	Very Satisfied – 20% Fairly Satisfied – 54% Neither satisfied or dissatisfied - 15% Fairly dissatisfied – 10% Very dissatisfied - 0 Don't Know/not stated – 1% (Suffolk Speaks, April 2004)		No trend data available	The question is not reviewed on a regular basis; SSAG will need to request the Suffolk Speaks Panel to mail this question again, annually?	😐 Baseline data
ME	% of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood as a place to live (Suffolk Speaks/ODPM QOL surveys)	IBC	Very Satisfied – 21% Fairly Satisfied – 54% Neither satisfied or dissatisfied - 12% Fairly dissatisfied – 5% Very dissatisfied – 5% Don't Know/not stated – 2% (Suffolk Speaks, April 2004)		No trend data available	The question is not reviewed on a regular basis; SSAG will need to request the Suffolk Speaks Panel to mail this question again, annually?	😐 Baseline data
ME	% of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood as a place to live (Suffolk Speaks/ODPM QOL surveys)	MSDC	Very Satisfied – 35% Fairly Satisfied – 52% Neither satisfied or dissatisfied – 7% Fairly dissatisfied – 4% Very dissatisfied – 1% Don't Know/not stated – 0 (Suffolk Speaks, April 2004)		No trend data available	The question is not reviewed on a regular basis; SSAG will need to request the Suffolk Speaks Panel to mail this question again, annually?	😐 Baseline data
ME	% of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood as a place to live (Suffolk Speaks/ODPM QOL surveys)	SEBC	Very Satisfied – 38% Fairly Satisfied – 48% Neither satisfied or dissatisfied – 10% Fairly dissatisfied – 5% Very dissatisfied - 0 Don't Know/not stated – 0 (Suffolk Speaks, April 2004)		No trend data available	The question is not reviewed on a regular basis; SSAG will need to request the Suffolk Speaks Panel to mail this question again, annually?	😐 Baseline data
ME	% of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood as a place to live (Suffolk Speaks/ODPM QOL surveys)	SCDC	Very Satisfied – 45% Fairly Satisfied – 45% Neither satisfied or dissatisfied – 5% Fairly dissatisfied – 1% Very dissatisfied – 2% Don't Know/not stated – 2% (Suffolk Speaks, April 2004)		No trend data available	The question is not reviewed on a regular basis; SSAG will need to request the Suffolk Speaks Panel to mail this question again, annually?	😐 Baseline data

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
ME	% of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood as a place to live (Suffolk Speaks/ODPM QOL surveys)	WDC	Very Satisfied – 26% Fairly Satisfied – 52% Neither satisfied or dissatisfied – 12% Fairly dissatisfied – 5% Very dissatisfied – 3% Don't Know/not stated – 2% (Suffolk Speaks, April 2004)		No trend data available	The question is not reviewed on a regular basis; SSAG will need to request the Suffolk Speaks Panel to mail this question again, annually?	😐 Baseline data
ME	% of residents who are happy with their neighbourhood as a place to live (Suffolk Speaks/ODPM QOL surveys)	Suffolk	Very Satisfied – 33% Fairly Satisfied – 50% Neither satisfied or dissatisfied – 9% Fairly dissatisfied – 5% Very dissatisfied - 2% Don't Know/not stated – 1% (Suffolk Speaks, April 2004)		No trend data available	The question is not reviewed on a regular basis; SSAG will need to request the Suffolk Speaks Panel to mail this question again, annually?	😐 Baseline data
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it increase access to natural green space?							
	Area of land managed in whole or part for its ecological interest and with public access over and above public rights of way (Suffolk)	BDC	Awaiting data from Sarah Jennings (SCC)				
	Area of land managed in whole or part for its ecological interest and with public access over and above public rights of way (Suffolk)	FHDC	Awaiting data from Sarah Jennings (SCC)				
	Area of land managed in whole or part for its ecological interest and with public access over and above public rights of way (Suffolk)	IBC	Awaiting data from Sarah Jennings (SCC)				
	Area of land managed in whole or part for its ecological interest and with public access over and above public rights of way (Suffolk)	MSDC	Awaiting data from Sarah Jennings (SCC)				
	Area of land managed in whole or part for its ecological interest and with public access over and above public rights of way (Suffolk)	SEBC	Awaiting data from Sarah Jennings (SCC)				
	Area of land managed in whole or part for its ecological interest and with public access over and above public rights of way (Suffolk)	SCDC	Awaiting data from Sarah Jennings (SCC)				
	Area of land managed in whole or part for its ecological interest and with public access over and above public rights of way (Suffolk)	WDC	Awaiting data from Sarah Jennings (SCC)		No trend data available		😐 Baseline data The areas of land included are Local Nature Reserves and proposed Local Nature Reserves were current local groups/WDC managing the site.
	Area of land managed in whole or part for its ecological interest and with public access over and above public rights of way (Suffolk)	Suffolk	Awaiting data from Sarah Jennings (SCC)				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
Will it increase access to natural green space?							
	Areas of deficiency in terms of natural green space (Suffolk)	BDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Areas of deficiency in terms of natural green space (Suffolk)	FHDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Areas of deficiency in terms of natural green space (Suffolk)	IBC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Areas of deficiency in terms of natural green space (Suffolk)	MSDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Areas of deficiency in terms of natural green space (Suffolk)	SEBC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Areas of deficiency in terms of natural green space (Suffolk)	SCDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Areas of deficiency in terms of natural green space (Suffolk)	WDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Areas of deficiency in terms of natural green space (Suffolk)	Suffolk	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it increase access to natural green space?							
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	BDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	FHDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	IBC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	MSDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	SEBC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	SCDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	WDC	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
	Change in amount of accessible natural green space (Districts)	Suffolk	No data for baseline but anticipate it will be available in the future.				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
Will it encourage engagement in decision making?							
ME	Electoral turnout in local authority elections	BDC	Awaiting data after the 2005 elections BDC				
ME	Electoral turnout in local authority elections	FHDC	Overall Turn Out – 29.34% (FHDC)	1st May 2003	No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
ME	Electoral turnout in local authority elections	IBC	Overall Turn Out – 31.88% (IBC)	1st May 2003	No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
ME	Electoral turnout in local authority elections	MSDC	Overall Turn Out – 37.89% (MSDC)	1st May 2003	No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
ME	Electoral turnout in local authority elections	SEBC	Awaiting data after the 2005 elections – email sent				
ME	Electoral turnout in local authority elections	SCDC	Awaiting data after the 2005 elections BDC – telephone message				
ME	Electoral turnout in local authority elections	WDC	Overall Turn Out – 30.21% (WDC)	1st May 2003	No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
ME	Electoral turnout in local authority elections	Suffolk		7th June 2001			Unable to obtain a figure to date – left message
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it encourage engagement in decision making?							
ME	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Suffolk Acre)	BDC	7 complete and * 1 MT Heath check				Each authority to complete.
ME	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Suffolk Acre)	FHDC	3 complete and * 2 MT Heath check				Each authority to complete.
ME	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Suffolk Acre)	IBC	N/A				Each authority to complete.
ME	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Suffolk Acre)	MSDC	16 complete and * 1 MT Heath check				Each authority to complete.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
ME	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Suffolk Acre)	SEBC	10 complete and * 1 MT Heath check				Each authority to complete.
ME	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Suffolk Acre)	SCDC	20 complete and * 2 MT Heath check				Each authority to complete.
ME	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Suffolk Acre)	WDC	3 complete and * 1 MT Heath check				Each authority to complete.
ME	Number of Parish Plans adopted (Suffolk Acre)	Suffolk	59 complete and * 8 MT Heath check				Each authority to complete.
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it increase the number of people involved in volunteer activities?							
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Suffolk/CVS)	BDC	Each District/Borough to do. Need to define types of activities.				No Response
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Suffolk/CVS)	FHDC	Each District/Borough to do. Need to define types of activities.				No Response
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Suffolk/CVS)	IBC	Each District/Borough to do. Need to define types of activities.				No Response
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Suffolk/CVS)	MSDC	Each District/Borough to do. Need to define types of activities.				
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Suffolk/CVS)	SEBC	Each District/Borough to do. Need to define types of activities.				No Response
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Suffolk/CVS)	SCDC	Each District/Borough to do. Need to define types of activities.				No Response
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Suffolk/CVS)	WDC	Each District/Borough to do. Need to define types of activities.				
ME	Number of people involved in volunteer activities (Suffolk/CVS)	Suffolk	Awaiting response from Lyn Dicker SCC. Need to define types of activities.				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve ethnic relations?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
ME	Number / rate of racist incidents (Racial Harassment Initiative)	BDC	April – Dec 2004: 22 Racial Incidents (7%)		No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
ME	Number / rate of racist incidents (Racial Harassment Initiative)	FHDC	April – Dec 2004: 48 Racial Incidents (10%)		No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
ME	Number / rate of racist incidents (Racial Harassment Initiative)	IBC	April – Dec 2004: 211 Racial Incidents (43%)		No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
ME	Number / rate of racist incidents (Racial Harassment Initiative)	MSDC	April – Dec 2004: 29 Racial Incidents (6%)		No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
ME	Number / rate of racist incidents (Racial Harassment Initiative)	SEBC	April – Dec 2004: 56 Racial Incidents (11%)		No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
ME	Number / rate of racist incidents (Racial Harassment Initiative)	SCDC	April – Dec 2004: 45 Racial Incidents (9%)		No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
ME	Number / rate of racist incidents (Racial Harassment Initiative)	WDC	April – Dec 2004: 80 Racial Incidents (16%)		No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
ME	Number / rate of racist incidents (Racial Harassment Initiative)	Suffolk	April – Dec 2004: 496 Racial Incidents		No trend data available		😐 Baseline data
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve access to cultural facilities?							
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (BV170a)	BDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (BV170a)	FHDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (BV170a)	IBC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (BV170a)	MSDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (BV170a)	SEBC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (BV170a)	SCDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (BV170a)	WDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to/uses of Council funded or part-funded museums per 1,000 population (BV170a)	Suffolk	Each District/Borough to do.				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve access to cultural facilities?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (BV170b)	BDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (BV170b)	FHDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (BV170b)	IBC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (BV170b)	MSDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (BV170b)	SEBC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (BV170b)	SCDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (BV170b)	WDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	Number of visits to Council funded or part-funded museums that were in person per 1,000 population (BV170b)	Suffolk	Each District/Borough to do.				
Headline Objective: To improve the quality of where people live and to encourage community participation							
Will it improve access to cultural facilities?							
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (BV170c)	BDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (BV170c)	FHDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (BV170c)	IBC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (BV170c)	MSDC	Each District/Borough to do.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (BV170c)	SEBC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (BV170c)	SCDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (BV170c)	WDC	Each District/Borough to do.				
	The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school trips (BV170c)	Suffolk	Each District/Borough to do.				

ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE DATA

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve the quality of inland waters?							
AN	Water quality in rivers (EA)	BDC	Data coming soon….				
AN	Water quality in rivers (EA)	FHDC	Data coming soon….				
AN	Water quality in rivers (EA)	IBC	Data coming soon….				
AN	Water quality in rivers (EA)	MSDC	Data coming soon….				
AN	Water quality in rivers (EA)	SEBC	Data coming soon….				
AN	Water quality in rivers (EA)	SCDC	Data coming soon….				
AN	Water quality in rivers (EA)	WDC	Data coming soon….				
AN	Water quality in rivers (EA)	Suffolk	<u>Chemical water quality 2003:</u> Grade A: 2.6% Grade B: 26.1% Grade C: 37.8% Grade D: 21.2% Grade E: 11.6% Grade F: 0.8% <u>Biological water quality 2003:</u> Grade A: 32.7% Grade B: 46.9% Grade C: 17.4% Grade D: 2.3% Grade E: 0.7% Grade F: 0%	None specifically for chemical/biological water quality in Suffolk as a whole. However, River Quality Targets have been set for individual river reaches	<u>Chemical water quality 2000:</u> Grade A: 4.3% Grade B: 34.5% Grade C: 32.7% Grade D: 15.8% Grade E: 12.1% Grade F: 0.5% Deterioration since 2000 – only 28.7% rated as 'very good' (A) or 'good' (B) cf 38.8% in 2003 <u>Biological water quality 2000:</u> Grade A: 24.9% Grade B: 48.9% Grade C: 14.8% Grade D: 5.7% Grade E: 0.6% Grade F: 0% Grade O (unclassified): 5.0% Improvement since 2000 –77.6% grade A or B cf 73.8%		😐 5 yearly indicator. Biological water quality seems to be improving but chemical water quality deteriorating in the county as a whole. But the situation will vary considerably from river reach to river reach
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve the quality of inland waters?							
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS)	BDC	Uncertain if information is available				
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS)	FHDC	Uncertain if information is available				
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS)	IBC	Uncertain if information is available				
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS)	MSDC	Uncertain if information is available				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS)	SEBC	Uncertain if information is available				
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS)	SCDC	Uncertain if information is available				
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS)	WDC	Uncertain if information is available				
AN	Groundwater quality (may be available from EA in future - CAMS)	Suffolk	Uncertain if information is available				
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?							
AN	Water quality in estuaries (EA)	BDC	Data coming soon…				
AN	Water quality in estuaries (EA)	FHDC	N/A				
AN	Water quality in estuaries (EA)	IBC	Data coming soon…				
AN	Water quality in estuaries (EA)	MSDC	N/A				
AN	Water quality in estuaries (EA)	SEBC	N/A				
AN	Water quality in estuaries (EA)	SCDC	Data coming soon…				
AN	Water quality in estuaries (EA)	WDC	Data coming soon…				
AN	Water quality in estuaries (EA)	Suffolk	Estuarine water quality 2000: Waveney: 15km all Grade A Blyth: 7km all Grade A Alde: 26.5km all Grade A Butley: 9km all Grade A Deben: 16km all Grade A Orwell: 21.5km Grade A and 4km Grade B Stour: 27km all Grade A	No target.	Estuarine water quality 1995: Waveney: 15km all Grade A Blyth: 7km all Grade A Alde: 26.5km all Grade A Butley: 9km all Grade A Deben: 16km all Grade A Orwell: 6.5km Grade A and 6km Grade B + 9km Grade C Stour: 25km Grade A and 2km Grade B Orwell and Stour have shown improvement. All other estuaries retained good water quality.		☺ 5 yearly indicator. Almost all estuarine water in the county is top quality, and Orwell and Stour have shown improvement in last 5 years. No update in 2003-4 – estuarine water quality only monitored every five years
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?							
AN	Bathing water quality (EA)	BDC	N/A				
AN	Bathing water quality (EA)	FHDC	N/A				
AN	Bathing water quality (EA)	IBC	N/A				
AN	Bathing water quality (EA)	MSDC	N/A				
AN	Bathing water quality (EA)	SEBC	N/A				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
AN	Bathing water quality (EA)	SCDC	2004 Felixstowe North – Guideline pass Felixstowe South – Guideline pass	The quality of designated bathing waters in England and Wales is monitored against standards in the Bathing Water regulations), which come from the EC Bathing Water Directive (76/160/EEC) . 20 samples are taken per year (weekly) to cover the bathing season (15 May-30 September). Three pathogens are measured: total coliforms, faecal coliforms and faecal streptococci. In order to pass the Bathing Water Directive targets, 19 of the 20 samples must pass the mandatory (imperative) standards. The guideline standards, which are 20 times higher for the two coliforms, should be achieved 'where possible'	Felixstowe North 2003: Guideline pass 2002: Guideline pass 2001: Guideline pass 2000: Imperative pass 1999: Guideline pass Felixstowe South 2003: Guideline pass 2002: Guideline pass 2001: Guideline pass 2000: Guideline pass 1999: Guideline pass	One of the requirements for obtaining a 'Blue Flag' designation is passing Guideline standards for all 3 parameters is necessary. However, a single failure of the Guideline standard is enough to deny a Blue Flag award, and this failure could be due to a storm event (when surface water can mix with sewerage in storm overflow channels and be discharged direct to the sea). Thus failure of the Guideline standards needs to be put into context – it could be systematic failure (e.g. untreated or poorly-treated sewage is routinely discharged to the sea) or just spot failures	☺ Standards are generally high. Improvements to sewage treatment works, and the building of new treatment works, has led to a general increase in bathing water quality over time
AN	Bathing water quality (EA)	WDC	2004 Gunton Denes (Lowestoft) – Guideline pass North of Claremont Pier (Low) – Guideline pass South of Claremont Pier (Low) – Guideline pass The Pier (Southwold) - Guideline pass The Denes (Southwold) – Imperative pass	The quality of designated bathing waters in England and Wales is monitored against standards in the Bathing Water regulations), which come from the EC Bathing Water Directive (76/160/EEC) . 20 samples are taken per year (weekly) to cover the bathing season (15 May-30 September). Three pathogens are measured: total coliforms, faecal coliforms and faecal streptococci. In order to pass the Bathing Water Directive targets, 19 of the 20 samples must pass the mandatory (imperative) standards. The guideline standards, which are 20 times higher for the two coliforms, should be achieved 'where possible'	Gunton Denes 2003: Guideline pass 2002: Guideline pass 2001: Guideline pass 2000: Imperative pass 1999: Imperative pass North of Claremont Pier 2003: Guideline pass 2002: Guideline pass 2001: Imperative pass 2000: Imperative pass 1999: Guideline pass South of Claremont Pier 2003: Guideline pass 2002: Guideline pass 2001: Guideline pass 2000: Imperative pass 1999: Guideline pass The Pier, Southwold 2003: Guideline pass 2002: Guideline pass 2001: Guideline pass 2000: Guideline pass 1999: Guideline pass The Denes, Southwold 2003: Guideline pass 2002: Guideline pass 2001: Imperative pass 2000: Imperative pass 1999: Guideline pass	One of the requirements for obtaining a 'Blue Flag' designation is passing Guideline standards for all 3 parameters is necessary. However, a single failure of the Guideline standard is enough to deny a Blue Flag award, and this failure could be due to a storm event (when surface water can mix with sewerage in storm overflow channels and be discharged direct to the sea). Thus failure of the Guideline standards needs to be put into context – it could be systematic failure (e.g. untreated or poorly-treated sewage is routinely discharged to the sea) or just spot failures	☺ Standards are generally high. Improvements to sewage treatment works, and the building of new treatment works (e.g. at Corton), has led to a general increase in bathing water quality over time

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
AN	Bathing water quality (EA)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve air quality?							
AN	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded?	BDC	NO_2 mean concentration at: 1) Lattinford Bridge on the A12: 24.0 µg/m^3 2) 70 Cross St, Sudbury: 38.4 µg/m^3 (Babergh Air Quality 2004 Annual Progress Report (April 2005))	Annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide (NO_2): 40 µg/m^3, to be achieved by 31 December 2005 (national Air Quality Objective)	Lattinford Bridge: 28.4 µg/m^3 (2003) 70 Cross St, Sudbury: 39.4 µg/m^3 (2003)	BDC believes that the objectives for the other six national Air Quality Objective pollutants are likely to be met, hence they are not routinely monitored (*the same applies to all other districts)*. Because NO_2 concentrations approach AQO levels at certain points in the district (principally by major roads), it is monitored at 8 locations in the district. All 8 locations use diffusion tubes to monitor NO_2, and a correction factor has to be applied to the results. There is one continuous monitoring station at Lattinford Bridge (no correction factor necessary)	☺ Concentrations of NO_2 at all locations are currently below the 40 µg/m^3 threshold, but it is thought that certain locations on the A12 and in Sudbury town centre may be vulnerable to higher levels, and future monitoring there will be important
AN	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded?	FHDC	NO_2 mean concentration (µg/m^3) at: Newmarket 4 (Memorial Gardens): 21.9 Mildenhall 2 (Kingsway): 34.9 Fiveways 2 (Little Chef): 43.7 Brandon 3 (Town Hall): 16.9 Elveden (A11 Primary School): 39.9 (Info from James Lemon @ FHDC: Air Quality Update 2004)	Annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide (NO_2): 40 µg/m^3, to be achieved by 31 December 2005 (national Air Quality Objective)	00 / 01 / 02 / 03 N4: 17.3 / 22.9 / 19.6 / 14.5 M2: 18.8 / 40.3 / [illegible] / 38.6 F2: 46 / 51.3 / 45.3 / 55.5 B3: 23.7 / 22.6 / 22.3 / 16.7 E: 34.1 / 33.4 / 37.5 / 32.1	A total of 41 diffusion tube monitoring stations in FH, and, from August 2004, one continuous monitor at Fiveways roundabout. The concentration is on locations in the A11/A14 corridor After consultations with DEFRA, a detailed assessment of the air quality at the Fiveways roundabout is currently in progress, with six monitors in place Monitoring in Newmarket has been problematic due to vandalism at a number of monitoring sites; more secure sites have been selected in 2004. High levels of NO_2 near the taxi rank and traffic lights in the High Street needs to be investigated in more detail	😐 Although air quality is generally good in Forest Heath, there have been spot exceedences at various locations over the past five years (Newmarket, Brandon, Mildenhall and Barton Mills). In addition, levels at Elveden Primary School appear to have been generally climbing since 2000, and the 2004 value was only 0.1 µg/m^3 below the 40 µg/m^3 threshold. This is being examined in the production of LTP2 NO_2 thresholds have been exceeded at the Fiveways 2 roundabout site every year since at least 2000, sometimes by considerable margins. Future development in Forest Heath that could increase traffic levels at this location would need to be considered carefully, with the Highways Authority & Highways Agency key consultees
AN	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded?	IBC	Info coming soon…	Annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide (NO_2): 40 µg/m^3, to be achieved by 31 December 2005 (national Air Quality Objective)			
AN	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded?	MSDC	2004 mean annual NO_2 concentration (µg/m^3): Lower Crescent, Barham: 28.7 High Street, Needham Market; 20.9 Station Road, Claydon: 31.7 Forester's Walk, Barham 31.0 Old Stowupland Road, Stowmarket: 25.7	Annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide (NO_2): 40 µg/m^3, to be achieved by 31 December 2005 (national Air Quality Objective)	98 / 99 / 00 / 01 / 02 / 03	The decision was made in 2004 to located five monitoring tubes at locations where it was felt there could be high levels of NO_s close to residential property. Four tubes are located adjacent to the A14, and the fifth is located in Needham Market High Street	☺ General reduction in NO_2 levels over recent years is welcome, and concentrations at all locations are well below the 40 µg/m^3 objective. However, increasing traffic levels and above-average periods of calm, sunny weather could lead to higher levels in future years

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend							Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
					HS, NM	35.3	39.6	30.2	29.4	22.6	21.8		
					SR, C	33.3	34.3	31.7	25.2	28.6	23.5		
					OS R, S				21.6	26.2	24.6		
AN	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded?	SEBC	2004 mean annual NO_2 concentration (µg/m^3, bias corrected results): Fornham Road, Bury St Edmunds: 32.5 Out Risbygate, Bury: 35.0 Withersfield Rd 2, Haverhill: 35.8 Hollands Road, Haverhill: 20.3	Annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide (NO_2): 40 µg/m^3, to be achieved by 31 December 2005 (national Air Quality Objective)								The Air Quality Management Area covering four areas adjacent to the A14 in Bury ran for one year between September 2001 and September 2002, when the additional monitoring indicated that NO_2 concentrations were below the threshold of40 µg/m^3 Monitoring takes place at 27 locations in St Edmundsbury, and the location of monitoring devices is constantly evaluated to assess their appropriateness	☺ General reduction in NO_2 levels over recent years is welcome, and concentrations at all locations are below the 2005 40 µg/m^3 objective (and are expected to remain so in 2005). However, future developments which could lead to increases in traffic (e.g. Snoasis, North-West Haverhill development, Felixstowe port extensions, Bury Cattlemarket etc) should be accompanied by an Air Quality Assessment to demonstrate that there would not be unacceptably deleterious impacts on air quality in St Edmundsbury
AN	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded?	SCDC	Lime Kiln Road/The Thoroughfare junction, Woodbridge: 51.9 µg/m^3 (bias corrected result, 2002) (Source: SCDC Air Quality Report, March 2004, and direct from Penny Moys @ SCC)	Annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide (NO_2): 40 µg/m^3, to be achieved by 31 December 2005 (national Air Quality Objective)									
AN	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded?	WDC	2003 (bias corrected) results (µg/m^3): Golden Court 39.3 Saltwater Way 28.6 Flying Dutchman (A1117/A146 junction): 26.5 Pier Terrace (A146/A12 junction): 40.5 (all diffusion tube monitoring, and all site are in Lowestoft) February-August 2004, continuous monitoring at Flying Dutchman: 32.5 (estimated mean for 2003: 42) (Source: December 2004 Air Quality Review & Assessment)	Annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide (NO_2): 40 µg/m^3, to be achieved by 31 December 2005 (national Air Quality Objective)								Diffusion tube monitoring was carried out at a number of locations in Lowestoft until 2003, when it was discontinued NO_2 concentrations at the four sites identified left are all predicted to be below threshold levels in 2005 and 2010, although at the Flying Dutchman 2005 values may be very close to the 40 µg/m^3 limit. However, the opening of the South Lowestoft Relief Road is expected to lead to a reduction in traffic levels at the Flying Dutchman junction, and a consequent improvement in NO_2 concentrations. Little change is	☺ Air quality is generally fairly good in Lowestoft, and is not thought to be a problem in any other parts of Waveney However, the 2004 Review found that the 2010 annual mean objective for fine particulates (PM10s) is, on current trends, likely to be exceeded at the Flying Dutchman junction. Although PM10s are not currently part of the national Air Quality Regs (so AQMAs cannot be designated because of elevated levels of PM10s), they will be in the future, so future development in Lowestoft will need to take account of this, and mitigation strategies may be necessary

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
						expected at Pier Terrace (by the bascule bridge)	
AN	Have annual mean concentrations of any of three pollutants been exceeded?	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To improve water and air quality							
Will it improve air quality?							
SSAG	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (SSAG)	BDC	0	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	4 AQMAs covering 18 properties in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5. AQMA quite a crude measure of air pollution	☺ Reduction to 0 welcome, but future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads, heatwaves can increase NO_x, fine particulates (PM_{10}), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)
SSAG	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (SSAG)	FHDC	0	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	0 in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5. AQMA quite a crude measure of air pollution	☺ But future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads, heatwaves can increase NO_x, fine particulates (PM_{10}), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)
SSAG	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (SSAG)	IBC	0	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	0 in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5.	☺ But future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads, heatwaves can increase NO_x, fine particulates (PM_{10}), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)
SSAG	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (SSAG)	MSDC	0	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	0 in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5.	☺ But future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads, heatwaves can increase NO_x, fine particulates (PM_{10}), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)
SSAG	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (SSAG)	SEBC	0	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	0 in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5.	☺ But future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads, heatwaves can increase NO_x, fine particulates (PM_{10}), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)
SSAG	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (SSAG)	SCDC	0	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	0 in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5.	☺ But future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads,

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
							heatwaves can increase NO_x, fine particulates (PM_{10}), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)
SSAG	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (SSAG)	WDC	0	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	0 in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5.	☺ But future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads, heatwaves can increase NO_x, fine particulates (PM_{10}), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)
SSAG	Number of Air Quality Management Areas and dwellings affected (SSAG)	Suffolk	0	To not exceed threshold limits. To meet objectives contained in National Air Quality Strategy.	0 in 2002/3	Rolling three-year programme of monitoring starting in 2004/5.	☺ But future air quality pollution levels not entirely within the district's control (e.g. Highways Agency/County Council responsible for roads, heatwaves can increase NO_x, fine particulates (PM_{10}), tropospheric ozone and other pollutants etc)
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise the loss of greenfield land to development?							
DR	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on greenfield land	BDC	2003/04 96 45.3% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)		2001/02 104 43% 2002/03 311 61% Significant decrease in last financial year.		☺
DR	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on greenfield land	FHDC	2003/04 19 28.4% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	2nd lowest in the County.	2001/02 N/R 2002/03 17 27.4% Figures fairly stable		☺
DR	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on greenfield land	IBC	2003/04 97 17.1% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Lowest percentage in the County. Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 80 23.1% 2002/03 65 13.9% Fluctuating trend but figures remain low.		☺
DR	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on greenfield land	MSDC	2003/04 155 44.7% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	3rd lowest in the County. Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 170 54.1% 2002/03 174 59.6% Significant decrease in last financial year.		☺
DR	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on greenfield land	SEBC	2003/04 318 52% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 187 55.3% 2002/03 197 42.1% Fluctuating trend		😐
DR	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on greenfield land	SCDC	2003/04 239 52.5% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 299 70.4% 2002/03 265 46.7% Fluctuating trend.		😐
DR	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on greenfield land	WDC	2003/04 359 70.8% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Highest in the County. Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 452 78.7% 2002/03 329 75.5% Overall trend is towards reduction in Greenfield completions		☺

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
DR	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on greenfield land	Suffolk	2003/04 1283 46.4% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 1292 57.7% 2002/03 1358 48.4% Overall trend is towards a reduction in completions on Greenfield sites.		☺
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise the loss of greenfield land to development?							
DR	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on greenfield land (SSAG)	BDC	2003/04 1832 55.3% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 N/R 2002/03 3569 94.8% significant downward trend over the last year		☺
DR	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on greenfield land (SSAG)	FHDC	2003/04 2808 96.3% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Higest percentage in the County. Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 N/R 2002/03 1842 94.2% Upward trend		☹
DR	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on greenfield land (SSAG)	IBC	2003/04 1769 23.6% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Lowest percentage in the County. Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 1724 28.7% 2002/03 1802 25.6% Downward trend		☺
DR	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on greenfield land (SSAG)	MSDC	2003/04 1207 49.8% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 1313 61.6% 2002/03 1259 57.1% Downward trend		☺
DR	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on greenfield land (SSAG)	SEBC	2003/04 2117 42.2% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 N/R 2002/03 1445 76.8% Significant downward trend over the last year.		☺
DR	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on greenfield land (SSAG)	SCDC	2003/04 2174 62.6% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 2679 65.8% 2002/03 2399 64.8% Downward trend		☺
DR	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on greenfield land (SSAG)	WDC	2003/04 1775 62.3% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 2049 81.1% 2002/03 2103 65.5% Downward trend		☺
DR	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on greenfield land (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003/04 13,682 49.8% (Derived from Regional Monitoring)	Targets relate to brownfield.	2001/02 7765 52.7% 2002/03 9008 49.9% Overall downward trend		☺
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise the loss of greenfield land to development?							
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area (SSAG)	BDC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 34.96	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. 2nd highest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.	Not recorded for 2001/2 or 2002/3. No data for comparison.		😐 Currently 2nd highest density in Suffolk, but no past trend data for comparison

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area (SSAG)	FHDC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: N/R	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = 30 dwellings/hectare.	Density last year was recorded at 23.83 dwellings per hectare. Not recorded for 2001/2.		😐 Limited data available.
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area (SSAG)	IBC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 39	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. Highest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.	Density has increased annually in last 2 years, and is now above the recommended guideline.		☺ Highest density in Suffolk and increasing year on year.
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area (SSAG)	MSDC	Dwellings per hectare 2002/3: 32.34	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare.	Density has decreased since last year, but is still above the recommended guideline. Indicator has fluctuated between 25.0 in 2001/2 and 34.4 in 2002/3.		☺ Decreased this year but above the PPG3 density minimum requirement.
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area (SSAG)	SEBC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 33.98	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = 30 dwellings/hectare.	Not recorded for 2001/2, but has increased this year from 28.01 in 2002/3. Now above the recommended guideline.		😐 Lack of time related data means it is difficult to discern any trends but the figure for 2003/4 is above the PPG3 density minimum requirement.
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area (SSAG)	SCDC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 26.80	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. 2nd lowest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.	Density has decreased each year since 2001/2 when a density of 29.29 was recorded, and is below recommended levels.		😐 Increased this year but still is below the PPG3 density minimum requirement.
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area (SSAG)	WDC	Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 23.22	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare. Lowest density recorded in Suffolk, 2003/4.	Dwellings per hectare 2001/2: 22.92 Density has decreased since last year, and is consistently below the recommended guideline. Indicator has fluctuated between 24.4 in 2002/3 and 22.92 in 2001/2.		☹ Decreased this year and is below the PPG3 density minimum requirement. This indicator measures completions on large sites (10+ units) and many of the permissions coming through were granted some years ago. Approvals indicate an improving trend.
SSAG	Dwellings per hectare of net developable area (SSAG)	Suffolk	Excluding BDC: Dwellings per hectare 2003/4: 30.39	"To avoid developments which make inefficient use of land" (PPG3). Recommended guideline = minimum of 30 dwellings/hectare.	Combined density in Suffolk meets the recommended guideline. County totals do not include all districts in previous years so trends are difficult to discern.		😐 Housing meets the recommended guideline for the county as a whole. Varies between districts and data for previous years are incomplete.
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it minimise loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land to development?							
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a)	BDC	This indicator needs developing for the 05/06 financial year. E.g. need to identify all allocations on agricultural land and grade if possible with hectarage. Could look at as a percentage of total allocations. Need to consider whether the sub				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			objective and indicator should just relate to ag land and not grade as well?				
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a)	FHDC	This indicator needs developing for the 05/06 financial year. E.g. need to identify all allocations on agricultural land and grade if possible with hectarage. Could look at as a percentage of total allocations. Need to consider whether the sub objective and indicator should just relate to ag land and not grade as well?				
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a)	IBC	This indicator needs developing for the 05/06 financial year. E.g. need to identify all allocations on agricultural land and grade if possible with hectarage. Could look at as a percentage of total allocations. Need to consider whether the sub objective and indicator should just relate to ag land and not grade as well?				
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a)	MSDC	This indicator needs developing for the 05/06 financial year. E.g. need to identify all allocations on agricultural land and grade if possible with hectarage. Could look at as a percentage of total allocations. Need to consider whether the sub objective and indicator should just relate to ag land and not grade as well?				
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a)	SEBC	This indicator needs developing for the 05/06 financial year. E.g. need to identify all allocations on agricultural land and grade if possible with hectarage. Could look at as a percentage of total allocations. Need to consider whether the sub objective and indicator should just relate to ag land and not grade as well?				
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a)	SCDC	This indicator needs developing for the 05/06 financial year. E.g. need to identify all allocations on agricultural land and grade if possible with hectarage. Could look at as a				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			percentage of total allocations. Need to consider whether the sub objective and indicator should just relate to ag land and not grade as well?				
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a)	WDC	This indicator needs developing for the 05/06 financial year. E.g. need to identify all allocations on agricultural land and grade if possible with hectarage. Could look at as a percentage of total allocations. Need to consider whether the sub objective and indicator should just relate to ag land and not grade as well?				
DR	Allocations on best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a)	Suffolk	This indicator needs developing for the 05/06 financial year. E.g. need to identify all allocations on agricultural land and grade if possible with hectarage. Could look at as a percentage of total allocations. Need to consider whether the sub objective and indicator should just relate to ag land and not grade as well?				
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it maintain and enhance soil quality?							
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use (Districts/EA)	BDC	Info awaited Need to set a baseline – number and area of potentially/declared contaminated sites.	No target	Need to set up a monitoring system?		This indicator includes potentially contaminated land sites and sites defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e. declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. If a site is Declared Contaminated, then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use (Districts/EA)	FHDC	Baseline (March 05) - Approx 500 potentially contaminated sites covering 300ha (approx 1% of district (37,398 ha)) Declared contaminated sites = 0	No target	Need to set up a monitoring system to assess number and area of sites brought back into beneficial use.		Clarification of the baseline will be available in Spring 2005. This indicator includes potentially contaminated land sites and sites defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e. declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. If a site is Declared Contaminated, then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use (Districts/EA)	IBC	Potentially contaminated sites – number unknown Declared contaminated sites = 0	No target	Need to set up a monitoring system?		This indicator includes potentially contaminated land sites and sites defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e. declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. If a site is Declared Contaminated, then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use (Districts/EA)	MSDC	Baseline (March 05). Potentially contaminated sites = 1227 (Gary Wright to provide total area) Declared contaminated sites = 0	No target	Need to set up a monitoring system.		Wish to undertake further investigation into 50 of the identified sites. This indicator includes potentially contaminated land sites and sites

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
							defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e. declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. If a site is Declared Contaminated, then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use (Districts/EA)	SEBC	Awaiting info (from Peter Gudde) Number and area of potentially contaminated sites = Declared contaminated sites =	No target?	Need to set up a monitoring system?		This indicator includes potentially contaminated land sites and sites defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e. declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. If a site is Declared Contaminated, then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use (Districts/EA)	SCDC	Awaiting info Need to set a baseline – number and area of potentially/declared contaminated sites.	No target?	Need to set up a monitoring system?		This indicator includes potentially contaminated land sites and sites defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e. declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. If a site is Declared

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
							Contaminated, then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use (Districts/EA)	WDC	Baseline (March 2005) Potentially contaminated sites = 348 Total site area estimated at34 to 40 hectares (most sites are less than 0.1 ha) No declared contaminated sites.	No target	Need to set up a monitoring system.		Have a database of approx 400 potentially contaminated land sites. This can form the baseline. (Do not have any sites defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e. declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. However, if we did they would be part of this database). Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. New computer software being installed will enable this to happen as from 2006/07. If a site is Declared Contaminated, then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.
DR	No. and area of potential and declared contaminated sites returned to beneficial use (Districts/EA)	Suffolk	Need to set a baseline – number and area of potentially/declared contaminated sites.	No target	Need to set up a monitoring system.		This indicator includes potentially contaminated land sites and sites defined as Contaminated under the 1995 Act i.e. declared contaminated sites where there are 'significant pollutant linkages', i.e. to receptors such as human health, environment, property, water etc. Is a need to cross ref sites where new development has been completed with the sites in the database. If a site is Declared

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
							Contaminated, then it is required to be remediated i.e. brought back into beneficial use. There are also 'special sites' for which the EA is responsible. Therefore need to monitor completed developments on potentially contaminated sites plus Contaminated sites (including 'special sites') remediated in order to have the complete pictures of sites brought back into beneficial use.
Headline Objective: To conserve soil resources and quality							
Will it maintain and enhance soil quality?							
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Soil Association, Bristol)	BDC	4 farms 41.4 ha	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Soil Association, Bristol)	FHDC	2 farms 759 ha	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Soil Association, Bristol)	IBC	0	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Soil Association, Bristol)	MSDC	10 farms 530.9 ha	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Soil Association, Bristol)	SEBC	2 farms 596.7 ha	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Soil Association, Bristol)	SCDC	8 farms 1101.1 ha	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Soil Association, Bristol)	WDC	1 farm 0.6 ha	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
DR	Number / area of organic farms (Soil Association, Bristol)	Suffolk	27 farms 3059.7 ha	No target	No trend information		Farm size may include non organic areas
Headline Objective: To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible							
Will it promote sustainable use of minerals?							
SSAG	Recycled aggregate production (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003: 480,000 tonnes (annual average 1996-2003: 330,918 tonnes)	The Waste Local Plan calculates that, over the period 1995-2006, an annual average of 347,000 tonnes or recycled aggregates should be produced (an annual average of 347,000 tonnes)	1996: 101,938 1997: 157,000 1998: 150,000 1999: 320,000 2000: 418,000 2001: 505,786 2002: 514,622	Despite the decline in 2003, the annual average of 347,000 tonnes between 1995-2006 is still expected to be met. However, production is dependent on the fiscal attractiveness of secondary aggregates relative to primary aggregates, and also depends on the raw supply of secondary aggregate material	☺ Although the 2003 figure shows a 6% reduction on 2002 levels, recycled aggregates as a percentage of total mineral sales continued to rise in 2003
Headline Objective: To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible							
Will it promote sustainable use of water?							
AH	Water consumption	BDC	Data for Suffolk not available. Possible link to CAMS when produced in the future by EA.				CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in Suffolk.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
AH	Water consumption	FHDC	Data for Suffolk not available. Possible link to CAMS when produced in the future by EA.				CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in Suffolk.
AH	Water consumption	IBC	Data for Suffolk not available. Possible link to CAMS when produced in the future by EA.				CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in Suffolk.
AH	Water consumption	MSDC	Data for Suffolk not available. Possible link to CAMS when produced in the future by EA.				CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in Suffolk.
AH	Water consumption	SEBC	Data for Suffolk not available. Possible link to CAMS when produced in the future by EA.				CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in Suffolk.
AH	Water consumption	SCDC	Data for Suffolk not available. Possible link to CAMS when produced in the future by EA.				CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in Suffolk.
AH	Water consumption	WDC	Data for Suffolk not available. Possible link to CAMS when produced in the future by EA.				CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in Suffolk.
AH	Water consumption	Suffolk	Data for Suffolk not available. Possible link to CAMS when produced in the future by EA.				CAMS may be able to identify whether water is sufficient to support further development in those areas covered, but production has not yet started in Suffolk.
Headline Objective: To use water and mineral resources efficiently, and re-use and recycle where possible							
Will it maintain water availability for water dependant habitats?							
AH	Water availability for water dependant habitats (EN / Wildlife Trust)	BDC	Investigate. Possible link to future EA Review of Consents.				
AH	Water availability for water dependant habitats (EN / Wildlife Trust)	FHDC	Investigate. Possible link to future EA Review of Consents.				
AH	Water availability for water dependant habitats (EN / Wildlife Trust)	IBC	Investigate. Possible link to future EA Review of Consents.				
AH	Water availability for water dependant habitats (EN / Wildlife Trust)	MSDC	Investigate. Possible link to future EA Review of Consents.				
AH	Water availability for water dependant habitats (EN / Wildlife	SEBC	Investigate. Possible link to future EA Review of Consents.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	Trust)						
AH	Water availability for water dependant habitats (EN / Wildlife Trust)	SCDC	Investigate. Possible link to future EA Review of Consents.				
AH	Water availability for water dependant habitats (EN / Wildlife Trust)	WDC	Investigate. Possible link to future EA Review of Consents.				
AH	Water availability for water dependant habitats (EN / Wildlife Trust)	Suffolk	Investigate. Possible link to future EA Review of Consents.				
Headline Objective: To reduce waste							
Will it reduce household waste?							
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (SSAG)	BDC	2004/5: Household: 43,860 tonnes Municipal: 48,353 tonnes	No formal targets – although year-on-year reductions desirable	1999/2000: H: 44,753 tonnes M: 47,600 tonnes 2000/1: H: 45,711 tonnes M: 48,505 tonnes 2001/2: H: 45,990 tonnes M: 48,922 tonnes 2002/3: H: 44,177 tonnes M: 46,655 tonnes 2003/4: H: 42,453 tonnes M: 48,824 tonnes		😐 Rates of household and municipal waste production appear to have plateaued in recent years. The challenge will be to achieve sustained, year-on-year reductions in the future
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (SSAG)	FHDC	2004/5: Household: 30,404 tonnes Municipal: 33,590 tonnes	No formal targets – although year-on-year reductions desirable	1999/2000: H: 31,437 tonnes M: 33,756 tonnes 2000/1: H: 31,258 tonnes M: 33,496 tonnes 2001/2: H: 32,112 tonnes M: 34,425 tonnes 2002/3: H: 31,723 tonnes M: 34,083 tonnes 2003/4: H: 32,163 tonnes M: 34,432 tonnes		☺ 2004/5 saw a welcome reduction in both household and municipal waste, although the 'trade' element of municipal waste increased by over 50% from 2003/4 figures

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (SSAG)	IBC	2004/5: Household: 66,465 tonnes Municipal: 74,104 tonnes	No formal targets – although year-on-year reductions desirable	1999/2000: H: 64,947 tonnes M: 70,144 tonnes 2000/1: H: 60,106 tonnes M: 67,205 tonnes 2001/2: H: 64,415 tonnes M: 72,121 tonnes 2002/3: H: 66,761 tonnes M: 74,152 tonnes 2003/4: H: 65,184 tonnes M: 72,447 tonnes		☺ Apart from 2000/1, figures have been relatively stable since 1999/2000
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (SSAG)	MSDC	2004/5 Household: 41,246 tonnes Municipal: 41,835 tonnes	No formal targets – although year-on-year reductions desirable	1999/2000: H: 38,141 tonnes M: 38,184 tonnes 2000/1: H: 37,585 tonnes M: 37,707 tonnes 2001/2: H: 39,449 tonnes M: 39,889 tonnes 2002/3: H: 40,322 tonnes M: 40,775 tonnes 2003/4: H: 39,367 tonnes M: 39,960 tonnes		☹ 2004/5 saw a sizeable 5% jump in household waste produced. Efforts to reduce this figure need to be re-doubled
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (SSAG)	SEBC	2004/5 Household: 58,188 tonnes Municipal: 62,251 tonnes	No formal targets – although year-on-year reductions desirable	1999/2000: H: 54,743 tonnes M: 59,877 tonnes 2000/1: H: 54,749 tonnes M: 59,653 tonnes 2001/2: H: 57,153 tonnes M: 62,038 tonnes 2002/3: H: 59,506 tonnes M: 64,361 tonnes		😐 Figures for 2004/5 showed a small increase from 2003/4 totals, and more needs to be done to reduce the total in future years

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
					2003/4: H: 57,734 tonnes M: 61,679 tonnes		
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (SSAG)	SCDC	2004/5 Household: 64,921 tonnes Municipal: 70,395 tonnes	No formal targets – although year-on-year reductions desirable	1999/2000: H: 56,757 tonnes M: 57,107 tonnes 2000/1: H: 56,094 tonnes M: 56,446 tonnes 2001/2: H: 58,633 tonnes M: 59,852 tonnes 2002/3: H: 59,412 tonnes M: 60,999 tonnes 2003/4: H: 59,320 tonnes M: 62,902 tonnes		☹ A big increase on the 2003/4 figures, much of which is due to an increase in 'trade' waste (part of the municipal waste stream). However, part of the explanation is a greater capture of 'trade' waste information
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (SSAG)	WDC	2004/5 Household: 68,958 tonnes Municipal: 69,542 tonnes NB: The provisional figures above are subject to change following verification of data	No formal targets – although year-on-year reductions desirable	1999/2000: H: 64,705 tonnes M: 66,401 tonnes 2000/1: H: 64,508 tonnes M: 66,257 tonnes 2001/2: H: 64,093 tonnes M: 66,218 tonnes 2002/3: H: 64,728 tonnes M: 66,778 tonnes 2003/4: H: 63,988 tonnes M: 67,285 tonnes		☹ Because of the data collection problems in Waveney in 2004/5, caution should be taken not to read too much into the provisional figures. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that all the 5000 tonne increase in household waste will be eliminated, so perhaps an emphasis on waste reduction activities should be explored
AN	Household (and municipal) waste produced (SSAG)	Suffolk	2004/5 Household: 374,042 tonnes Municipal: 400,071 tonnes	No formal targets – although year-on-year reductions desirable	1999/2000: H: 355,483 tonnes M: 373,081 tonnes 2000/1: H: 350,011 tonnes M: 369,268 tonnes 2001/2: H: 361,845 tonnes M: 383,465 tonnes		☹ A big increase on the 2003/4 figures, the more disappointing having come after a healthy reduction from 2002/3 levels. Much of the increase is due to Suffolk Coastal and Waveney districts, so further waste reduction efforts in these districts might be appropriate

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
					2002/3: H: 366,630 tonnes M: 387,802 tonnes 2003/4: H: 360,809 tonnes M: 387,529 tonnes		
Headline Objective: To reduce waste							
Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?							
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (SSAG / BVPI)	BDC	Tonnage recycled: 2003/4: 25.8%	BVPI targets: 2003-4: 14% 2005-6: 21%	A huge increase on the 2002/3 figure of 11.0%		☺ Already beyond the target for 2005-6
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (SSAG / BVPI)	FHDC	Tonnage recycled: 2003/4: 32.8%	BVPI targets: 2003-4: 33% 2005-6: 40%	A 5% increase on the 2002/3 figure of 27.6% and the target of 33% has been met		☺ Sixth-best Local Authority in the country for recycling! But the 2005-6 target will be challenging
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (SSAG / BVPI)	IBC	Tonnage recycled: 2003/4: 16.4%	BVPI targets: 2003-4: 10% 2005-6: 18%	Only small increase in recycling from the 2002/3 level of 15.4%, but still well above the **BVPI** target		☺ Good progress being made towards the 2005/6 target with the rollout of the dry recyclables (blue bin) and garden/vegetable waste (brown bin) collections
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (SSAG / BVPI)	MSDC	Tonnage recycled: 2003/4: 19.0%	BVPI targets: 2003-4: 16% 2005-6: 24%	The 2002/3 rate of 9.3% was more than doubled in 2003/4		☺ The 2005/6 target appears within reach at the current rate of progress
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (SSAG / BVPI)	SEBC	Tonnage recycled: 2003/4: 33.7%	BVPI targets: 2003-4: 33% 2005-6: 40%	A 3.5% increase on the 2002-3 figure of 29.8% and 2003/4 BVPI target has been exceeded		☺ Fourth best Local Authority in the country for recycling! But the 2005-6 target is still challenging
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (SSAG / BVPI)	SCDC	Tonnage recycled: 2003/4: 21.8%	BVPI targets: 2003-4: 24% 2005-6: 36%	Although there has been a substantial increase on the 2002/3 level of 13.8%, the 2003/4 BVPI target has not been met		☹ Although a relatively narrow failure in 2002/3, the 2005/6 target will be tough to meet
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (SSAG / BVPI)	WDC	Tonnage recycled: 2003/4: 12.5%	BVPI targets: 2003-4: 10% 2005-6: 18%	A substantial increase from the 2002/3 figure of 5.9%, and the BVPI target has been met		☺ The 2005-6 target should be achievable at the current rate of progress
SSAG	Tonnage / proportion of household (and municipal) waste recycled, composted and landfilled (SSAG / BVPI)	Suffolk	Tonnage recycled: 2003/4: 26.1%	BVPI targets: 2003-4: 28% 2004-5: 35% 2005-6: 38%	20.8%		☹ The 2002-3 BVPI target has not been met, mainly due to a slower-than-anticipated rollout of the three-bin collection system, and lower-than-expected recycling levels at Household Waste & Recycling sites. Targets for future years remain challenging.
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will if effect traffic volumes?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (SCC)	BDC	2003: 7 day annual average flows – all traffic = 312,648. 51 sites (Suffolk CC)		1999: 294,941 2000: 298,421 2001: 302,040 2002: 305,243	Traffic levels have increased each year since 1999.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes.
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (SCC)	FHDC	2003: 7 day annual average flows – all traffic = 262,042. 34 sites (Suffolk CC)		1999: 261,071 2000: 259,922 2001: 249,615 2002: 259,600	Traffic levels have increased each year since 2001. Currently highest since 1999.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes in recent years.
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (SCC)	IBC	2003: 7 day annual average flows – all traffic = 299,702. 13 sites (Suffolk CC)		1999: 280,311 2000: 276,038 2001: 284,469 2002: 297,652	Traffic levels have increased each year since 2000. Currently highest since 1999.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes in recent years.
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (SCC)	MSDC	2003: 7 day annual average flows – all traffic = 233,624. 37 sites (Suffolk CC)		1999: 208,818 2000: 209,928 2001: 213,084 2002: 223,368	Traffic levels have increased each year since 1999.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes.
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (SCC)	SEBC	2003: 7 day annual average flows – all traffic = 415,916. 47 sites (Suffolk CC)		1999: 391,287 2000: 388,771 2001: 394,500 2002: 403,492	Traffic levels have increased each year since 2000. Currently highest since 1999.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes in recent years.
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (SCC)	SCDC	2003: 7 day annual average flows – all traffic = 478,841. 74 sites (Suffolk CC)		1999: 427,890 2000: 445,856 2001: 452,030 2002: 458,408	Traffic levels have increased each year since 1999.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes.
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (SCC)	WDC	2003: 7 day annual average flows – all traffic = 230,095. 27 sites (Suffolk CC)		1999: 203,361 2000: 209,764 2001: 213,576 2002: 219,113	Traffic levels have increased each year since 1999.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes.
HH	Traffic volumes in key locations (SCC)	Suffolk total	2003: 7 day annual average flows – all traffic = 2,232,866. 283 sites (Suffolk CC)		1999: 2,067,679 2000: 2,088,699 2001: 2,109,313 2002: 2,166,875	Traffic levels have increased each year since 1999.	☹ Steadily rising traffic volumes.
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it reduce the need for local travel?							
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere (SSAG)	BDC	2003/4: Major towns: 9% Other towns: 34% Elsewhere: 58%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for sustainable development (Structure Plan Policy CS3(a)).	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 21.5% (43%) Other towns: 55% (26%) Elsewhere: 23.5% (31%) 5-yearly data for 1991-96 and 1996-01 show that development in major towns increased (from 13% to 35%), while in other towns and elsewhere it decreased. From 2001/2 to 2003/4 development in major towns decreased each year but figures for other towns and elsewhere showed fluctuation.	Amount of development taking place in major towns in decreasing, while development elsewhere is higher than last 2 years.	☹ Amount of development taking place in major towns has decreased in recent years, and in 2003/4 most took place elsewhere.
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere (SSAG)	FHDC	2003/4: Major towns: 0% Other towns: 73% Elsewhere: 27%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for sustainable development (Structure	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 0% (0%) Other towns: 20.5% (72%) Elsewhere: 79.5% (28%)		☺ The majority of development took place in towns

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
				Plan Policy CS3(a)).	5-yearly data for 1991-96 and 1996-01 show that proportionally development in other towns (78-74%) and elsewhere remained fairly constant. Similar proportions are recorded this year. The high proportion of development elsewhere in 2002/3 appears to be on anomaly. There are no major towns in Forest Heath.		
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere (SSAG)	IBC	2003/4: Major towns: 100% Other towns: 0% Elsewhere: 0%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for sustainable development (Structure Plan Policy CS3(a)).	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 100% (100%) Other towns: 0% (0%) Elsewhere: 0% (0%) As all development in Ipswich is within a major town, there is no change from year to year.		
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere (SSAG)	MSDC	2003/4: Major towns: 8% Other towns: 32% Elsewhere: 60%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for sustainable development (Structure Plan Policy CS3(a)).	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 4% (5.5%) Other towns: 53% (43.5%) Elsewhere: 43% (51%) 5-yearly data for 1991-96 and 1996-01 show that development in major and other towns increased (6 to 10% and 20 to 27% respectively), while elsewhere it decreased. In 2001/2 to 2003/4 all types of development showed fluctuation with no clear trend apparent. However in 2003/4 development in towns is lower than in recent years while development elsewhere is higher.	Development within major towns has reached capacity.	😐/☹ Development within major towns has reached capacity. This will need to be addressed in the emerging Local Development Framework for Mid Suffolk. Large Settlement Boundaries in small villages have led to an influx in back-land development.
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere (SSAG)	SEBC	2003/4: Major towns: 43% Other towns: 22% Elsewhere: 35%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for sustainable development (Structure Plan Policy CS3(a)).	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 52.5 (30%) Other towns: 27.5 (54%) Elsewhere: 20% (16%) 5-yearly data for 1991-96 and 1996-01 show that development in major towns decreased (54 to 31%) with a corresponding increase in other towns, and 20 to 27% respectively), while elsewhere it remained almost constant. In 2001/2 to 2003/4, the amount of development taking place elsewhere has increased each year, while the proportions in other and major towns has varied.		😐 Amount of development taking place elsewhere has increased in recent years. Overall however, development is being directed to major towns in accordance with the structure plan.
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere	SCDC	2003/4: Major towns: 19% Other towns: 49%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 37.5% (43%) Other towns: 43% (39.5%)	Long term trend of less development in major towns and more elsewhere, each monitoring year.	😐/☹ Long term trend of less development in major towns and more

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	(SSAG)		Elsewhere: 31%	sustainable development (Structure Plan Policy CS3(a)).	Elsewhere: 19.5% (17.5%) 5-yearly data for 1991-96 and 1996-01 show that development in major towns decreased (55 to 45%) with small increases in other towns and elsewhere. In 2001/2 and 2003/4 this trend has continued, with further decreases in major towns and increases in other towns and elsewhere.		elsewhere. Overall however, development is being directed to major towns in accordance with the structure plan
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere (SSAG)	WDC	2003/4: Major towns: 59% Other towns: 26% Elsewhere: 15%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for sustainable development (Structure Plan Policy CS3(a)).	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 64% (57.5%) Other towns: 27% (36.5%) Elsewhere: 9.5% (6.5%) 5-yearly data for 1991-96 and 1996-01 show that development in major towns remained fairly constant at 56-57%, with a small shift from other towns to elsewhere. In 2001/2 to 2003/4 development in major towns has fluctuated but remained relatively stable, while the amount elsewhere has gradually increased.		☺ Small increases in amount of development elsewhere in recent years, but relatively stable split. Overall however, development is being directed to major towns in accordance with the structure plan
SSAG	Percentage of all new residential development taking place in major towns, other towns, and elsewhere (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003/4: Major towns: 39% Other towns: 31% Elsewhere: 30%	Most housing development to be located within or adjoining towns, at a scale consistent with potential for sustainable development (Structure Plan Policy CS3(a)).	2002/3 (and 2001/2): Major towns: 46% (44.5%) Other towns: 34% (37%) Elsewhere: 20% (18.5%) 5-yearly data for 1991-96 and 1996-01 show that development in major towns dropped from 42 to 37%, with slightly more in other towns and elsewhere. In 2001/2 to 2002/3 increased development has taken place in major towns, with less elsewhere. 2002/3 figures show more development in major towns and less elsewhere, compared to the historical data.		☺ Development is increasingly being directed away from elsewhere to major and other towns, in accordance with the structure plan.
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it reduce the need for local travel?							
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	BDC	Total Rural Population **45,561** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **18,921** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **41.5**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services Highest % in Suffolk	% of rural population with access to all five listed facilities has halved - **64% recorded in 2002/3 (no data for 2001/2).**	Rapid loss of rural services during last year is a concern.	☹ There has been a significant decrease this year indicating a rapid decrease in rural service provision. Not on track to meet target. Needs to be monitored and improved in the future.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	FHDC	Total Rural Population **9384** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **N/A** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **N/A**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services Lowest % in Suffolk in 2002/3	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: **4.4% (no data for 2001/2).**		😐 The source of population data has changes and so figures are not directly comparable.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	IBC	Total Rural Population **0** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **N/A** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **N/A**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services			IBC does not have a rural population, therefore this indicator is not applicable
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	MSDC	Total Rural Population **60,987** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **26,312** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **43.1%**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: 39.8% 2001/2: 49.8% A 7% decrease since 2001/2, but has increased since last year.		😐 Not currently on track to meet target, but has increased this year. The adoption of SPG to safeguard pubs, shops and post offices have sought to protect access to these key services.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	SEBC	Total Rural Population **40,961** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **19,580** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **47.8**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: 51.6% 2001/2: 41.6% Figure increased in 2002/3, but a small decrease recorded this year. Currently higher than 2001/2 baseline.		😐 There has been a small decrease this year. However rural service provision is currently higher than 2001/2 baseline, so still on track to meet target.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	SCDC	Total Rural Population **47,401** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **21,090** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **44.5**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: 29.8% 2001/2: 29.6% Has increased significantly this year from a previously stable 30%		☺ There has been a significant increase this year indicating an increase in rural service provision. On track to meet target.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	WDC	Total Rural Population **13,486** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities **1602** % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities **8.9**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: 11.9% 2001/2: 33.8% Decrease due to Kessingland, previously included as a rural parish but now grown to become 'urban'.	Loss of rural services during last year is a concern.	☹ There has been a decrease this year indicating a further decrease in rural service provision. Not on track to meet target. Needs to be monitored and improved in the future.
SSAG	Percentage of rural population living in parishes which have a food shop or general store, post office, pub, primary school and meeting place (SSAG)	Suffolk	Total Rural Population **208,396** Rural Population living in parishes with access to all five listed facilities 87,505 % of rural population with access to all five listed facilities 42.0 **(Total excludes FHDC)**	Target to increase % of rural population living in parishes with access to 5 services	Rural population with access to 5 services 2002/3: **43.2**% 2001/2: 41.0% Appears to have been a slight decrease in provision of rural services over the past year. However this does not include FHDC, which had lowest % last year, so actual decrease may in fact be greater.		😐 The source of population data has changed and so figures are not directly comparable. Not all districts returned data for each year, therefore not accurate to compare.
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it reduce the need for local travel?							
SB	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT)	BDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT)	FHDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT)	IBC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT)	MSDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT)	SEBC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT)	SCDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT)	WDC	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
SB	Distance to key services (new accessibility indicators from DfT)	Suffolk	Can obtain from Graham Mateer (Suffolk) using Accession database in the future but need to define more clearly.				
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it increase the proportion of journeys made using modes other than the private car?							
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	BDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.3%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	FHDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.1%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	IBC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 32.1% Willis (Ipswich) Employee Travel Survey 2004: 32.4%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. Largest % of sustainable travel in Suffolk.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information. In 2001 Ipswich had highest sustainable travel % in Suffolk.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	MSDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 15.5% MSDC Employee Travel Survey 2004: 11.1%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. Lowest % of sustainable travel in Suffolk.	No other comparable data recorded.	Low use of sustainable modes to travel to work in 2001 census.	😐 No trend information. In 2001 Mid Suffolk had lowest sustainable travel % in Suffolk. Small sample size (36) in employee travel survey.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	SEBC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.9% SEBC Employee Travel Survey 2004:	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information. Small sample size (67) in employee travel survey.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			17.9%				
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	SCDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.4% SCDC Employee Travel Survey 2004: 12.1% BT (Martlesham Heath) Travel Survey 2004: 30.3%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	BT (Martlesham Heath) Travel Survey 2003: 20.7% BT employees recorded a large (50%) increase in use of sustainable modes from 2003 to 2004. No other comparable data recorded.		😐 Large increase in use of sustainable modes by BT employees in 2004 travel survey, but is this representative of the wider population?. No other trend information. Small sample size (116) in SCDC employee travel survey.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	WDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 23.7% WDC Employee Travel Survey 2004: 17.5%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. 2nd largest % of sustainable travel in Suffolk in 2001 Census.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information. Small sample size (40) in employee travel survey.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	Suffolk	% sustainable 2001 Census: 21.2% Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2004: 28.0%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2003: 25.2% No other comparable data recorded.		😐 Limited trend information. An increase has been recorded in use of sustainable modes by Suffolk employees but is this representative of the wider population?
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it increase the proportion of journeys made using modes other than the private car?							
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI)	BDC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI)	FHDC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI)	IBC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI)	MSDC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI)	SEBC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI)	SCDC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI)	WDC	N/A	N/A	N/A		
HH	Percentage of schoolchildren travelling to school by sustainable modes (BVPI)	Suffolk	2004 survey: 41% walk, 18% bus, 6% cycle, 35% car.	Suffolk target of 23% by bus in 2004	Awaiting trend data from Terry Dodman, Suffolk		
Headline Objective: To reduce the effects of traffic on the environment							
Will it increase the proportion of journeys made using modes other than the private car?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG)	BDC	Date PPG13 standards were adopted: N/A	For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No other data collected to date. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.		😐 There is a need to develop monitoring systems that allow the collection of data for this revised indicator.
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG)	FHDC	Date PPG13 standards were adopted: N/A	For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No data collected to date. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.		😐 There is a need to develop monitoring systems that allow the collection of data for this revised indicator.
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG)	IBC	Date PPG13 standards were adopted: 2001 2003/4: Number of commercial developments >1,000sq m: 3 (total area: 41366sq m) Number of these developments complying with PPG13 parking standard: 0 (total area: 0 sq m)	For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No previous data collected. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.	Developments in 2003/4 did not meet PPG13 parking standards.	😐 Standards were adopted in 2001, but developments in 2003/4 did not meet PPG13 parking standards.
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG)	MSDC	Date PPG13 standards were adopted: N/A	For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No other data collected to date. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.		😐 There is a need to develop monitoring systems that allow the collection of data for this revised indicator. Need to take into account RMR indicator.
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG)	SEBC	Date PPG13 standards were adopted: Mid-2001	For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No other data collected to date. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.		😐 There is a need to develop monitoring systems that allow the collection of data for this revised indicator.
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG)	SCDC	Date PPG13 standards were adopted: 7th May 2002	For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No other data collected to date. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.		😐 There is a need to develop monitoring systems that allow the collection of data for this revised indicator.
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG)	WDC	Adopted Suffolk Advisory Parking Standards revised in the light of PPG13 12th November 2002	For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No other data collected to date. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.		😐 There is a need to develop monitoring systems that allow the collection of data for this revised indicator. Need to take into account the new

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
							Regional Monitoring requirements.
SSAG	Car parking standards (SSAG)	Suffolk	Data from Ipswich only 2003/4: Number of commercial developments >1,000sq m: 3 (total area: 41366sq m) Number of these developments complying with PPG13 parking standard: 0 (total area: 0 sq m)	For every local authority in Suffolk to have adopted car parking standards to PPG 13 standards and from 1 April 2003 to be fully implementing those standards	No other data collected to date. This indicator was introduced as part of a recent review. The monitoring systems required to collect the information have yet to be implemented in many authorities.	Developments in 2003/4 did not meet PPG13 parking standards.	😐 In Ipswich, standards were adopted in 2001, but developments in 2003/4 did not meet PPG13 parking standards. Monitoring systems have yet to be implemented in many authorities
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it reduce emissions of green house gases by reducing energy consumption?							
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	BDC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 5,668 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 210 GWh	2nd lowest industrial use in Suffolk.	No trend data available to date.		😐 Industrial use is relatively low for Suffolk. Limited data available so far.
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	FHDC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 6,121 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 147 GWh	Lowest industrial use in Suffolk, but 2nd highest domestic use.	No trend data available to date.		😐 Industrial use is relatively low for Suffolk but domestic use is relatively high. Limited data available so far.
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	IBC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 4,567 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 414 GWh	Lowest domestic use in Suffolk, but highest industrial use.	No trend data available to date.		😐 Industrial use is relatively high for Suffolk, but domestic use is relatively low. Limited data available so far.
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	MSDC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 6,167 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 234 GWh	Highest domestic use in Suffolk.	No trend data available to date.		😐 Domestic use is relatively high for Suffolk. Limited data available so far.
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	SEBC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 5,209 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 320 GWh		No trend data available to date.		😐 Limited data available so far.
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	SCDC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 5,610 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 307 GWh		No trend data available to date.		😐 Limited data available so far.
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	WDC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 4,753 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 371 GWh	2nd lowest domestic use in Suffolk, but 2nd highest industrial use.	No trend data available to date.		😐 Industrial use is relatively high for Suffolk, but domestic use is relatively low. Limited data available so far.
AN	Consumption of electricity - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	Suffolk	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 5,337 kWh		No trend data available to date.		😐 Limited data available so far.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			Total commercial / industrial use: 2003 GWh				
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it reduce emissions of green house gases by reducing energy consumption?							
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	BDC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 19,072 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 344 GWh		2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 18,926 kWh (18,536 kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 369 GWh (336GWh) Domestic gas use is increasing annually, and while industrial use has decreased this year, it remains above 2001 figures.	Increasing use of gas in the District.	☹ Gas consumption (domestic and industrial) is increasing. Industrial has shown a decrease this year. Domestic use affected by cold weather in winters.
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	FHDC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 19,775 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 174 GWh	Highest domestic consumption in Suffolk, but lowest industrial use.	2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 19,807 kWh (19,277 kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 148 GWh (141 GWh) Industrial gas use is increasing annually, and while domestic use has decreased this year, it remains above 2001 figures.	Increasing use of gas in the District.	☹ Gas consumption (domestic and industrial) is increasing. Domestic has shown a decrease this year. Domestic use is high for Suffolk, perhaps indicative that mains gas is not available in all areas. In contrast, industrial use is relatively low. Domestic use affected by cold weather in winters.
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	IBC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 18,937 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 431 GWh	2nd highest industrial use.	2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 18,807 kWh (18,369 kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 517 GWh (510 GWh) Domestic gas use is increasing annually. However, industrial use has decreased this year, to below 2001 figures.	Increasing domestic use of gas in the Borough (although industrial use has decreased this year).	☹ Domestic gas consumption is increasing. Industrial use has decreased this year, to below 2001 levels, but remains relatively high for Suffolk. Domestic use affected by cold weather in winters.
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	MSDC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 18,490 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 196 GWh	2nd lowest District in Suffolk for both domestic and industrial consumption.	2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 18,574 kWh (18,426kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 212 GWh (217GWh) Industrial gas use is decreasing annually. However, while domestic use has decreased this year, it remains above 2001 figures.		☺ Gas consumption (domestic and industrial) have both decreased this year, and both are relatively low for Suffolk. Domestic use affected by cold weather in winters.
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	SEBC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 19,323 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 1832 GWh	Highest industrial use (almost double next nearest District).	2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 19,374 kWh (19,016 kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 851 GWh (1328 GWh) Large fluctuations in industrial use. Domestic use has decreased this year,	High industrial use, but subject to large fluctuations. Domestic use has decreased this year, but remains above 2001 figures.	☹ Gas consumption is relatively high for Suffolk, particularly industrial use. Large fluctuations in industrial use may be related to sugar beet industry?? Domestic use has decreased this year, but remains above 2001 figures. Domestic use affected by cold weather

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
					but remains above 2001 figures.		in winters.
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	SCDC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 19,728 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 206 GWh	2nd highest domestic consumption in Suffolk.	2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 19,891 kWh (19,551 kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 849 GWh (836 GWh) Domestic and industrial gas use has decreased this year (particularly industrial). Domestic use remains above 2001 figures.		☺/😐 Gas consumption (domestic and industrial) have both decreased this year. Industrial use is relatively low. However domestic use remains high for Suffolk perhaps indicative that mains gas is not available in all areas, and higher than 2001 levels. Domestic use affected by cold weather in winters.
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	WDC	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 18,340 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 319 GWh	Lowest domestic consumption in Suffolk.	2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 18,518 kWh (18,226 kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 341 GWh (289 GWh) Domestic and industrial gas use has decreased this year, but both remain above 2001 figures.		☺/😐 Gas consumption (domestic and industrial) have both decreased this year, although both are higher than 2001 levels. Domestic use is relatively low for Suffolk. Domestic use affected by cold weather in winters.
AN	Consumption of gas - Domestic use per consumer and total commercial /industrial use (DTI)	Suffolk	2003: Domestic use per consumer: 19,028 kWh Total commercial / industrial use: 3502 GWh		2002 (2001): Domestic use per consumer: 19,043 kWh (18,688 kWh) Total commercial / industrial use: 2701 GWh (3064 GWh) Domestic use has decreased slightly this year, but remains above 2001 figures. Industrial use has increased.	Increase in gas use in county since 2001 (although domestic use has decreased slightly this year).	☹ Gas consumption (industrial and domestic) has increased since 2001. Domestic use has decreased this year, but remains above 2001 figures. Domestic use affected by cold weather in winters.
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it reduce emissions of green house gases by reducing energy consumption?							
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns)	BDC	58 (BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA overall figure for improvement in total district stock since 1996 is 14.2% (HECA Progress Report)	BVPI Target for 2004/05 59.7 HECA Strategy target 19% by 2006	BVPI 63 2001/02 2002/03 HECA (% improvement in domestic energy efficiency since 1996) 2001 6.41% 2002 8.3% 2003 11.1%		BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1st April 1996. The DEFRA website advises that because HECA Strategies and monitoring techniques differ, the information should not be used to compare the performance of LAs.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns)	FHDC	Stock transferred to Kings' Forest Housing Association (BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA av figure for total district stock is 50 (Housing Strategy) HECA overall figure for improvement in total district stock since 1996 is ? Emailed Mark Woolhouse for figure – no reply as of 18-3-05 (HECA Progress Report)	3% improvement each year	BVPI 63 2001/02 53 2002/03 54.9 HECA (% improvement in domestic energy efficiency since 1996) 2001 6.71% 2002 7.5% 2003 8.7%		BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1st April 1996. The DEFRA website advises that because HECA Strategies and monitoring techniques differ, the information should not be used to compare the performance of LAs.
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns)	IBC	Figure not in BVPP (BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA overall figure for improvement in total borough stock since 1996 is 15.93% (HECA Progress Report)	No target in BVPP HECA Strategy target 30% by 2010 **(should this be 2011?)**	BVPI 63 2001/02 69 2002/03 71.1 HECA (% improvement in domestic energy efficiency since 1996) 2001 10.13% 2002 11.5% 2003 13.5%		BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1st April 1996. The DEFRA website advises that because HECA Strategies and monitoring techniques differ, the information should not be used to compare the performance of LAs.
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns)	MSDC	Figure not in BVPP (BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA overall figure for improvement for total district stock since 1996 is 7.18% (HECA Progress Report)	Target not in BVPP HECA Strategy target 30% by 2011.	BVPI 63 2001/02 N/R 2002/03 48.6 HECA (% improvement in domestic energy efficiency since 1996) 2001 7.37% 2002 8.5% 2003 5.8%		BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
							in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1st April 1996. The DEFRA website advises that because HECA Strategies and monitoring techniques differ, the information should not be used to compare the performance of LAs.
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns)	SEBC	Stock transferred to Havebury Housing Association in 2002. (BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA overall figure for improvement total borough stock since 1996 is 16.18% (HECA Progress Report)	HECA strategy target 30% to 2011	BVPI 63 2001/02 47 2002/03 47.6 HECA (% improvement in domestic energy efficiency since 1996) 2001 9.81% 2002 11.1% 2003 13.5%		BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1st April 1996. The DEFRA website advises that because HECA Strategies and monitoring techniques differ, the information should not be used to compare the performance of LAs.
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns)	SCDC	Stock transferred to Suffolk Heritage Housing Association in May 1991 (BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA overall figure for improvement in total district stock since 1996 is 9.8% (HECA Progress Report)	HECA strategy target 28.6% by 2011	HECA (% improvement in domestic energy efficiency since 1996) 2001 5.49% 2002 7.0% 2003 8.8%		BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1st April 1996. The DEFRA website advises that because HECA Strategies and monitoring techniques differ, the information should not be used to compare the performance of LAs.
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns)	WDC	60 (BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA overall figure for improvement in total district stock since 1996 is 19.4% (HECA Progress Report)	BVPI Target for 2004/05 62 HECA Strategy 1996 - 30% increase by 2011	BVPI 63 2001/02 53 2002/03 58 HECA (% improvement in domestic energy efficiency since 1996) 2001 10.2% 2002 16.0%		BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
					2003 17.0%		The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1st April 1996. The DEFRA website advises that because HECA Strategies and monitoring techniques differ, the information should not be used to compare the performance of LAs.
DR	Energy efficiency of homes (BVPI 63 and HECA returns)	Suffolk	? (BVPI 63 Av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) HECA – DEFRA website advises that 'HECA strategies and monitoring techniques differ, therefore the information should not be used to compare the performance of authorities.' This suggests that to aggregate the figures and find an average for Suffolk may also not be appropriate.		BVPI 63 2001/02 ? 2002/03 ?		BVPI 63 looks at the av. SAP rating of LA owned dwellings) The Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) measures the overall energy efficiency of a home, including the existing insulation and heating measures and is expressed on a scale of 1 to 100. As of 05/06 the rating will be 1 to 120. www.bre.co.uk The Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (HECA) required LAs to identify measures to improve energy efficiency in all residential accommodation. Each LA had to create a baseline for 1st April 1996.
Headline Objective: To reduce contributions to climate change							
Will it increase the proportion of energy needs being met by renewable sources?							
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG)	BDC	2003/4: 0	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	None since at least 1996/7		☹ No schemes in the pipeline
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG)	FHDC	2003/4: 0	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	None since at least 1996/7		☹ No schemes in the pipeline
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG)	IBC	2003/4: 0	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	None since at least 1996/7		☹ No schemes in the pipeline
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG)	MSDC	2003/4: 19.5 MWh	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	Only the one plant in Mid Suffolk, which opened in 1996	The power plant is located in Eye, and generates electricity from the combustion of chicken litter	☹ Proportion is relatively high.
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG)	SEBC	2003/4: 0	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	None since at least 1996/7		
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG)	SCDC	2003/4: 0	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	None since at least 1996/7		
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG)	WDC	2003/4: 0	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	None since at least 1996/7		
SSAG	Installed electricity generating capacity using renewable energy (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003/4: 19.5 MWh	RSS 14 targets for East of England for renewable energy (excluding offshore wind): 10% (2010); 17% (2020)	Just one plant, in Mid Suffolk		

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property from rivers and watercourses?							
SSAG	Flood Risk – Planning applications approved against Environment Agency advice (SSAG)	BDC	2003/4: 0 (data from Environment Agency High Level Target 12 report to DEFRA)	2002/3: 1 Target is 0	Reduction to zero from 2002/3		☺ But conflicting priorities between PPG3 and PPG25 may impact on future 'inappropriate' approval figures
SSAG	Flood Risk – Planning applications approved against Environment Agency advice (SSAG)	FHDC	2003/4: 0	2002/3: 0 Target is 0	No refusals		☺ But conflicting priorities between PPG3 and PPG25 may impact on future 'inappropriate' approval figures
SSAG	Flood Risk – Planning applications approved against Environment Agency advice (SSAG)	IBC	2003/4: 1	2002/3: 0 Target is 0	Increase from zero in 2002/3	Reason given for approval is that previous permissions set a precedent. But shouldn't each application be decided on its own merits?	☹ Further development around the River Orwell/ Waterfront – particularly the Island Site - will probably raise PPG3/PPG25 conflict
SSAG	Flood Risk – Planning applications approved against Environment Agency advice (SSAG)	MSDC	2003/4: 6	2002/3: 3 Target is 0	The contrary approvals doubled from 2002-3		☹ Two of the approvals were made before the Agency advice was received (i.e. the Agency advice was late). However, two other approvals were for 'major' developments, and there were only 21 such 'inappropriate' approvals in the whole of England
SSAG	Flood Risk – Planning applications approved against Environment Agency advice (SSAG)	SEBC	2003/4: 1	2002/3: 1 Target is 0	No change from 2002/3		😐 Conflicting priorities between PPG3 and PPG25 may impact on future 'inappropriate' approval figures
SSAG	Flood Risk – Planning applications approved against Environment Agency advice (SSAG)	SCDC	2003/4: 0	2002/3: 0 Target is 0	No change from 2002/3		☺ Conflicting priorities between PPG3 and PPG25 may impact on future 'inappropriate' approval figures
SSAG	Flood Risk – Planning applications approved against Environment Agency advice (SSAG)	WDC	2003-4: 0	2002/3: 3 Target is 0	Reduction to 0 from 2002/3		☺ Conflicting priorities between PPG3 and PPG25 may impact on future 'inappropriate' approval figures
SSAG	Flood Risk – Planning applications approved against Environment Agency advice (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003-4: 8	2002/3: 8 Target is 0	No change on 2002/3 figures.		😐 Mid-Suffolk figures are of concern, but other districts seem to be moving towards sustainability in this area
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property from rivers and watercourses?							
RC / MD	Properties at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea (EA)	BDC	1,434		No trend data available.		
RC / MD	Properties at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea (EA)	FHDC	? * awaiting response from EA		No trend data available.		Forest Heath not covered within the EA's Ipswich office area for data.
RC / MD	Properties at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea (EA)	IBC	2,286		No trend data available.		
RC / MD	Properties at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea (EA)	MSDC	1,154	Lowest number of houses at risk in Suffolk.	No trend data available.		

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
RC / MD	Properties at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea (EA)	SEBC	2,062		No trend data available.		
RC / MD	Properties at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea (EA)	SCDC	2,624	Highest number of houses at risk in Suffolk	No trend data available.		
RC / MD	Properties at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea (EA)	WDC	2,383		No trend data available.		
RC / MD	Properties at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea (EA)	Suffolk	11,943* *note this excludes FHDC.		No trend data available.		
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property from rivers and watercourses?							
RC / MD	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected)	BDC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected)	FHDC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected)	IBC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected)	MSDC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected)	SEBC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected)	SCDC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected)	WDC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of fluvial flooding (properties affected)	Suffolk	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property on the coast?							
RC / MD	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected)	BDC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected)	FHDC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected)	IBC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
RC / MD	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected)	MSDC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected)	SEBC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected)	SCDC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected)	WDC	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
RC / MD	Incidence of coastal flooding (properties affected)	Suffolk	To be developed. Many events go unreported.				
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it reduce the risk of coastal erosion?							
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG)	BDC	N/A				No coastal areas.
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG)	FHDC	N/A				No coastal areas.
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG)	IBC	N/A				No coastal areas.
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG)	MSDC	N/A				No coastal areas.
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG)	SEBC	N/A				No coastal areas.
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG)	SCDC	0	0 (2002/3)	No change on 2002/3 figure		☺ Policy AP95 applies, but areas at risk are primarily rural and in sensitive locations and also protected by other polices. The number of applications will therefore be limited.
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG)	WDC	0	1 (2002/3)	Reduction to 0 from 2002/3 figure		☺ Policy ENV 1 applies, together with other polices of constraint [for example within the AONB] and whilst there will always be some pressure the number of applications is likely to remain very low.
SSAG	Developments refused because of risk of coastal erosion (SSAG)	Suffolk	Totals from the 2 coastal districts: 0				😐 Policies apply in both coastal Districts, and whilst there will always be some pressure the number of applications is likely to remain very low.
Headline Objective: To reduce vulnerability to climatic events							
Will it reduce the risk of damage to people and property from storm events?							
RC / MD	Incidence of flood watches & warnings (EA)	BDC	N/a				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
RC / MD	Incidence of flood watches & warnings (EA)	FHDC	N/a				
RC / MD	Incidence of flood watches & warnings (EA)	IBC	N/a				
RC / MD	Incidence of flood watches & warnings (EA)	MSDC	N/a				
RC / MD	Incidence of flood watches & warnings (EA)	SEBC	N/a				
RC / MD	Incidence of flood watches & warnings (EA)	SCDC	N/a				
RC / MD	Incidence of flood watches & warnings (EA)	WDC	N/a				
RC / MD	Incidence of flood watches & warnings (EA)	Suffolk	Flood Watches* 2003 = 40 Flood Warnings* 2003 = 12 Flood Watches* 2004 = 26 Flood Warning* 2004 = 2 * Suffolk wide figure.				Data only available from EA on a Suffolk wide basis.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?							
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG)	BDC	RAMSAR 1(part) SPA 1(part) SAC 0 0ha SSSI 17 2573ha CWS 164 1574ha LNR 8 142.23 [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	Gained 1 SSSI and 14 CWS since 2003. LNRs appear to have decreased but probably due to miscount previously		☺ Increase in SSSIs and CWS is promising. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are baseline data. 5 yearly indicator
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG)	FHDC	RAMSAR 0 0ha SPA 1(part) SAC 3(1 part) SSSI 24 12024ha CWS 65 5345ha LNR 2 67.9ha [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	Gained 1 SSSI, 1 LNR and 8 CWS since 2003.		☺ Increase in SSSIs, LNR and CWS is promising. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are baseline data. 5 yearly indicator
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG)	IBC	RAMSAR 0 0ha SPA 0 0ha SAC 0 0ha SSSI 2 48ha CWS 17 200ha LNR 4 36.6ha [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	No change in number of designations since 2003.		☺ No loss of designated sites this year. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are baseline data. 5 yearly indicator
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG)	MSDC	RAMSAR 1 SPA 0 0ha SAC 1(part) SSSI 24 426ha CWS 184 1334ha	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	Gained 12 CWS since 2003.		☺ Increase in CWS is promising. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			LNR 6 32.48ha [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]				baseline data. 5 yearly indicator
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG)	SEBC	RAMSAR 0 0ha SPA 1(part) SAC 3(all part) SSSI 22 4627ha CWS 144 3530ha LNR 0 0ha [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	Gained 9 CWS since 2003.	No Local Nature Reserves designated.	☺ Increase in CWS is promising. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are baseline data. 5 yearly indicator
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG)	SCDC	RAMSAR 4(1 part) SPA 4(1 part) SAC 5 SSSI 45 10630ha CWS 205 5906 ha LNR 3 64.9ha [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	Gained 5 CWS since 2003. (Increase of 1 SSSI due to it erroneously being counted in WDC last year).		☺ Increase in CWS is promising. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are baseline data. 5 yearly indicator
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG)	WDC	RAMSAR 1 SPA 2 SAC 2 SSSI 10 1013ha CWS 113 1620ha LNR 2 38.26ha [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	Gained 1 CWS since 2003. (Loss of 1 SSSI due to it erroneously being counted in SCDC last year).		☺ Increase in CWS is promising. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are baseline data. 5 yearly indicator
SSAG	Change in number and area of designated ecological sites (SSAG)	Suffolk	RAMSAR 6 8141ha SPA 7 18227.5ha SAC 11 2542.9ha SSSI 142 31341ha CWS 875 19509ha LNR 25 377.84ha [Suffolk Biological Records Centre]	No loss in number and area of ecological designations. No target	Gained 42 CWS since 2003. Decrease in LNRs due to miscount previously. Apparent changes in hectarage due to changes in method - only including Suffolk area this year.		☺ Increase in CWS is promising. Due to a more accurate method of calculating area and number of ecological sites, 2003 figures are baseline data. 5 yearly indicator
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?							
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (EN / Wildlife Trust)	BDC	Investigate.				
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (EN / Wildlife Trust)	FHDC	Investigate				
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (EN / Wildlife Trust)	IBC	Investigate				
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (EN / Wildlife Trust)	MSDC	Investigate				
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (EN / Wildlife Trust)	SEBC	Investigate				
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (EN / Wildlife Trust)	SCDC	Investigate				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (EN / Wildlife Trust)	WDC	Investigate				
ME	Reported condition of ecological SSSIs (EN / Wildlife Trust)	Suffolk	Investigate				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it help deliver targets and action for habitats and species within the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan?							
	Achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	BDC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	FHDC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	IBC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	MSDC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	SEBC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	SCDC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	WDC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Habitat Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	Suffolk	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it help deliver targets and action for habitats and species within the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan?							
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	BDC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	FHDC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	IBC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	MSDC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	SEBC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	SCDC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	WDC	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
	Achievement of Species Action Plan targets (SBRC/SBP)	Suffolk	Awaiting appointment of Suffolk BAP Officer, SCC				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it help deliver targets and action for habitats and species within the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan?							
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (SWT)	BDC	**Habitat Action Plan** Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland total 1 Condition – 1 (100%) Reason N/T Ponds total 1 Condition – 1 (100%) Reason N/T **Species Action Plan** Bats known roosts N/A Bats potential roosts total 26 Survey prior to decision – 26 (100%) Condition – 26 (100%) Reason – N/T Great Crested Newts N/A [Suffolk Wildlife Trust]	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.	Number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to planning decisions has increased since 2001/2.		😐 Data limited but number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to potential bat roosts has increased.
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (SWT)	FHDC	**Habitat Action Plan** Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland N/T Ponds N/T **Species Action Plan** Bats known roosts total 1 Survey prior to decision – 0 Condition – 1 (100%) Reason for Refusal – N/T Bats potential roosts 10 Survey prior to decision –2 (20%) Condition – 8 (80%) Reason – N/T Great Crested Newts N/T [Suffolk Wildlife Trust]	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.	Number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to planning decisions has increased since 2001/2.		😐 Data limited but number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to potential bat roosts has increased.
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (SWT)	IBC	**Habitat Action Plan** Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland N/T Ponds N/A **Species Action Plan** Bats known roosts total N/A Survey prior to decision –	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.			😐 Limited data.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			Condition – Reason for Refusal – Bats potential roosts N/A Survey prior to decision – Condition – Reason – Great Crested Newts N/A Survey prior to decision – Safeguarding Condition – Relevant reason - [Suffolk Wildlife Trust]				
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (SWT)	MSDC	**Habitat Action Plan** **Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland total 1** Condition – 1 (100%) Reason for refusal – N/T Ponds total 8 Condition – 1 (12.5%) Reason for refusal – 1 (12.5%) **Species Action Plan** Bats known roosts total 11 Survey prior to decision – 3 (27%) Condition – 3 (27%) Reason for Refusal – N/T Bats potential roosts total 110 Survey prior to decision – 8 (7%) Condition – 54 (49%) Reason for refusal – 0 (0%) Great Crested Newts total 14 Survey prior to decision – 1 (7%) Safeguarding Condition – 4 (29%) Reason for refusal – 0 (0%) [Suffolk Wildlife Trust]	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.	Number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to planning decisions has increased since 2001/2.		😐 Data limited but number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to bat roosts has increased.
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (SWT)	SEBC	**Habitat Action Plan** Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland total N/T Ponds total N/T **Species Action Plan** Bats known roosts total 26 Survey prior to decision – 0 Safeguarding Condition – 2 (8%) Reason for Refusal – 0 Bats potential roosts 39 Survey prior to decision – 0 Safeguarding Condition – 1 (3%) Reason for refusal – 0 Great Crested Newts total 1 Survey prior to decision – 0 (0%) Safeguarding Condition – 1 (100%) Relevant reason – N/T	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.			😐 Limited data.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			[Suffolk Wildlife Trust]				
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (SWT)	SCDC	**Habitat Action Plan** **Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland total N/T** **Ponds total 1** Safeguarding Condition – 0 (0%) Reason for refusal – N/T **Species Action Plan** Bats known roosts total 33 Survey prior to decision – 0 Safeguarding Condition – 13 (39%) Reason for Refusal – 2 (6%) Bats potential roosts 39 Survey prior to decision – 2 (5%) Safeguarding Condition – 24 (62%) Reason for refusal – 0 Great Crested Newts total 1 Survey prior to decision – 0 (0%) Safeguarding Condition – n/t Reason for refusal – n/t [Suffolk Wildlife Trust]	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.	Number of safeguarding conditions attached to planning decisions has increased since 2001/2.		😐 Data limited but number of safeguarding conditions attached to bat roosts has increased.
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (SWT)	WDC	**Habitat Action Plan** Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland total N/T Ponds total 7 Condition – 0 (0%) Reason – 0 (0%) **Species Action Plan** Bats known roosts total 6 Survey prior to decision – 0 (0%) Safeguarding Condition – 4 (67%) Reason for Refusal – 0 Bats potential roosts 20 Survey prior to decision – 0 (0%) Safeguarding Condition – 17 (85%) Reason for refusal – 0 (0%) Great Crested Newts total 3 Survey prior to decision – 0 (0%) Safeguarding Condition – 0 (0%) Relevant reason – 0 (0%) [Suffolk Wildlife Trust]	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.	Number of safeguarding conditions attached to planning decisions has increased since 2001/2, but surveys have not.		😐 Data limited but number of safeguarding conditions attached to bat roosts has increased, but surveys have not.
SSAG	Development proposals affecting BAP habitats outside protected areas (SWT)	Suffolk	**Habitat Action Plan** Lowland Heathland and Lowland Dry Acid Grassland total 1 Safeguarding Condition – 1 (100%) Reason for refusal – N/T Ponds total 17 Safeguarding Condition – 2 (12%) Reason for refusal – 1 (6%)	To use the new planning system more effectively to move towards the achievement of the Suffolk Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SLBAP) targets and aims.	Number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to planning decisions have increased since 2001/2.		😐 Data limited but number of surveys and safeguarding conditions attached to bat roosts have increased.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			Species Action Plan Bats all roosts total 321 Survey prior to decision – 41 (13%) Safeguarding Condition – 153 (48%) Reason for Refusal – 2 (1%) Great Crested Newts total 19 Survey prior to decision – 1 (5%) Safeguarding Condition – 5 (26%) Reason for refusal – 0 (0%) [Suffolk Wildlife Trust]				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance biodiversity							
Will it help to reverse the national decline in farmland birds?							
ME	Bird survey results (BTO/RSPB)	BDC	District level data not available.				
ME	Bird survey results (BTO/RSPB)	FHDC	District level data not available.				
ME	Bird survey results (BTO/RSPB)	IBC	District level data not available.				
ME	Bird survey results (BTO/RSPB)	MSDC	District level data not available.				
ME	Bird survey results (BTO/RSPB)	SEBC	District level data not available.				
ME	Bird survey results (BTO/RSPB)	SCDC	District level data not available.				
ME	Bird survey results (BTO/RSPB)	WDC	District level data not available.				
ME	Bird survey results (BTO/RSPB)	Suffolk	1995 – Total squares Surveyed: **37** Total number of species: **97** Mean count per square: **2.62** 2000 – Total squares Surveyed: **38** Total number of species: **118** Mean count per square: **3.11** 2001 – Total squares Surveyed: **22** Total number of species: **93** Mean count per square: **4.23** 2002 – Total squares Surveyed: **43** Total number of species: **10** Mean count per square: **2.44** 2003 – Total squares Surveyed: **40** Total number of species: **105** Mean count per square: **2.63** (Breeding Bird Survey, 31/08.04)	N/A	Since 1995 the mean count of species has generally increased, however 2002 saw a dramatic reduction in the number of species identified. Particular care should be taken when comparing these results.		😐 While these figures may provide a general indication of major changes in abundance over time they do not provide a statistically robust measure of such changes due to the overall number and variation in the number of sample squares surveyed.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (SSAG)	BDC	Grade 1 88 Grade 11* 219 Grade 11 3403 Total 3710 Buildings at Risk in 2003 11 (0.3%)	2nd highest number of LBs in Suffolk. No target. Lowest percentage of Buildings at Risk in Suffolk. Suffolk target is 0.7% by 2006.	Total LBs in 1995 was 3673, increasing to 3709 as of 2003. Reveals a gradual increase over time. Over the year 2003/04 there has been an addition of 1 Grade II listed building. % at risk has remained fairly constant.		☺ The increasing number of listed buildings is positive
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (SSAG)	FHDC	Grade 1 12 Grade 11* 23 Grade 11 448 Total 483 Buildings at Risk in 2003 9 (1.9%)	Lowest number of LBs in Suffolk. No target. Highest percentage of Buildings at Risk in Suffolk. Suffolk target is 0.7% by 2006.	Little change in number of LBs since 1995 (486). % at risk has remained fairly constant since 1995.		😐 A recent thematic survey of Newmarket is likely to result in an increase. Buildings are likely to be taken off the register at next year's review.
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (SSAG)	IBC	Grade 1 13 Grade 11* 32 Grade 11 565 Total 610 Buildings at Risk in 2003 6 (1%)	2nd lowest number of LBs in Suffolk. No target. Percentage at risk is just above the County average of 0.8%. Suffolk target is 0.7% by 2006.	Little change in number of LBs since 1995 (610). % at risk in 1995 was 2.1%, therefore substantial progress has been made to reduce the number.		
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (SSAG)	MSDC	Grade 1 85 Grade 11* 190 Grade 11 3783 Total 4058 Buildings at Risk in 2003 32 (0.8%)	Highest number of LBs in Suffolk. Percentage at risk is at the county average of 0.8%. Suffolk target is 0.7% by 2006.	Until 2003 total 'listings' as opposed to 'buildings' was recorded therefore difficult to compare past trends. However between 1995 and 2001 the number of entries increased from 3336 to 3401. As of 2003 total listed buildings was 4056. There has been an increase of 2 Grade 11 buildings since then. Number of buildings at risk has decreased from 48 in 1995 (the highest in Suffolk) to 32 in 2003, so significant progress has been made.		☺ Number of listed buildings has increased while buildings at risk has decreased.
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (SSAG)	SEBC	Grade 1 98 Grade 11* 160 Grade 11 2977 Total 3235 Buildings at Risk in 2003 33 (1%)	3rd highest number of LBs in Suffolk. Percentage at risk is just above the County average of 0.8%. Suffolk target is 0.7% by 2006.	Number of LBs has gradually increased since 1995 (2998) to 3234 in 2002/03 and 3235 in 2003/04 (one additional Grade II). Number and percentage of buildings at risk since 1995, 19 (0.6%) has gradually increased.		☺ The increasing number of listed buildings is positive ☹ The increasing number of buildings at risk is worrying and should be addressed.
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (SSAG)	SCDC	Grade 1 59 Grade 11* 168 Grade 11 2533 Total 2760	4th highest number of listed buildings in Suffolk.	Number of LBs has gradually increased from 2729 in 1985 to 2756 in 2003 and 2760 in 2004 (4 additional Grade II buildings).		☺ The increasing number of listed buildings is positive

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			Buildings at Risk in 2003 31 (1.1%)	2nd highest percentage of buildings at risk in Suffolk. Suffolk target is 0.7% by 2006.	Percentage at risk has remained fairly constant.		
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (SSAG)	WDC	Grade 1 49 Grade 11* 75 Grade 11 1475 Total 1599 Buildings at Risk in 2003 14 (0.9%)	5th highest number of LBs in Suffolk. % at risk is just above the County average of 0.8%. Suffolk target is 0.7% by 2006.	In 1995, there were 1644 LBs. In 2001 the methodology for calculating the number of LBs was revised which significantly reduced the number to 1596. Actual number of LBs has slightly increased since 1995. 2003 total 1598 2004 total 1599 (additional Grade II building) In 1995, 11 (0.7%) of the LBs were at risk. It is difficult to compare percentages due to the revised methodology for counting listed buildings. But the actual number of LBs at risk shows a recent fall in numbers following an increase to 12 in 1997 and 18 in 2000.		☺ Number of listed buildings has increased but number at risk has decreased.
SSAG	Number of listed buildings and buildings at risk (SSAG)	Suffolk	Grade 1 404 Grade 11* 867 Grade 11 15,184 Total 16,446 Buildings at Risk in 2003 134 (0.8%)	No target Just above the county target of 0.7% by 2006.	MSDC did not start reporting 'buildings' as opposed to 'listing entries' until 2003 therefore it is difficult to assess trends. However, taking into account the approximate difference in the figures for MSDC, and that no district or borough has shown a decrease in the number of LBs, in Suffolk the general trend has been a gradual increase in LBs since 1995. The overall number of listed building increased by 9 over the last financial year.		☺ Number of listed buildings has increased gradually since 1995. Number at risk has decreased this year and is moving towards the 2006 target.
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (SSAG)	BDC	**AONB (Ha) *9191*** **Special Landscape area (Ha) *19764*** **National designated historic parkland (Ha) *229.0 (5 parks)*** **County designated historic parkland (Ha) *Not applicable***	To ensure that 100% of historic parks and gardens are maintained and enhanced.	Overall drop in National Designated Parkland by 564.8 Ha since 2001, although number of parks has increased by one.		😐 Not measured annually. Number of parks has increased but area designated has dropped.
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (SSAG)	FHDC	**AONB (Ha) *Not applicable*** **Special Landscape area (Ha) *19244*** **National designated historic parkland (Ha) *0*** **County designated historic parkland (Ha) *Not applicable***	To ensure that 100% of historic parks and gardens are maintained and enhanced.	No change since 2001		☺ No change. Not measured annually.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (SSAG)	IBC	**AONB (Ha) *17*** **Special Landscape area (Ha) *Not applicable*** **National designated historic parkland (Ha) *109.3*** **County designated historic parkland (Ha) *Not applicable***	To ensure that 100% of historic parks and gardens are maintained and enhanced.	**Gained 17 Ha of AONB since 2001.** **Increase in the overall Ha of National Designated Parkland by 25.08 Ha since 2001.**		☺ Increase in AONB and Nationally Designated Parkland. Not measured annually.
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (SSAG)	MSDC	**AONB (Ha) *Not applicable*** **Special Landscape area (Ha) *11235*** **National designated historic parkland (Ha) *407.3 2 parks*** **County designated historic parkland (Ha) *Not applicable***	To ensure that 100% of historic parks and gardens are maintained and enhanced.	No change since 2001		☺ Not measured annually. No loss but difficult to measure the level of maintenance or any enhancement that takes place.
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (SSAG)	SEBC	**AONB (Ha) *Not applicable*** **Special Landscape area (Ha) *16687*** **National designated historic parkland (Ha) *1542 4 parks*** **County designated historic parkland (Ha) *Not applicable***	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.		☺ Not measured annually which means that it is difficult to discern any trends, however the increase in the number of nationally designated parks is positive.
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (SSAG)	SCDC	**AONB (Ha) *31962*** **Special Landscape area (Ha) *14788*** **National designated historic parkland (Ha) *420.26 (6 parks)*** **County designated historic parkland (Ha) *1745 (21 parks)***	To ensure that 100% of historic parks and gardens are maintained and enhanced.	**AONB and Special Landscape area – no change since 2001.** **Increase in the number of Nationally Designated Parkland from 4 in 2001 to 6 in 2003** **Only authority with County Designated Historic Parkland – has not changed since 1996**		☺ Not measured annually which means that it is difficult to discern any trends, however the increase in the number of nationally designated parks is positive.
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (SSAG)	WDC	**AONB (Ha) *5050.37*** **Special Landscape area (Ha) *3613.23*** **National designated historic parkland (Ha) *455.37 3 parks*** **County designated historic parkland (Ha) *Not applicable***	To ensure that 100% of historic parks and gardens are maintained and enhanced.	Increase by 1 Nationally Designated park since 2001, however the overall Ha has decreased by 35.43 Ha.		☺ Not measured annually. Decrease in Ha is due to improved measuring of site areas.
SSAG	Area of historic parks and gardens (SSAG)	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG)	BDC	28 CAs (1809 ha) 4 Article 4 directions	Largest hectarage in Suffolk. 3rd highest number in Suffolk. Suffolk total is 22. No target.	Number and area remained constant since 1996. Since monitoring in 2000, the number of Article 4 directions has remained fairly constant.		Article 4 for Glemsford covers approx 400 properties.
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG)	FHDC	13 CAs (594.9 ha) No Article 4 Directions	5th largest hectarage in Suffolk. No target.	Number and area remained constant since 1996.		😐 No additions proposed

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG)	IBC	13 CAs (249.02 ha) 3 Article 4 Directions (covering 464 properties)	Smallest hectarage in Suffolk. No target.	Since 1996 number has increased by 1 from 12 to 13 in 2003/04. Area in 2003 was 231 ha. As of 2004 249.02 ha. As of 2003 2 Article 4 Directions (covering 438 properties).		☺ Full Conservation Area boundary review Sept 2003. Over past year, one additional Conservation Area and Article 4 Direction.
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG)	MSDC	34 CAs (715 ha) 1 Article 4 Direction	4th largest hectarage in Suffolk. No target.	30 CAs in 1996 32 in 2001 33 in 2002 34 in 2003 First Article 4 was designated in 2002.		☺ Cretingham (with part of Framsden) CA also lies in SCDC. Not included here. Number of properties covered by Article 4 not available. Increase in designated Conservation areas highlight a greater protection to the built environment.
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG)	SEBC	35 CAs (1684 ha) 6 Article 4 Directions (covering 1015 properties)	2nd largest hectarage in Suffolk. No target.	27 CAs in 1996 31 in 2001 31 in 2002 34 in 2003 (1,671 ha) 2 Article 4s as of 2002 5 as of 2003 (1003 properties)		☺ The increasing number of conservation areas and Article 4 Directions is positive
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG)	SCDC	33 CAs (937 ha) No Article 4 Directions	3rd largest hectarage in Suffolk. No target.	No change in number since 1996.		Included Cretingham (with parts of Framsden) which lies in MSDC. Includes Walberswick which lies part in WDC.
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG)	WDC	14 CAs (331 ha) 7 Article 4 Directions (covering approx 5455 properties)	2nd smallest hectarage in Suffolk. No target.	No change in number since 1996. 7 Article 4 Directions since monitoring in 2000.		Part of Walberswick not included here but recorded under SCDC. In addition a small part of Ellingham CA in South Norfolk lies in WDC but not included. ☺ Good progress with Article 4 Directions.
SSAG	Number and area of Conservation Areas and Article 4 directions (SSAG)	Suffolk	170 CAs (6320 ha) 22 Article 4 Directions (covering approx 6934 properties)	No target.	157 in 1996 163 in 2001 165 in 2002 168 in 2003 At start of monitoring in 2000, 21 Article 4 Directions covering approx 7153 properties)		☺ The increasing number of conservation areas each year is positive. Data on number of properties covered by Article 4s is not complete but is improving. Improved accuracy has result in a reduced number.
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG)	BDC	5 Appraisals as of 04 18% of all conservation areas 1 enhancement schemes completed 03/04	2nd lowest percentage coverage in Suffolk. No target. Similar to other Suffolk Authorities. No target.	Increase of 2 since 1996. 8 schemes completed in 1995/96 3 in 1996/97 3 in 1997/98 3 in 1998/99 1 in 1999/00 1 in 2000/01 0 in 2001/02 0 in 2002/03 Total 19 - downward trend		😐 Limited progress Monitoring of enhancement schemes needs revisiting.
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG)	FHDC	3 Appraisals as of 04 23% of all conservation areas 0 enhancement schemes completed 03/04	3rd lowest percentage coverage in Suffolk. No target. Similar to other Suffolk Authorities. No target.	No progress since 1996. Enhancement Schemes completed: 2 in 1995/96 1 in 1996/97 0 in 1997/98 0 in 1998/99 0 in 1999/00 1 in 2000/01 0 in 2001/02 0 in 2002/03 Total 4 - downward trend		☹ Monitoring of enhancement schemes needs revisiting.
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG)	IBC	12 Appraisals as of 04 92% of all conservation areas 0 enhancement schemes completed 03/04	Highest percentage coverage in Suffolk. No target. Similar to other Suffolk Authorities. No target.	Increase of 1 appraisal between since 1996 and 2003 to give 9. Completion of 3 in 2003/04 and 1 underway gives almost 100% coverage for 13 conservation areas. Enhancement schemes completed: 0 in 1995/96 1 in 1996/97 2 in 1997/98 1 in 1998/99 0 in 1999/00 1 in 2000/01 0 in 2001/02 0 in 2002/03 Total 5 - downward trend		☺ Excellent progress Monitoring of enhancement schemes needs revisiting.
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG)	MSDC	13 Appraisals 41% of all conservation areas 0 enhancement schemes completed 03/04	3rd highest percentage coverage in Suffolk. No target. Similar to other Suffolk Authorities. No target.	Increase of 10 since 1996. None completed in 2003/04. 2 schemes completed in 1995/96 2 in 1996/97 0 in 1997/98 1 in 1998/99 3 in 1999/00 2 in 2000/01 0 in 2001/02 0 in 2002/03 Total 10 - downward trend		☺ Good progress Monitoring of enhancement schemes needs revisiting.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG)	SEBC	2 Appraisals as of 04 6% of conservation areas 0 enhancement schemes completed 03/04	Lowest percentage coverage in Suffolk but high percentage of interim statements (88%). No target. No target.	2 completed since 1996. 27 interim statements completed as of 1996. None completed in 02/03 and 03/04 Enhancement schemes completed: 2 in 1995/96 5 in 1996/97 5 in 1997/98 2 in 1998/99 0 in 1999/00 1 in 2000/01 No return in 2001/02 No return in 2002/03 Total 15 - downward trend		😐 Monitoring of enhancement schemes needs revisiting.
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG)	SCDC	12 Appraisals as of 04 36% of conservation areas 6 enhancement schemes completed 03/04	4th highest percentage coverage in Suffolk, plus high percentage of interim statements (52%). No target. Significant increase in schemes completed this financial year compared with other Suffolk Authorities. No target.	12 completed since 1996. No additional in 2003/04. Enhancement schemes completed: 7 in 1995/96 7 in 1996/97 4 in 1997/98 1 in 1998/99 7 in 1999/00 1 in 2000/01 1 in 2001/02 0 in 2002/03 Total 28 - downward trend but 2003/04 financial year shows a significant upturn.		☺ Good progress ☺ Good progress Monitoring of enhancement schemes needs revisiting.
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG)	WDC	9 Appraisals as of 04 64% of conservation areas Enhancement schemes completed – no return 03/04	2nd highest percentage coverage in Suffolk. No target. Similar to other Suffolk Authorities. No target.	2 completed since 1996. Bungay appraisal commenced Autumn 04. Enhancement schemes completed: 6 in 1995/96 2 in 1996/97 2 in 1997/98 1 in 1998/99 0 in 1999/00 2 in 2000/01 No return in 2001/02 No return in 2002/03 Total 13 - downward trend		😐 Slow progress. Monitoring of enhancement schemes needs revisiting.
SSAG	Number of Conservation Area Appraisals completed and enhancement schemes implemented (SSAG)	Suffolk	56 Appraisals 33% of conservation areas 7 enhancement schemes completed 03/04 6 in SCDC and 1 in BDC	No target. No target.	29 completed since the baseline figure of 24 in 1996. 53 as of 2003 27 schemes completed in 1995/96 21 in 1996/97 16 in 1997/98		😐 Slow progress. Number of schemes completed shows downward trend to 0 in 2002/3 but a significant increase

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
					9 in 1998/99 11 in 1999/00 9 in 2000/01 1in 2001/02 0 in 2002/03 Total 101 incl. 03/04 - downward trend		in 2003/04, albeit primarily down to SCDC. Monitoring of enhancement schemes needs revisiting.
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of archaeological value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG)	BDC	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	Figure has been 0 for all years since 1997-8		☺ None damaged since at least 1997-8
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG)	FHDC	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	Figure is 0 for all years since 1997-8		☺ None damaged since at least 1997-8
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG)	IBC	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	Figure has been 0 for all years since 1997-8		☺ None damaged since at least 1997-8
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG)	MSDC	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	Figure has been 0 for all years since 1997-8		☺ None damaged since at least 1997-8
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG)	SEBC	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	1997-8: 0 1998-9: 2 1999-0: 0 2000-1: 1 2001-2: 0 2002-3: 0 Figure is 0 for all years apart from 1998-9 and 2000-1. Figures are so low that this cannot count as a proper 'trend'		☺ Whilst there is a lack of trend information the complete lack of damage to ancient monuments over the past two years is very positive
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG)	SCDC	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	Figure has been 0 for all years since 1997-8 apart from 2001-2 and 2002-3, when one in each year were approved that might potentially impact on a SAM. Both were for sites that abut a SAM site rather than actually being included within one		☺ The results have been overwhelmingly positive since 1997-8
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG)	WDC	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	Figure has been 0 for all years since 1997-8		☺ None damaged since at least 1997-8
SSAG	Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) damaged as a result of development (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003-4: 0	To prevent damage to any SAMs as a result of development	1997-8: 0 1998-9: 2 1999-0: 0 2000-1: 1 (+1, SCDC, see above) 2001-2: 0		☺ No SAMs have been damaged since 2000-1

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
					2002-3 0 (+1, SCDC, see above) Figure is 0 for all years apart from 1998-9 and 2000-1. Figures are so low that this cannot count as a proper 'trend'		
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of archaeological value in both urban and rural areas?							
SSAG	Planning permissions affecting known or potential archaeological sites (SSAG)	BDC	2003-4: 26	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1997-8: 6 1998-9: 11 1999-0: 17 2000-1: 22 2001-2: 11 2002-3: 1	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	☺ This is largely dependent on the location of development, but the 2003-4 figure is the highest since the start of *Suffolk's Environment*
SSAG	Planning permissions affecting known or potential archaeological sites (SSAG)	FHDC	2003-4: 37	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1997-8: 6 (six months' data only) 1998-9: 16 1999-0: 16 2000-1: 25 2001-2: 12 2002-3: 7	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	☺ This is largely dependent on the location of development, but the 2003-4 figure is the highest since the start of *Suffolk's Environment*
SSAG	Number of applications affecting no known archaeological site but judged of high potential and approved with conditions requiring prior excavation or recording during development (SSAG)	IBC	2003-4: 17	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1997-8: 4 1998-9: 6 1999-0: 12 2000-1: 17 2001-2: 11 2002-3: 14	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	☺ This is largely dependent on the location of development, but the 2003-4 figure is the joint-highest since the start of *Suffolk's Environment*
SSAG	Number of applications affecting no known archaeological site but judged of high potential and approved with conditions requiring prior excavation or recording during development (SSAG)	MSDC	2003-4: 57	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1997-8: 13 1998-9: 18 1999-0: 16 2000-1: 23 2001-2: 7 2002-3: 1	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	☺ This is largely dependent on the location of development, but the 2003-4 figure is by far the highest since the start of *Suffolk's Environment*
SSAG	Number of applications affecting no known archaeological site but judged of high potential and approved with conditions requiring prior excavation or recording during development (SSAG)	SEBC	2003-4: 37	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1997-8: 9 1998-9: 6 1999-0: 28 2000-1: 16 2001-2: 19 2002-3: 10 Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	☺ This is largely dependent on the location of development, but the 2003-4 figure is the joint-highest since the start of *Suffolk's Environment*

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Number of applications affecting no known archaeological site but judged of high potential and approved with conditions requiring prior excavation or recording during development (SSAG)	SCDC	2003-4: 51	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1997-8: 17 1998-9: 20 1999-0: 13 2000-1: 34 2001-2: 31 2002-3: 29 Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	☺ This is largely dependent on the location of development, but the 2003-4 figure is by far the highest since the start of *Suffolk's Environment*
SSAG	Number of applications affecting no known archaeological site but judged of high potential and approved with conditions requiring prior excavation or recording during development (SSAG)	WDC	2003-4: 22	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1997-8: 1 1998-9: 4 1999-0: 5 2000-1: 11 2001-2: 8 2002-3: 1	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	☺ This is largely dependent on the location of development, but the 2003-4 figure is by far the highest since the start of *Suffolk's Environment*
SSAG	Number of applications affecting no known archaeological site but judged of high potential and approved with conditions requiring prior excavation or recording during development (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003-4: 2	To ensure that developments affecting archaeological sites of unknown importance but of high potential are granted appropriate protection against potentially damaging activities.	1998-9: 1 1999-0: 0 2000-1: 0 2001-2: 0 2002-3: 0	Figures vary from year-to-year as they are dependent on where development is proposed	☺ This is triggered only rarely, for few SCC applications affect areas of high archaeological potential
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of geological value in both urban and rural areas?							
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (EN)	BDC	2003/04 baseline Bobbitshole, Belstead 1.8ha (www.english-nature.org.uk)	No target	Notified under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act in 1987. No change since then.		☺ No loss
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (EN)	FHDC	As of 2003/04 Breckland Forest 18,078.7ha (also in St Eds/Breckland/KLWN) Thetford Heaths 269.36ha (also in St Eds) (www.english-nature.org.uk)	No target	Breckland forest notified under the Wildlife and countryside Act 1981 in 15 Nov 2000. Thetford Heaths notified in 1983 under the 1981 Act. No change since 2000.		☺ No loss
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (EN)	IBC	As of 2003/04 Stoke Tunnel Cutting 2.2ha (www.english-nature.org.uk)	No target	Notified under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act in 1990. No change since then.		☺ No loss
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (EN)	MSDC	As of 2003/04 Creeting St Mary Pits 5.2ha Great Blakenham Pit 2.08ha Hascot Hill Pit 0.4ha Hoxne Brick Pit 1.27ha	No target	All notified under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act prior to 2000. No change since then.		☺ No loss

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			Sandy Lane Pit, Barham 10.89ha (www.english-nature.org.uk)				
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (EN)	SEBC	As of 2003/04 Thetford Heaths (also FHDC) 269.36ha Breckland Forest (also FHDC/Breckland/KLWN) 18,078.7ha (www.english-nature.org.uk)	No target	Breckland forest notified under the Wildlife and countryside Act 1981 in 15 Nov 2000. Thetford Heaths notified in 1983 under the 1981 Act. No change since 2000.		☺ No loss
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (EN)	SCDC	2003/04 baseline Alde-Ore Estuary 2,554.3ha Aldeburgh Brick Pit 0.84ha Aldeburgh Hall Pit 0.8ha Buckanay Farm Pit, Alderton 0.75ha Chillesford Church Pit 1.0ha Crag Farm Pit, Sudbourne 4.6ha Crag Pit, Aldeburgh 0.8ha Ferry cliff, Sutton 3.0ha Gedgrave Hall Pit 0.6ha Neutral Farm Pit, Butley 1.0ha Ramsholt Cliff 2.1ha Red House Farm Pit 0.55ha Richmond Farm Pit, Gedgrave 0.5ha Rockhall Wood Pit, Sutton 5.4ha Round Hill Pit, Aldeburgh 0.5ha Sudbourne Park Pit 1.2ha Valley Farm Pit, Sudbourne 0.5ha Waldringfield Pit 0.069ha (www.english-nature.org.uk)	No target	All notified under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act prior to 2000. No change since 2000.		☺ No loss
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (EN)	WDC	2003/04 baseline Benacre to Easton Bavents 526.3ha Corton Cliffs 6.5ha Holton Pit 1.64ha (www.english-nature.org.uk)	No target	All notified under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act prior to 2000.		☺ No loss

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
DR	Change in number and area of designated geological SSSIs (EN)	Suffolk	2003/04 baseline 29 sites 21484.849ha (includes parts of Breckland forest and Thetford Heaths in Norfolk) (www.english-nature.org.uk)	No target	All notified under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act prior to 2000, apart from Thetford Heaths (15 Nov 2000). No change since 2000.		☺ No loss
Headline Objective: To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas of historical and archaeological importance							
Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of geological value in both urban and rural areas?							
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (EN)	BDC	Investigate.				
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (EN)	FHDC	Investigate.				
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (EN)	IBC	Investigate.				
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (EN)	MSDC	Investigate.				
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (EN)	SEBC	Investigate.				
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (EN)	SCDC	Investigate.				
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (EN)	WDC	Investigate.				
	Reported condition of geological SSSIs (EN)	Suffolk	Investigate.				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?							
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG)	BDC	Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 116 (= 54.7% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk.	% PDL completions in 2004 is higher than recorded in previous year, but indicator has fluctuated within range 39% to 65%, 1999/0 to 2002/3.		😐 Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG)	FHDC	Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 48 (= 71.6% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. 2nd highest % in Suffolk 2002/3.	% PDL completions is slightly lower than recorded in 2003, but higher than recorded in previous years (range = 39% to 56%, 1998/9 to 2000/1)		☺ Currently significantly higher than both the national and regional targets.
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG)	IBC	Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 469 (= 82.9% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Consistently has highest % in Suffolk.	% PDL completions have been consistently high from 1998/9, with the lowest recorded in 2001/2 (76.9%) and the highest in 2000/1 (89.7%)		☺ Currently significantly higher than both the national and regional targets.
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG)	MSDC	Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 192 (= 55.3% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk	Since 1998/9, % PDL completions have fluctuated between a minimum of 30% in 1998/9 to a peak of 62% in 200/1. This year's figure is higher than that recorded in the past 2 years.		😐 Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends. Percentage achieved is still being affected by the large SDA housing allocation currently under construction in the Local Plan and a predominantly rural district. Future allocations and developments envisage an improving trend.
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG)	SEBC	Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 294 (= 48.0% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Borough target of 40%	Last year % PDL completions were highest since 1998/9. % had increased for past 3 years from a minimum of 27% recorded in 2000/1 . This year the % has fallen but is still higher than all years except 2002/3.		😐 Although fallen this year, this indicator has previously shown consistent increases year on year, aided by housing allocations on PDL land. Completions exceed the borough target which is based on realistic levels of brownfield development which can be achieved within borough.
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG)	SCDC	Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 216 (= 47.5% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk.	Since 1998/9 the % PDL completions have varied between 30% in 2001/2 and 60%.This years figure is less than the 53% recorded last year.		😐 Indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG)	WDC	Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 148 (= 29.2% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Consistently has lowest % in Suffolk.	% PDL completions have been consistently low from 1998/9, with the lowest recorded in 2000/1 (18.4%). This years figure was highest since 1998/9, and the indicator has shown a year on year increase for last 3 years.	Low percentage of completions on PDL, but figure is improving in recent years.	😐 % PDLis low, but improving. Percentage achieved is still being affected by the number of large greenfield developments granted permission some years ago that are still being completed. Waveney Interim Local Plan envisages an improving trend.
SSAG	Number and percentage of new dwellings completed on previously developed land (SSAG)	Suffolk	Net completions on PDL 2003/4: 1483 (= 53.6% of total completions)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Suffolk meets regional target 2002/3.	% PDL has varied between 42%-54% since 1998/9. This year recorded the highest % since 1998/9 and % has increased for past 2 years.		☺ Suffolk total is currently above the regional target, and highest since 1998/9. However the indicator fluctuates, and % of completions on PDL has varied year on year.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG)	BDC	Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 1,478 (= 44.7% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk.	Large increase compared to last year's % of only 5.2%. Net commitments on PDL not recorded in previous years.		😐 Higher than last year, but indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG)	FHDC	Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 108 (= 3.7% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Lowest % of any district in Suffolk.	Decrease compared to 5.8% recorded last year. Net commitments on PDL not recorded for 2001/2. % PDL has fallen from 26-27% recorded in mid 1999 and 2000.		☹ Significantly below the national and regional targets and decreasing, which is a reflection of the predominately rural nature of the District.
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG)	IBC	Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 5,711 (= 76.4% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Consistently much higher than any other district in Suffolk.	% PDL fell from a peak of 87% in mid 1999, but has risen for the last 2 years.		☺ Consistently high % and increasing in recent years.
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG)	MSDC	Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 1,218 (= 50.2% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk.	% PDL has increased in the past 3 years, from values of 34% and 32% in mid 1999 and 2000.		☺ Below national and regional target, however is increasing year on year. A predominantly rural district and historic Greenfield permissions provide the reason for this low percentage.
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG)	SEBC	Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 2,899 (= 57.8% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. 2nd highest % in Suffolk this year.	Large increase since last year's figure of 23.2%, and % PDL is now significantly higher than the values of 20% and 19% recorded in mid 1999 and 2000. Net commitments on PDL not recorded for 2001/2.		☺ This is increasing year on year, particularly this year. However historic Greenfield developments mean that a high % commitments are not PDL
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG)	SCDC	Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 3,474 (= 37.4% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk.	Net commitments on PDL 2001/2: 1,391 (= 34.2% of commitments). % PDL has varied relatively little since mid 1999, but figure has increased for last 3 years and is now higher than those previously reported.		☺ This is increasing year on year.
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG)	WDC	Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 2,851 (= 37.7% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk.	Increasing trend, with annual increases reported for last 3 years. % PDL has increased substantially from the 14% reported in mid 1999 and 2000.		☺ Increasing trend. Also Waveney Interim Local Plan envisages an improving trend.
SSAG	Number and percentage of existing housing commitments on previously developed land (SSAG)	Suffolk	Net commitments on PDL 2003/4: 13,790 (= 50.2% of total commitments)	Regional target of 50% (RPG6). No specific target for Suffolk. Suffolk meets regional target, 2002/3, for first time since mid 1999.	Net commitments on PDL for Suffolk as a whole showed minimal change compared to last year (50.1%) % PDL has risen from values of 34% and 33% recorded in mid 1999 and 2000 (NB data was not available for all authorities in these years).		😐 Suffolk total currently meets the regional target and is higher than previous years. However the situation varies considerably between districts.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
HH	Number of vacant dwellings	BDC	Number of long-term vacant dwellings (empty more than 6 months) 2004 - 359 (source – Babergh Council Tax Records)				😐 No trend data.
HH	Number of vacant dwellings	FHDC	Number of long-term vacant dwellings (empty more than 6 months) 2004 – 200 (source - from the Empty Homes Survey 2004)		No trend data available from this source		😐 No trend data.
HH	Number of vacant dwellings	IBC	Number of long-term vacant dwellings (empty more than 6 months) 2004 – 428 (source – Empty Homes Survey 2004)		No trend data available from this source		😐 No trend data.
HH	Number of vacant dwellings	MSDC	Number of long-term vacant dwellings (empty more than 6 months) 2004 – 260 (source – Empty Homes Survey 2004)		No trend data available from this source		😐 No trend data.
HH	Number of vacant dwellings	SEBC	Number of long-term vacant dwellings (empty more than 6 months) 2004 - 404		2000 332 2001 460 2002 497 2003 602		😐 No trend data.
HH	Number of vacant dwellings	SCDC	Number of long-term vacant dwellings (empty more than 6 months) 2004 – 658 (source – Empty Homes Survey 2004)		No trend data available from this source		😐 No trend data.
HH	Number of vacant dwellings	WDC	Number of long-term vacant dwellings (empty more than 6 months) 2004 – 758 (source – Empty Homes survey 2004)		No trend data available from this source		😐 No trend data.
HH	Number of vacant dwellings	Suffolk	Number of long-term vacant dwellings 2004 – 3067		No trend data available from this source		😐 No trend data.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and/or townscape?							
SSAG	Changes in the landscape (WI landscape survey) (SSAG)	BDC	1km squares have been resurveyed and data will be available later in the year.				
SSAG	Changes in the landscape (WI landscape survey) (SSAG)	FHDC	1km squares have been resurveyed and data will be available later in the year.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Changes in the landscape (WI landscape survey) (SSAG)	IBC	1km squares have been resurveyed and data will be available later in the year.				
SSAG	Changes in the landscape (WI landscape survey) (SSAG)	MSDC	1km squares have been resurveyed and data will be available later in the year.				
SSAG	Changes in the landscape (WI landscape survey) (SSAG)	SEBC	1km squares have been resurveyed and data will be available later in the year.				
SSAG	Changes in the landscape (WI landscape survey) (SSAG)	SCDC	1km squares have been resurveyed and data will be available later in the year.				
SSAG	Changes in the landscape (WI landscape survey) (SSAG)	WDC	1km squares have been resurveyed and data will be available later in the year.				
SSAG	Changes in the landscape (WI landscape survey) (SSAG)	Suffolk	Original survey 1999. Reports % land use (6 categories), km length of linear features (4 types) and number of point features (3 types) for each of the 7 landscape character areas in Suffolk: Breckland, East Anglia Chalk, High Suffolk Claylands, Broads, Fens, South Suffolk Claylands, Suffolk Coast and Heaths. 1km squares have been resurveyed and data will be available later in the year.	To ensure that the character areas in Suffolk preserve their distinctive features.	Only 2 areas have been resurveyed, in 2001. Most significant change observed is more use of fencing as a boundary treatment, rather than traditional hedging. However, in most areas data is so far unavailable to describe trends.		😐 Not measured annually. Limited data available so far, so trends cannot be ascertained. Full update on changes will be available in 2004-5.
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and/or townscape?							
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons	BDC	Waiting info from County – Lynn Dicker				
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons	FHDC	Waiting info from County – Lynn Dicker				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons	IBC	Waiting info from County – Lynn Dicker				
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons	MSDC	Waiting info from County – Lynn Dicker				
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons	SEBC	Waiting info from County – Lynn Dicker				
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons	SCDC	Waiting info from County – Lynn Dicker				
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons	WDC	Waiting info from County – Lynn Dicker				
HH	Number / area of town / village greens and commons	Suffolk	Waiting info from County – Lynn Dicker				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and/or townscape?							
HH	Area of designated landscapes (AONB) (CA/DEFRA)	BDC	AONB – 9,191.20 ha 2004		2002/3 9487 ha 2001 9172 ha 1996 9172 ha	Area of AONB has decreased in 2003/4.	☹ Decreased since 2002/3 (although still higher than 1996 baseline).
HH	Area of designated landscapes (AONB) (CA/DEFRA)	FHDC	AONB – none 2004		2002/3 none 2001 none 1996 none		😐 No change – No AONB.
HH	Area of designated landscapes (AONB) (CA/DEFRA)	IBC	AONB – 17 ha 2004		2002/3 17 ha 2001 none 1996 none		☺ Increase since 1996 baseline. No change since 2002/3.
HH	Area of designated landscapes (AONB) (CA/DEFRA)	MSDC	AONB – none 2004		2002/3 none 2001 none 1996 none		😐 No change – No AONB.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
HH	Area of designated landscapes (AONB) (CA/DEFRA)	SEBC	AONB – none 2004		2002/3 none 2001 none 1996 none		😐 No change – No AONB.
HH	Area of designated landscapes (AONB) (CA/DEFRA)	SCDC	AONB – 31962 ha 2004		2002/3 31962 ha 2001 31962 ha 1996 31962 ha		☺ No change since 2002/3.
HH	Area of designated landscapes (AONB) (CA/DEFRA)	WDC	AONB – 5050.37ha 2004		2002/3 5050 ha 2001 4992 ha 1996 4992 ha		☺ Increase since 1996 baseline. No change since 2002/3.
HH	Area of designated landscapes (AONB) (CA/DEFRA)	Suffolk total	AONB – 46220.57 ha 2004		2002/3 46516 ha 2001 46126 ha 1996 46126 ha	Area of AONB has decreased in 2003/4.	☹ Decreased since 2002/3 in Babergh (although still higher than 1996 baseline).
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and/or townscape?							
HH	Number of Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (DEFRA)	BDC	New scheme so no baseline data, but anticipate will be available in the future.				
HH	Number of Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (DEFRA)	FHDC	New scheme so no baseline data, but anticipate will be available in the future.				
HH	Number of Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (DEFRA)	IBC	New scheme so no baseline data, but anticipate will be available in the future.				
HH	Number of Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (DEFRA)	MSDC	New scheme so no baseline data, but anticipate will be available in the future.				
HH	Number of Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (DEFRA)	SEBC	New scheme so no baseline data, but anticipate will be available in the future.				
HH	Number of Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (DEFRA)	SCDC	New scheme so no baseline data, but anticipate will be available in the future.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
HH	Number Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (DEFRA)	WDC	New scheme so no baseline data, but anticipate will be available in the future.				
HH	Number Countryside Stewardship / Environmental Stewardship schemes (DEFRA)	Suffolk	New scheme so no baseline data, but anticipate will be available in the future.				
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and/or townscape?							
HH	Light pollution (CPRE)	BDC	No data available.				
HH	Light pollution (CPRE)	FHDC	No data available.				
HH	Light pollution (CPRE)	IBC	No data available.				
HH	Light pollution (CPRE)	MSDC	No data available.				
HH	Light pollution (CPRE)	SEBC	No data available.				
HH	Light pollution (CPRE)	SCDC	No data available.				
HH	Light pollution (CPRE)	WDC	No data available.				
HH	Light pollution (CPRE)	Suffolk	% of area in each of the 5 light pollution bands Dark Blue 0-1.70 Blue 1.71-50 Light blue – 50.01-150		2000 Dark Blue – 7% Blue – 25% Light Blue – 59% Yellow – 8%		☹ overall levels of Light pollution has increased.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			Yellow – 150.01-240 Red 240.01-255 (Source CPRE)		Red – 1% 1993 Dark Blue – 5% Blue – 48% Light Blue – 40% Yellow – 7% Red - 1%		
Headline Objective: To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes							
Will it improve the landscape and/or townscape?							
	Number of planning applications refused for reasons due to poor design	BDC	Each District / Borough to do.				
	Number of planning applications refused for reasons due to poor design	FHDC	Each District / Borough to do.				
	Number of planning applications refused for reasons due to poor design	IBC	Each District / Borough to do.				
	Number of planning applications refused for reasons due to poor design	MSDC	Each District / Borough to do.				
	Number of planning applications refused for reasons due to poor design	SEBC	Each District / Borough to do.				
	Number of planning applications refused for reasons due to poor design	SCDC	Each District / Borough to do.				
	Number of planning applications refused for reasons due to poor design	WDC	Each District / Borough to do.				
	Number of planning applications refused for reasons due to poor design	Suffolk	Each District / Borough to do.				

ECONOMIC BASELINE DATA

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	BDC	**Not recorded**	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Not recorded		😐 No data available
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	FHDC	Not recorded	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Data only available for 2002/3: Development Gained (m^2) **3145** Development lost to other uses (m^2) **138** Net development change (m^2) **3007** Development gained on PDL (m^2) **2922**		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	IBC	Development Gained (m^2) **41366** Development lost to other uses (m^2) **Not recorded** Net development change (m^2) **Not recorded** Development gained on PDL (m^2) **30936**	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Development gained and amount on PDL are both much higher than previous years (2000/1 to 2002/3), but figures have fluctuated and show no clear trend.		☺/😐 Increases recorded this year, but indicator fluctuates and requires a longer period of data collection to observe reliable trends.
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	MSDC	Not recorded	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	No data recorded for 2003/4. No clear trend from previous years, but in 2001/2 and 2003/4 development gained on PDL and in total were both lower than 2000/1.		😐 Gaps in information means time series observations are difficult to make
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	SEBC (Urban)	Development Gained (m^2) **11579.5** Development lost to other uses (m^2) **2197.4** Net development change (m^2) **9382.1** Development gained on PDL (m^2) 1842	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Development is significantly lower than 2002/3 (48,700 m^2 gained) but figures have fluctuated in past years and show no clear trend.		😐 Fluctuation and gaps in information means time series observations are difficult to make
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	SEBC (Rural)	Development Gained (m^2) **3542** Development lost to other uses (m^2) 1069 Net development change (m^2) **2473** Development gained on PDL (m^2) **3542**	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Development is significantly lower than 2002/3 (23,380 m^2 gained) but figures have fluctuated in past years and show no clear trend.		😐 Fluctuation and gaps in information means time series observations are difficult to make

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	SCDC	Not recorded	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Data only available for 2002/3: Development Gained (m^2) **6577** Development lost to other uses (m^2) **0** Net development change (m^2) **6577** Development gained on PDL (m^2) **4922**		😐 Gaps in information means time series observations are difficult to make
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	WDC (Urban)	Development Gained (m^2) **2200** Development lost to other uses (m^2) 2399 Net development change (m^2) **-199** Development gained on PDL (m^2) **2200**	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Compared to 2002/3, development gained is lower and there is a net loss. All development was on PDL in both years. Not recorded for previous years.		😐 Gaps in information means time series observations are difficult to make
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	WDC (Rural)	Development Gained (m^2) **3940** Development lost to other uses (m^2) **0** Net development change (m^2) **3940** Development gained on PDL (m^2) **186**	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Compared to 2002/3, development gained is higher but less was on PDL. Not recorded for previous years.		😐 Gaps in information means time series observations are difficult to make
SSAG	Take-up of employment floorspace (SSAG)	Suffolk	Too much data missing to calculate a meaningful county total.	Target to maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year-on-year employment development. Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too much data missing to evaluate a meaningful county trend.		😐 Gaps in information means overall and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	BDC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **Not recorded** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **Not recorded** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **9** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 0	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	BDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **33000** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **14017** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **1.8** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1.4	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	FHDC (All rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **Not recorded** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **Not recorded** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **20.57**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment	Little change in outstanding allocations since last year.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make. There are major employment allocations at Brandon, Newmarket and Red Lodge still to be implement, the

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1	Land Returns			latter has outline planning permission. Completion rates have been low in recent years.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	IBC (All urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) 19,438 Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **19,438** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **6** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1.9**4**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	All measures have decreased since March 2003.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	MSDC (All rural)	Not recorded	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Data available for 2003: Total outstanding permissions at March 2003 (m^2) **179002** Outstanding permissions March 2003 on PDL (m^2) **0** Total outstanding allocations at March 2003 (Ha) **23.73** Outstanding allocations at March 2003 on PDL (Ha) **3.9**		😐 Figures indicate a good supply of land with outstanding employment permissions available. Note: Completion rates are slow and need to ensure that take up of employment sites take place.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	SEBC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) 27,977.5 Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **4,774.0** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **3** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **1.83**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Outstanding business permissions are much lower than last year, but outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	SEBC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) 31,807.6 Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **20,987.6** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **43.72** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **31.62**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Outstanding business permissions are much lower than last year, but outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	SCDC (All rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **98,440** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **81,507** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **54.75** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **14.07**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Outstanding business permissions are much lower than last year although the amount on PDL has increased. Outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	WDC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **104,040** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) 101,733 Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **4** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **0**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Number of outstanding permissions has increased and amount on PDL had increased significantly. Outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make. Little change takes place in the amount of land with permission or allocated. Employment land study to be carried out to assess the amount and quality of employment land needed.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	WDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **184,257** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) 89,709 Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **4.8** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **0**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Number of outstanding permissions has decreased but amount on PDL has increased. Outstanding allocations has decreased.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make. Little change takes place in the amount of land with permission or allocated. Employment land study to be carried out to assess the amount and quality of employment land needed.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	Suffolk	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **Data missing from 3 authorities** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **Data missing from 3 authorities** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **Total 147.64 (excluding MSDC)** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **Total 51.86 (excluding MSDC)**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too many values missing this year to look at county trends in outstanding permissions. Outstanding land allocations (total and on PDL) have both decreased from March 2003.		😐 Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
AMcC	Net percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (SDA / Suffolk Observatory)	BDC	+ 0.6% (2003) (Latest data available from Suffolk Observatory)	Target – To maintain and, where possible, increase the number of businesses registered in the area.	Total stock of VAT registered businesses has increased steadily year on year since 2001.		☺ Trend shows increase in businesses registered annually since 2001. Easy to monitor as sources easily accessible.
AMcC	Net percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (SDA / Suffolk Observatory)	FHDC	+ 2.4% (2003) (Latest data available from Suffolk Observatory)	Target – To maintain and, where possible, increase the number of businesses registered in the area. 2nd highest % increase in Suffolk in 2003	Total stock of VAT registered businesses has increased steadily year on year since 2001.		☺ Trend shows increase in businesses registered annually since 2001. Easy to monitor as sources easily accessible.
AMcC	Net percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (SDA / Suffolk Observatory)	IBC	+ 2.5% (2003) (Latest data available from Suffolk Observatory)	Target – To maintain and, where possible, increase the number of businesses registered in the area. Highest % increase in Suffolk in 2003	Total stock of VAT registered businesses has in 2003, reversing a decreasing trend in 2001 and 2002.		☺ Trend shows increase in businesses registered this year. Easy to monitor as sources easily accessible.
AMcC	Net percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (SDA / Suffolk Observatory)	MSDC	+ 0% (2003) (Latest data available from Suffolk Observatory)	Target – To maintain and, where possible, increase the number of businesses registered in the area. Lowest % increase in Suffolk in 2003	Total stock of VAT registered businesses has remained static in 2003, but had increased in 2001 and 2002.	Increase in registered businesses has slowed this year. Monitor to check growth doesn't decline in future.	☺ Trend shows increase in businesses registered since 2001, though static in 2003. Easy to monitor as sources easily accessible.
AMcC	Net percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (SDA / Suffolk Observatory)	SEBC	+ 1.4% (2003) (Latest data available from Suffolk Observatory)	Target – To maintain and, where possible, increase the number of businesses registered in the area.	Total stock of VAT registered businesses has increased steadily year on year since 2001.		☺ Trend shows increase in businesses registered annually since 2001. Easy to monitor as sources easily accessible.
AMcC	Net percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (SDA / Suffolk Observatory)	SCDC	+ 1.2% (2003) (Latest data available from Suffolk Observatory)	Target – To maintain and, where possible, increase the number of businesses registered in the area.	Total stock of VAT registered businesses has increased steadily year on year since 2001.		☺ Trend shows increase in businesses registered annually since 2001. Easy to monitor as sources easily accessible.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
AMcC	Net percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (SDA / Suffolk Observatory)	WDC	+ 0.2% (2003) (Latest data available from Suffolk Observatory)	Target – To maintain and, where possible, increase the number of businesses registered in the area. 2nd lowest % increase in Suffolk in 2003	Total stock of VAT registered businesses has increased steadily year on year since 2002, following a small decrease in 2001.		☺ Trend shows increase in businesses registered annually since 2002. Easy to monitor as sources easily accessible.
AMcC	Net percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (SDA / Suffolk Observatory)	Suffolk	+ 1.1% (2003) (Latest data available from Suffolk Observatory)	Target – To maintain and, where possible, increase the number of businesses registered in the area.	Total stock of VAT registered businesses has increased steadily year on year since 2002, following a small decrease in 2001.		☺ Trend shows increase in businesses registered annually since 2001. Easy to monitor as sources easily accessible.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve business development and enhance competitiveness?							
SB	Business formation rate (or new VAT registrations as % of total VAT registered stock) (SDA/Suffolk Observatory)	BDC	2003: 8.9		Business development rate has increased each year since 2001.		☺
SB	Business formation rate (or new VAT registrations as % of total VAT registered stock) (SDA/Suffolk Observatory)	FHDC	2003: 10.9	2nd highest in Suffolk.	Business development rate has increased each year since 2001.		☺
SB	Business formation rate (or new VAT registrations as % of total VAT registered stock) (SDA/Suffolk Observatory)	IBC	2003: 11.5	Highest in Suffolk.	Business development rate has increased each year since 2001.		☺
SB	Business formation rate (or new VAT registrations as % of total VAT registered stock) (SDA/Suffolk Observatory)	MSDC	2003: 8.1	Lowest in Suffolk.	Business development rate has increased each year since 2001.		☺
SB	Business formation rate (or new VAT registrations as % of total VAT registered stock) (SDA/Suffolk Observatory)	SEBC	2003: 9.3		Business development rate has decreased in 2003, and has fluctuated since 2001.		😐/☺
SB	Business formation rate (or new VAT registrations as % of total VAT registered stock) (SDA/Suffolk Observatory)	SCDC	2003: 9.4		Business development rate has increased each year since 2001.		☺
SB	Business formation rate (or new VAT registrations as % of total VAT registered stock) (SDA/Suffolk Observatory)	WDC	2003: 8.3	2nd lowest in Suffolk.	Business development rate has decreased slightly in 2003, but prior to this had increased steadily each year since 2000.		😐/☺
SB	Business formation rate (or new VAT registrations as % of total VAT registered stock) (SDA/Suffolk Observatory)	Suffolk	2003: 9.3	East of England 2003: 10.2 England 2003: 10.6	Business development rate has increased each year since 2001.		☺ Increasing trend, although in 2003 business development rate was lower than in other parts of England and the East.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve the resilience of business and the economy?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Suffolk Observatory)	BDC	Start Ups = 300 Closures = 275 Net Change = + 25 (2003, SDA)		Trend data from Suffolk Observatory available (i.e. previous years stats)		☺
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Suffolk Observatory)	FHDC	Start Ups = 235 Closures = 185 Net Change = + 50 (2003, SDA)		Trend data from Suffolk Observatory available (i.e. previous years stats)		☺
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Suffolk Observatory)	IBC	Start Ups = 325 Closures = 260 Net Change = + 65 (2003, SDA)		Trend data from Suffolk Observatory available (i.e. previous years stats)		☺
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Suffolk Observatory)	MSDC	Start Ups = 315 Closures = 310 Net Change = + 5 (2003, SDA)		Trend data from Suffolk Observatory available (i.e. previous years stats)		☺
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Suffolk Observatory)	SEBC	Start Ups = 330 Closures = 280 Net Change = + 50 (2003, SDA)		Trend data from Suffolk Observatory available (i.e. previous years stats)		☺
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Suffolk Observatory)	SCDC	Start Ups = 400 Closures = 355 Net Change = + 45 (2003, SDA)		Trend data from Suffolk Observatory available (i.e. previous years stats)		☺
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Suffolk Observatory)	WDC	Start Ups = 235 Closures = 230 Net Change = + 5 (2003, SDA)		Trend data from Suffolk Observatory available (i.e. previous years stats)		☺
AMcC	Business start ups and closures (Suffolk Observatory)	Suffolk	Start Ups = 2140 Closures = 1900 Net Change = +240 (2003, SDA)		Trend data from Suffolk Observatory available (i.e. previous years stats)		☺
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve the resilience of business and the economy?							
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG)	BDC	% all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 2.3 energy and water - manufacturing 15.9 construction 12.1 distribution, hotels and restaurants 12.3 transport and communications 8.9 banking, finance and insurance 9.1 public admin., education and health 29.4 other services 9.2 total services 69	No specific target Source- ONS - Local Area Labour Force Survey [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]	Comments given on countywide basis only.		😐 Further work required to review district level data from 1999/2000 to 2003/4 and identify trends.
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG)	FHDC	% all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 4.6 energy and water - manufacturing 17.2 construction 6.8	No specific target Source- ONS - Local Area Labour	Comments given on countywide basis only.		😐 Further work required to review district level data from 1999/2000 to 2003/4 and identify trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			distribution, hotels and restaurants 20.3 transport and communications - banking, finance and insurance 17.1 public admin., education and health 28.5 other services - total services 71.5	Force Survey [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]			
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG)	IBC	% all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing - energy and water - manufacturing 11.4 construction 7.4 distribution, hotels and restaurants 20.3 transport and communications 16.4 banking, finance and insurance 15.8 public admin., education and health 26 other services 1.7 total services 80.2	No specific target Source- ONS - Local Area Labour Force Survey [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]	Comments given on countywide basis only.		😐 Further work required to review district level data from 1999/2000 to 2003/4 and identify trends.
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG)	MSDC	% all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 3.2 energy and water - manufacturing 16.3 construction 12.4 distribution, hotels and restaurants 18.4 transport and communications 7 banking, finance and insurance 17 public admin., education and health 19.2 other services 5.6 total services 67.2	No specific target Source- ONS - Local Area Labour Force Survey [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]	Comments given on countywide basis only.		😐 Further work required to review district level data from 1999/2000 to 2003/4 and identify trends.
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG)	SEBC	% all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 2.4 energy and water 1.8 manufacturing 23.6 construction 4.6 distribution, hotels and restaurants 21.9 transport and communications 5.9 banking, finance and insurance 7.8 public admin., education and health 26.6 other services 5.4 total services 67.5	No specific target Source- ONS - Local Area Labour Force Survey [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]	Comments given on countywide basis only.		😐 Further work required to review district level data from 1999/2000 to 2003/4 and identify trends.
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG)	SCDC	% all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 3.8 energy and water 1.5 manufacturing 10.1 construction 6.8 distribution, hotels and restaurants 19 transport and communications 17.4 banking, finance and insurance 10	No specific target Source- ONS - Local Area Labour Force Survey [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]	Comments given on countywide basis only.		😐 Further work required to review district level data from 1999/2000 to 2003/4 and identify trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			public admin., education and health 25.1 other services 6.4 total services 77.8				
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG)	WDC	% all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 2 energy and water 3.5 manufacturing 21.3 construction 6.6 distribution, hotels and restaurants 23.3 transport and communications 6.7 banking, finance and insurance 11.8 public admin., education and health 21.1 other services 3.8 total services 66.7	No specific target Source- ONS - Local Area Labour Force Survey [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]	Comments given on countywide basis only.		😐 Further work required to review district level data from 1999/2000 to 2003/4 and identify trends.
SSAG	Number and percentage of employees by employment division (SSAG)	Suffolk	% all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 2.5 energy and water 1.2 manufacturing 16.3 construction 8 distribution, hotels and restaurants 19.4 transport and communications 9.9 banking, finance and insurance 12.3 public admin., education and health 25.1 other services 5 total services 71.8	No specific target <u>East of England</u> % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 1.6 energy and water 0.7 manufacturing 14.1 construction 8.2 distribution, hotels and restaurants 19.9 transport and communications 7.2 banking, finance and insurance 17.6 public admin., education and health 24.6 other services 6 total services 75.3 <u>Great Britain</u> % all in employment who work in: agriculture and fishing 1.2 energy and water 1 manufacturing 14.3 construction 7.5 distribution, hotels and restaurants 20.1 transport and communications 6.8 banking, finance and insurance 15.6 public admin., education and health 27.1 other services 6.1 total services 75.7 Source- ONS [From Nomis 25 Jan 2005]	As an essentially contextual indicator, the scope for informative commentary here is limited. However, this is useful as a possible measure of diversity in the local employment base. Caution is needed in making comparisons due to uncertainties in continuity of data. Leaving aside what generally seem to be relatively minor fluctuations, trends include an apparent large decline in the distribution, hotels and restaurants employment sector (from 28.2% to 19.4%). The public admin. / education & health sector shows an apparent rise from 21.6% to 25.1%, as the 2nd largest change.		😐 Further work required to review district level data from 1999/2000 to 2003/4 and identify trends.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve the resilience of business and the economy?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (AMR)	BDC	Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2004: agriculture 410 (11.2%) production 365 (9.9%) construction 395 (10.7%) motor trades 140 (3.8%) wholesale 230 (6.3%) retail 390 (10.6%) hotels & catering 255 (6.9%) transport 150 (4.1%) post & telecom 30 (0.8%) finance 40 (1.1%) property & business services 825 (22.4%) education 65 (1.8%) health 50 (1.4%) public admin & other services 325 (8.8%)		Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2003: agriculture 410 (11.2%) production 370 (10.2%) construction 380 (10.4%) motor trades 135 (3.7%) wholesale 225 (6.2%) retail 390 (10.7%) hotels & catering 240 (6.6%) transport 145 (4.0%) post & telecom 35 (1.0%) finance 35 (1.0%) property & business services 830 (22.8%) education 65 (1.8%) health 50 (1.4%) public admin & other services 335 (9.2%)		😐 Little change since last year. Further work required to review district level data before 2003 and identify trends.
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (AMR)	FHDC	Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2004: agriculture 220 (9.1%) production 200 (8.3%) construction 255 (10.5%) motor trades 95 (3.9%) wholesale 130 (5.4%) retail 270 (11.2%) hotels and catering 160 (6.6%) transport 85 (3.5%) post & telecom 35 (1.4%) finance 25 (1.0%) property and business services 405 (16.7%) education 30 (1.2%) health 30 (1.2%) public admin and other services 470 (19.4%)		Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2003: agriculture 215 (9.0%) production 205 (8.6%) construction 240 (10.0%) motor trades 100 (4.2%) wholesale 125 (5.2%) retail 280 (11.7%) hotels and catering 150 (6.3%) transport 85 (3.5%) post & telecom 35 (1.5%) finance 25 (1.0%) property and business services 405 (16.9%) education 30 (1.3%) health 25 (1.0%) public admin and other services 470 (19.6%)		😐 Little change since last year. Further work required to review district level data before 2003 and identify trends.
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (AMR)	IBC	Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2004: agriculture 25 (0.6%) production 235 (6.1%) construction 335 (8.6%) motor trades 180 (4.6%) wholesale 200 (5.2%) retail 635 (16.4%) hotels and catering 335 (8.6%) transport 185 (4.8%) post & telecom 70 (1.8%) finance 110 (2.8%) property and business services 1000 (25.8%) education 80 (2.1%) health 95 (2.4%) public admin and other services 395		Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2003: agriculture 20 (0.5%) production 235 (6.1%) construction 320 (8.4%) motor trades 185 (4.8%) wholesale 200 (5.2%) retail 650 (17.0%) hotels and catering 335 (8.7%) transport 185 (4.8%) post & telecom 65 (1.7%) finance 100 (2.6%) property and business services 965 (25.2%) education 80 (2.1%) health 90 (2.3%) public admin and other services 395		😐 Little change since last year. Further work required to review district level data before 2003 and identify trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			(10.2%)		(10.3%)		
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (AMR)	MSDC	Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2004: agriculture 700 (16.9%) production 340 (8.2%) construction 495 (12.0%) motor trades 175 (4.2%) wholesale 220 (5.3%) retail 330 (8.0%) hotels and catering 220 (5.3%) transport 180 (4.4%) post & telecom 40 (1.0%) finance 25 (0.6%) property and business services 895 (21.7%) education 75 (1.8%) health 70 (1.8%) public admin and other services 365 (8.8%)		Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2003: agriculture 705 (17.0%) production 360 (8.7%) construction 480 (11.6%) motor trades 175 (4.2%) wholesale 235 (5.7%) retail 330 (7.9%) hotels and catering 220 (5.3%) transport 190 (4.6%) post & telecom 35 (0.8%) finance 25 (0.6%) property and business services 880 (21.6%) education 75 (1.8%) health 75 (1.8%) public admin and other services 365 (8.8%)		😐 Little change since last year. Further work required to review district level data before 2003 and identify trends.
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (AMR)	SEBC	Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2004: agriculture 335 (8.0%) production 410 (9.8%) construction 420 (10.0%) motor trades 205 (4.9%) wholesale 270 (6.5%) retail 470 (11.2%) hotels and catering 300 (7.2%) transport 125 (3.0%) post & telecom 50 (1.2%) finance 60 (1.4%) property and business services 945 (22.6%) education 80 (1.9%) health 70 (1.7%) public admin and other services 420 (10.0%)		Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2003: agriculture 340 (8.1%) production 420 (10.0%) construction 410 (9.8%) motor trades 200 (4.8%) wholesale 270 (6.5%) retail 480 (11.5%) hotels and catering 305 (7.3%) transport 135 (3.2%) post & telecom 50 (1.2%) finance 65 (1.6%) property and business services 920 (22.0%) education 80 (1.9%) health 70 (1.7%) public admin and other services 430 (10.3%)		😐 Little change since last year. Further work required to review district level data before 2003 and identify trends.
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (AMR)	SCDC	Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2004: agriculture 500 (10.6%) production 320 (6.8%) construction 390 (8.3%) motor trades 175 (3.7%) wholesale 195 (4.1%) retail 460 (9.8%) hotels and catering 360 (7.6%) transport 440 (9.3%) post & telecom 85 (1.8%) finance 40 (0.8%) property and business services 1100		Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2003: agriculture 520 (11.1%) production 325 (6.9%) construction 370 (7.9%) motor trades 175 (3.7%) wholesale 195 (4.2%) retail 470 (10.0%) hotels and catering 355 (7.6%) transport 425 (9.1%) post & telecom 90 (1.9%) finance 35 (0.7%) property and business services 1095		😐 Little change since last year. Further work required to review district level data before 2003 and identify trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			(23.3%) education 90 (1.9%) health 50 (1.1%) public admin and other services 505 (10.7%)		(23.4%) education 85 (1.8%) health 50 (1.1%) public admin and other services 495 (10.6%)		
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (AMR)	WDC	Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2004: agriculture 270 (7.8%) production 300 (8.7%) construction 330 (9.5%) motor trades 155 (4.5%) wholesale 150 (4.3%) retail 580 (16.7%) hotels and catering 325 (9.4%) transport 135 (3.9%) post & telecom 20 (0.6%) finance 45 (1.3%) property and business services 645 (18.6%) education 75 (2.2%) health 75 (2.2%) public admin and other services 360 (10.4%)		Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2004: agriculture 285 (8.2%) production 300 (8.7%) construction 315 (9.1%) motor trades 150 (4.3%) wholesale 165 (4.8%) retail 580 (16.7%) hotels and catering 315 (9.1%) transport 135 (3.9%) post & telecom 25 (0.7%) finance 40 (1.2%) property and business services 635 (18.3%) education 80 (2.3%) health 85 (2.5%) public admin and other services 360 (10.4%)		😐 Little change since last year. Further work required to review district level data before 2003 and identify trends.
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by main industry type (AMR)	Suffolk	Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2004: agriculture 2460 (9.3%) production 2165 (8.2%) construction 2625 (9.9%) motor trades 1130 (4.3%) wholesale 1395 (5.3%) retail 3145 (11.9%) hotels and catering 1950 (7.4%) transport 1310 (4.9%) post & telecom 330 (1.2%) finance 345 (1.3%) property and business services 5820 (22.0%) education 500 (1.9%) health 445 (1.7%) public admin and other services 2840 (10.7%)		Number (and%) of local units by broad industry group in 2004: agriculture 2495 (9.5%) production 2230 (8.5%) construction 2515 (9.5%) motor trades 1120 (4.3%) wholesale 1410 (5.4%) retail 3185 (12.1%) hotels and catering 1920 (7.3%) transport 1300 (4.9%) post & telecom 335 (1.3%) finance 320 (1.2%) property and business services 5735 (21.8%) education 490 (1.9%) health 445 (1.7%) public admin and other services 2855 (10.8%)		😐 Little change since last year. Further work required to review data before 2003 and identify trends.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve the resilience of business and the economy?							
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (AMR)	BDC	Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2004: 0-4: 2685 (73.2%) 5-9: 475 (12.9%) 10-19: 270 (7.4%) 20-49: 155 (4.2%) 50-99: 60 (1.6%) 100-249: 20 (0.5%) 250-499: 5 (0.1%)		Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2003: 0-4: 2615 (71.8%) 5-9: 515 (14.1%) 10-19: 270 (7.4%) 20-49: 155 (4.3%) 50-99: 60 (1.6%) 100-249: 15 (0.4%) 250-499: 5 (0.1%)		😐 Further work required to review data before 2003 and identify trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			500-999: 5 (0.1%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		500-999: 5 (0.1%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (AMR)	FHDC	Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2004: 0-4: 1570 (65.0%) 5-9: 425 (17.6%) 10-19: 230 (9.5%) 20-49: 130 (5.4%) 50-99: 35 (1.5%) 100-249: 20 (0.8%) 250-499: 5 (0.2%) 500-999: 0 (0.0%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2003: 0-4: 1550 (64.9%) 5-9: 420 (17.6%) 10-19: 235 (9.8%) 20-49: 125 (5.2%) 50-99: 40 (1.7%) 100-249: 20 (0.8%) 250-499: 5 (0.2%) 500-999: 0 (0.0%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		😐 Further work required to review data before 2003 and identify trends.
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (AMR)	IBC	Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2004: 0-4: 2220 (57.4%) 5-9: 740 (19.1%) 10-19: 415 (10.7%) 20-49: 275 (7.1%) 50-99: 120 (3.1%) 100-249: 75 (1.9%) 250-499: 15 (0.4%) 500-999: 10 (0.3%) 1000+: 5 (0.1%)		Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2003: 0-4: 2155 (56.3%) 5-9: 710 (18.6%) 10-19: 460 (12.0%) 20-49: 275 (7.2%) 50-99: 130 (3.4%) 100-249: 70 (1.8%) 250-499: 20 (0.5%) 500-999: 5 (0.1%) 1000+: 5 (0.1%)		😐 Further work required to review data before 2003 and identify trends.
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (AMR)	MSDC	Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2004: 0-4: 3085 (74.8%) 5-9: 530 (12.8%) 10-19: 275 (6.7%) 20-49: 155 (3.8%) 50-99: 45 (1.1%) 100-249: 20 (0.5%) 250-499: 5 (0.1%) 500-999: 5 (0.1%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2003: 0-4: 3080 (74.2%) 5-9: 545 (13.1%) 10-19: 295 (7.1%) 20-49: 155 (3.7%) 50-99: 50 (1.2%) 100-249: 15 (0.4%) 250-499: 10 (0.2%) 500-999: 5 (0.1%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		😐 Further work required to review data before 2003 and identify trends.
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (AMR)	SEBC	Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2004: 0-4: 2680 (64.2%) 5-9: 685 (16.4%) 10-19: 405 (9.7%) 20-49: 260 (6.2%) 50-99: 90 (2.2%) 100-249: 35 (0.8%) 250-499: 10 (0.2%) 500-999: 5 (0.1%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2003: 0-4: 2645 (63.3%) 5-9: 725 (17.3%) 10-19: 410 (9.8%) 20-49: 255 (6.1%) 50-99: 90 (2.2%) 100-249: 40 (1.0%) 250-499: 10 (0.2%) 500-999: 0 (0.0%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		😐 Further work required to review data before 2003 and identify trends.
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (AMR)	SCDC	Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2004: 0-4: 3300 (70.0%) 5-9: 700 (14.8%) 10-19: 390 (8.3%)		Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2004: 0-4: 3285 (70.2%) 5-9: 705 (15.1%) 10-19: 435 (9.3%)		😐 Further work required to review data before 2003 and identify trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			20-49: 215 (4.6%) 50-99: 65 (1.4%) 100-249: 30 (0.6%) 250-499: 5 (0.1%) 500-999: 0 (0.0%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		20-49: 200 (4.3%) 50-99: 65 (1.4%) 100-249: 20 (0.4%) 250-499: 10 (0.2%) 500-999: 0 (0.0%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (AMR)	WDC	Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2004: 0-4: 2300 (66.5%) 5-9: 570 (16.5%) 10-19: 300 (8.7%) 20-49: 195 (5.6%) 50-99: 55 (1.6%) 100-249: 30 (0.9%) 250-499: 10 (0.3%) 500-999: 5 (0.1%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2004: 0-4: 2255 (64.2%) 5-9: 610 (17.6%) 10-19: 335 (9.7%) 20-49: 200 (5.8%) 50-99: 60 (1.7%) 100-249: 20 (0.6%) 250-499: 10 (0.3%) 500-999: 5 (0.1%) 1000+: 0 (0.0%)		😐 Further work required to review data before 2003 and identify trends.
SB	Number and percentage of businesses by size (number of employees) (AMR)	Suffolk	Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2004: 0-4: 17,845 (67.5%) 5-9: 4125 (15.6%) 10-19: 2285 (8.6%) 20-49: 1390 (5.3%) 50-99: 475 (1.8%) 100-249: 220 (0.8%) 250-499: 60 (0.2%) 500-999: 25 (0.1%) 1000+: 10 (0.0%)		Number (and %) of local units by employment size band 2004: 0-4: 17,500 (66.5%) 5-9: 4230 (16.1%) 10-19: 2445 (9.3%) 20-49: 1355 (5.1%) 50-99: 495 (1.9%) 100-249: 210 (0.8%) 250-499: 65 (0.2%) 500-999: 20 (0.1%) 1000+: 5 (0.0%)		😐 Further work required to review data before 2003 and identify trends.
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it promote growth in key sectors?							
	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local authority to specify key sectors) (SSAG / AMR)	BDC	Each LA to complete based on own key sectors.				
	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local authority to specify key sectors) (SSAG / AMR)	FHDC	Each LA to complete based on own key sectors.				
	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local authority to specify key sectors) (SSAG / AMR)	IBC	Each LA to complete based on own key sectors.				
	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local authority to specify key sectors) (SSAG / AMR)	MSDC	Each LA to complete based on own key sectors.				
	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local authority to specify key sectors) (SSAG / AMR)	SEBC	Each LA to complete based on own key sectors.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local authority to specify key sectors) (SSAG / AMR)	SCDC	Each LA to complete based on own key sectors.				
	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local authority to specify key sectors) (SSAG / AMR)	WDC	Each LA to complete based on own key sectors.				
	Number and percentage of businesses by industry type in key sectors (local authority to specify key sectors) (SSAG / AMR)	Suffolk	Each LA to complete based on own key sectors.				
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it improve economic performance in advantaged and disadvantaged areas?							
	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (ODPM/estate agents)	BDC	Each LA to complete based on identified advantaged and disadvantaged areas in own area (ODPM town centre data/estate agents etc).				
	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (ODPM/estate agents)	FHDC	Each LA to complete based on identified advantaged and disadvantaged areas in own area (ODPM town centre data/estate agents etc).				
	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (ODPM/estate agents)	IBC	Each LA to complete based on identified advantaged and disadvantaged areas in own area (ODPM town centre data/estate agents etc).				
	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (ODPM/estate agents)	MSDC	Each LA to complete based on identified advantaged and disadvantaged areas in own area (ODPM town centre data/estate agents etc).				
	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (ODPM/estate agents)	SEBC	Each LA to complete based on identified advantaged and disadvantaged areas in own area (ODPM town centre data/estate agents etc).				
	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (ODPM/estate agents)	SCDC	Each LA to complete based on identified advantaged and disadvantaged areas in own area (ODPM town centre data/estate agents etc).				
	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (ODPM/estate agents)	WDC	Each LA to complete based on identified advantaged and disadvantaged areas in own area (ODPM town centre data/estate agents etc).				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	Comparative industrial and office rental costs within the plan area (ODPM/estate agents)	Suffolk	Each LA to complete based on identified advantaged and disadvantaged areas in own area (ODPM town centre data/estate agents etc).				
Headline Objective: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth throughout the plan area							
Will it encourage rural diversification?							
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG)	BDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **33000** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **14017** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **1.8** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1.4	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG)	FHDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **Not recorded** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **Not recorded** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **20.57** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Little change in outstanding allocations since last year.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make. There are major employment allocations at Brandon, Newmarket and Red Lodge still to be implement, the latter has outline planning permission. Completion rates have been low in recent years.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG)	IBC	No rural areas.				
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG)	MSDC (Rural)	Not recorded	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Data available for 2003: Total outstanding permissions at March 2003 (m^2) **179002** Outstanding permissions March 2003 on PDL (m^2) **0** Total outstanding allocations at March 2003 (Ha) **23.73** Outstanding allocations at March 2003 on PDL (Ha) **3.9**		😐 Figures indicate a good supply of land with outstanding employment permissions available. Note: Completion rates are slow and need to ensure that take up of employment sites take place.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG)	SEBC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) 31,807.6 Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **20,987.6** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **43.72** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **31.62**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Outstanding business permissions are much lower than last year, but outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG)	SCDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **98,440** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **81,507** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **54.75** Outstanding allocations at March 2004	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Outstanding business permissions are much lower than last year although the amount on PDL has increased. Outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			on PDL (Ha) **14.07**				
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG)	WDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **184,257** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) 89,709 Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **4.8** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **0**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Number of outstanding permissions has decreased but amount on PDL has increased. Outstanding allocations has decreased.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make. Little change takes place in the amount of land with permission or allocated. Employment land study to be carried out to assess the amount and quality of employment land needed.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in rural areas (SSAG)	Suffolk (Rural)	Total outstanding rural permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **Data missing from 2 authorities** Outstanding rural permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **Data missing from 2 authorities** Total outstanding rural allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **Total 125.64 (excluding MSDC)** Outstanding rural allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **Total 48.09 (excluding MSDC)**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns			😐 Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To revitalise town centres							
Will it increase the range of employment opportunities, shops and services available in town centres?							
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG)	BDC	52% A1 uses, 2003/4 (Hadleigh = 50% Sudbury = 54%)	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre. Lowest % of districts to return data in 2003/4.	61.0% A1 uses, 2002/3 61.5% A1 uses, 2001/2. 9.5% decrease since 2001/2.	A1 uses match the national average in Hadleigh, and have decreased in both towns. Decrease needs to be monitored and addressed.	☹ Relatively low A1 uses and decreasing trend. Decrease needs to be monitored and addressed. Local authorities will continue to come under pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises.
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG)	FHDC	N/A 2003/4	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre.	52.66% A1 uses, 2002/3 52.66% A1 uses, 2001/2. No change in 2002/3.	A1 uses below national average in Brandon. Brandon was the only town in Suffolk to record less than 50% A1 uses in 2002/3, and the % was decreasing.	😐/☹ No change since 2001/2 on average, but relatively low, especially in Brandon. Decrease in Brandon needs to be monitored and addressed. Local authorities will continue to come under pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises.
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG)	IBC	65.0% A1 uses, 2003/4	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre. Lowest % of districts to return data in 2003/4.	68.0% A1 uses, 2002/3 68.0% A1 uses, 2001/2. 3% decrease this year from static % in 2002/3 and 2001/2.	Small decrease in A1 uses this year may need monitoring in future, but % is still high.	☺ Small decrease this year but still high % of A1 uses. Local authorities will continue to come under pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG)	MSDC	56% A1 uses, 2003/4 (Debenham = 48%)	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre.	63.66% A1 uses, 2002/3 64.33% A1 uses, 2001/2. 8% decrease since 2001/2.	All Mid Suffolk towns show a decrease in A1 uses this year. Debenham has the lowest % and has fallen below national average.	☹ Decreasing trend in all towns. % is lowest in Debenham, and has dropped below national average. Local authorities will continue to come under pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises. A small percentage of the decrease can be attributed to permitting a restricted A3 use to 'cafes' to enhance the town centre, identified in the health check (PPS6)
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG)	SEBC	N/R 2003/4	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre.	68.5% A1 uses, 2002/3 70.5% A1 uses, 2001/2. 2.0% decrease in 2002/3.		☺ Whilst there has been a decrease the figure is still significantly higher than the national average. Local authorities will continue to come under pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises.
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG)	SCDC	56% A1 uses, 2003/4 (Framlingham 48% Leiston 48% Saxmundham 47%)	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre.	58.75% A1 uses, 2002/3 60.25% A1 uses, 2001/2. 4% decrease this year since 2001/2 overall. Woodbridge and Felixstowe have increased % this year, Aldeburgh shows no change. Decreases in Framlingham, Leiston and Saxmundham.	A1 uses in Framlingham, Leiston and Saxmundham have fallen below national average this year.	☹ Some towns have shown improvement in % of A1 uses this year, but overall % is decreasing and 3 towns are below national average. Local authorities will continue to come under pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises.
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG)	WDC	55% A1 uses, 2003/4 (Beccles = 45% Bungay = 42%)	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre.	68.33% A1 uses, 2002/3 58.66% A1 uses, 2001/2. Following an increase in 2002/3, % has fallen to below 2001/2 levels this year. Bungay recorded largest decrease of 22% this year.	All Waveney towns show a decrease in A1 uses this year. Beccles and Bungay have the lowest % and have fallen below national average.	☹ Decreasing trend in all towns, rapid in some. % is lowest in Beccles and Bungay, which have dropped below national average. Local authorities will continue to come under pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises.
SSAG	Percentage of town centre units with A1 uses (SSAG)	Suffolk	**55**% A1 uses, 2003/4	To ensure that the proportion of A1 uses does not fall below the national average of 50% in any one centre. There is an above average number of A1 units in Suffolk's town centres (55%).	**62.9**% A1 uses, 2002/3 62.3% A1 uses, 2001/2 7% decrease since 2001/2, following a slight increase last year.	Average % of A1 uses across county has decreased this year, though is still above national average. A number of individual towns are below it, and should be monitored.	😐/☹ County total is still above average but has decreased this year. A number of towns are below national average. Local authorities will continue to come under pressure to allow changes from A1 units to either dwellings or A3 premises.
Headline Objective: To revitalise town centres							
Will it decrease the number of vacant units in town centres?							
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG)	BDC	5% vacant 2003/4	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%) 2nd lowest % of districts to return data in 2003/4.	7.1% vacant 2002/3 Decreased by 2% this year.		☺ Relatively low, and decreasing trend. The low percentage is some indication of healthy town centres

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG)	FHDC	N/A 2003/4	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%)	7.9% vacant 2002/3	Brandon had above average % of vacant units in 2002/3.	😐/☹ No trend information. Brandon above national average, but other towns below. Brandon Regeneration and HERS projects may assist reduce the vacancy rate
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG)	IBC	11% vacant 2003/4	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%). Highest % of districts to return data in 2003/4.	8.0% vacant 2002/3 Increased by 3% and now matches national average.	Ipswich has % of vacant units which matches national average in 2003/4. Should be monitored to ensure it doesn't exceed target, and increase should be addressed.	☹ % of vacant units is relatively high and increasing in Ipswich. IBC figure should be put in context of urban nature of borough.
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG)	MSDC	8% vacant 2003/4 (Debenham = 12%)	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%) 2nd highest % of districts to return data in 2003/4.	6.9% vacant 2002/3 Increased by 1% overall since last year. However, Debenham has recorded an increase of 5%, while other towns showed no change.	Debenham had above average % of vacant units in 2003/4, an increase from last year. This should be monitored and the increase addressed.	☹ % vacant units in Debenham has increased to above national average, other towns are below. District average remains below the national average but high enough to provide a stock of available units for new businesses.
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG)	SEBC	N/R 2003/4	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%)	6.6% vacant 2002/3		☺ No trend information. % of vacant units in 2002/3 was well below the national average but also high enough to provide a stock of available units for new business
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG)	SCDC	6% vacant 2003/4	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%)	6.2% vacant 2002/3 No change since last year.		☺ Little change since last year. % of vacant units in 2002/3 was well below the national average but also high enough to provide a stock of available units for new business
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG)	WDC	3% vacant 2002/3	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%) Lowest % of districts to return data in 2003/4.	4.2% vacant 2002/3 Decreased by 1% since last year.		☺ % of vacant units is low and decreasing. The low percentage is some indication of healthy town centres.
SSAG	Vacant units in town centres (SSAG)	Suffolk	**6**% vacant 2002/3	The number of vacant units in any one town should not exceed the national average (which is currently 11%)	**6.7**% vacant 2002/3 Small decrease since last year of less than 1%.		☺ Overall the % of vacant units is low and decreasing. The low percentage is some indication of healthy town centres, with Brandon and Debenham the main concerns.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce commuting?							
AMcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census).	BDC	Average distance (km) travelled to fixed place of work – KS015 (Census 2001) = 17	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
AMcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census).	FHDC	Average distance (km) travelled to fixed place of work – KS015 (Census 2001) = 13	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
AMcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census).	IBC	Average distance (km) travelled to fixed place of work – KS015 (Census 2001) = 11	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
AMcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census).	MSDC	Average distance (km) travelled to fixed place of work – KS015 (Census 2001) = 18	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
AMcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census).	SEBC	Average distance (km) travelled to fixed place of work – KS015 (Census 2001) = 15	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
AMcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census).	SCDC	Average distance (km) travelled to fixed place of work – KS015 (Census 2001) = 15	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
AMcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census).	WDC	Average distance (km) travelled to fixed place of work – KS015 (2001) = 16	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
AmcC	Distances travelled to work for the resident population (Census).	Suffolk	Average distance (km) travelled to fixed place of work – KS015 (Census 2001) = 15	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce commuting?							
SB	Import/export of workers to district and/or major towns (Census).	BDC	% of working residents who remain in district for work: 56.6%	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
SB	Import/export of workers to district and/or major towns (Census).	FHDC	% of working residents who remain in district for work: 69.4%	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
SB	Import/export of workers to district and/or major towns (Census/East of England Observatory).	IBC	% of working residents who remain in borough for work: 71.6% Ipswich Corridor *(also includes Kesgrave East & West, Martlesham, Rushmere St Andrew and Pinewood):* % of working residents who remain in area for work: 76.0%	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SB	Import/export of workers to district and/or major towns (Census).	MSDC	% of working residents who remain in district for work: 57.3%	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
SB	Import/export of workers to district and/or major towns (Census/East of England Observatory).	SEBC	% of working residents who remain in borough for work: 81.1% Bury St Edmunds: % of working residents who remain in town for work: 65.9%	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
SB	Import/export of workers to district and/or major towns (Census/East of England Observatory).	SCDC	% of working residents who remain in district for work: 67.4% Felixstowe: % of working residents who remain in town for work: 66.2%	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
SB	Import/export of workers to district and/or major towns (Census/East of England Observatory).	WDC	% of working residents who remain in district for work: 76.9% Lowestoft: % of working residents who remain in town for work: 60.6%	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
SB	Import/export of workers to district and/or major towns (Census).	Suffolk	% of working residents who remain in county for work: 76.9%	No specific target	Data taken from Census 2001. Trends difficult to identify as no other data to compare.		😐 Only Census data for 2001, therefore difficult to establish trends.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce commuting?							
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in urban areas (SSAG)	BDC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **Not recorded** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **Not recorded** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **9** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 0	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in urban areas (SSAG)	FHDC	No urban areas.				
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in urban areas (SSAG)	IBC (All urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) 19,438 Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **19,438** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **6** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1.9**4**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	All measures have decreased since March 2003.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in urban areas (SSAG)	MSDC	No urban areas.				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in urban areas (SSAG)	SCDC	No urban areas.				
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in urban areas (SSAG)	SEBC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) 27,977.5 Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **4,774.0** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **3** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **1.83**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Outstanding business permissions are much lower than last year, but outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in urban areas (SSAG)	WDC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **104,040** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) 101,733 Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **4** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **0**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Number of outstanding permissions has increased and amount on PDL had increased significantly. Outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make. Little change takes place in the amount of land with permission or allocated. Employment land study to be carried out to assess the amount and quality of employment land needed.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations in urban areas (SSAG)	Suffolk	Total outstanding urban permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **151,455.5 excluding Babergh** Outstanding urban permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) 125,945 **excluding Babergh** Total outstanding urban allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **Total 22** Outstanding urban allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **Total 3.77**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns			😐 Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce commuting?							
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home as main place of work (Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home could be used to indicate trends)	BDC	= 4,888 - 5.9% of total population = 83,500 (Census, 2001)	No specific target	Further data for subsequent years can be taken from planning applications by each LA.		😐 Useful indicator but difficult to monitor meaningfully through planning applications alone.
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home as main place of work (Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home could be used to indicate trends)	FHDC	= 2,421 - 4.3% of total population = 56,100	No specific target	Further data for subsequent years can be taken from planning applications by each LA.		😐 Useful indicator but difficult to monitor meaningfully through planning applications alone.
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home as main place of work (Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home could be used to indicate trends)	IBC	= 3,616 (3.1%) of total population = 117,165	No specific target	Further data for subsequent years can be taken from planning applications by each LA.		😐 Useful indicator but difficult to monitor meaningfully through planning applications alone.
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home as main place of work (Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home could be used to indicate trends)	MSDC	= 5,462 (6.3%) of total population (87,000)	No specific target	Further data for subsequent years can be taken from planning applications by each LA.		😐 Useful indicator but difficult to monitor meaningfully through planning applications alone.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home as main place of work (Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home could be used to indicate trends)	SEBC	= 5,081 (5.2%) of total population (98,300)	No specific target	Further data for subsequent years can be taken from planning applications by each LA.		😐 Useful indicator but difficult to monitor meaningfully through planning applications alone.
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home as main place of work (Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home could be used to indicate trends)	SCDC	= 5,937 (5.2%) of total population (115,200)	No specific target	Further data for subsequent years can be taken from planning applications by each LA.		😐 Useful indicator but difficult to monitor meaningfully through planning applications alone.
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home as main place of work (Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home could be used to indicate trends)	WDC	= 4,168 (3.7%) of total population (112,500)	No specific target	Further data for subsequent years can be taken from planning applications by each LA.		😐 Useful indicator but difficult to monitor meaningfully through planning applications alone.
AMcC	Number / percentage of people working from home as main place of work (Census provides a baseline, and planning consents for working from home could be used to indicate trends)	Suffolk	= 31,573 (4.7%) of total population (669,900)	No specific target	Further data for subsequent years can be taken from planning applications by each LA.		😐 Useful indicator but difficult to monitor meaningfully through planning applications alone.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it improve accessibility to work by public transport, walking and cycling?							
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG)	BDC	2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 0	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	Not recorded in previous years.		😐 Historical data for this indicator is limited (few if any submissions annually) and therefore trends are difficult to discern.
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG)	FHDC	2002/3 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2002/3 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 3	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	2002/3 and 2001/2 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2002/3 (2001/2) Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 3 (1)		😐 Historical data for this indicator is limited (few if any submissions annually) and therefore trends are difficult to discern.
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG)	IBC	2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 0	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	2002/3 and 2001/2 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2002/3 and 2001/2 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 0		😐 Historical data for this indicator is limited (few if any submissions annually) and therefore trends are difficult to discern.
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG)	MSDC	2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: N/A 2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: N/A	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	2002/3 and 2001/2 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2002/3 (2001/2) Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 0 (1)		😐 Historical data for this indicator is limited (few if any submissions annually) and therefore trends are difficult to discern.
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG)	SEBC	2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: N/A 2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: N/A	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	2002/3 and 2001/2 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2002/3 and 2001/2 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 0		😐 There have not yet been any Travel Plans submitted. Historical data for this indicator is limited (few if any submissions annually) and therefore trends are difficult to discern.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG)	SCDC	2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 0	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	Not recorded in previous years.		😐 Lack of trend data.
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG)	WDC	2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 3	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	2002/3 and 2001/2 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 (no change) 2002/3 and 2001/2 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 0 (increased by 3 this year)		😐 More travel plans required this year than previously. However, historical data for this indicator is limited (few if any submissions annually) and therefore trends are difficult to discern.
SSAG	Number of developments where a travel plan is submitted or is a condition of development (SSAG)	Suffolk	2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 2003/4 Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 3 (2003/4 total based on SCDC and WDC only.)	Travel plans submitted for all major developments, and smaller developments meeting certain criteria (PPG13)	2002/3 (2001/2) Approvals where travel plan was submitted: 0 (0) 2002/3 (2001/2) Approvals where travel plan was condition of development: 3 (2)		😐 Historical data for this indicator is limited (few if any submissions annually) and therefore trends are difficult to discern.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it improve accessibility to work by public transport, walking and cycling?							
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	BDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.3%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	FHDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.1%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	IBC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 32.1% Willis (Ipswich) Employee Travel Survey 2004: 32.4%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. Largest % of sustainable travel in Suffolk.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information. In 2001 Ipswich had highest sustainable travel % in Suffolk.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	MSDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 15.5% MSDC Employee Travel Survey 2004: 11.1%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. Lowest % of sustainable travel in Suffolk.	No other comparable data recorded.	Low use of sustainable modes to travel to work in 2001 census.	😐 No trend information. In 2001 Mid Suffolk had lowest sustainable travel % in Suffolk. Small sample size (36) in employee travel survey.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	SEBC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.9% SEBC Employee Travel Survey 2004: 17.9%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information. Small sample size (67) in employee travel survey.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	SCDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 18.4% SCDC Employee Travel Survey 2004: 12.1% BT (Martlesham Heath) Travel Survey 2004: 30.3%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	BT (Martlesham Heath) Travel Survey 2003: 20.7% BT employees recorded a large (50%) increase in use of sustainable modes from 2003 to 2004.		😐 Large increase in use of sustainable modes by BT employees in 2004 travel survey, but is this representative of the wider population?. No other trend information. Small sample size (116) in

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
					No other comparable data recorded.		SCDC employee travel survey.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	WDC	% sustainable 2001 Census: 23.7% WDC Employee Travel Survey 2004: 17.5%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes. 2nd largest % of sustainable travel in Suffolk in 2001 Census.	No other comparable data recorded.		😐 No trend information. Small sample size (40) in employee travel survey.
SSAG	Percentage of journeys to work undertaken by sustainable modes (SSAG)	Suffolk	% sustainable 2001 Census: 21.2% Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2004: 28.0%	A year-on-year increase in the % of travel by sustainable modes.	Suffolk County Council Employee Travel Survey 2003: 25.2% No other comparable data recorded.		😐 Limited trend information. An increase has been recorded in use of sustainable modes by Suffolk employees but is this representative of the wider population?
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it reduce journey times between key employment areas and key transport interchanges?							
	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	BDC					
	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	FHDC					
AMcC	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	IBC					
	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	MSDC					
	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	SEBC					
	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	SCDC					
	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	WDC					
	May be relevant for Ipswich but not considered suitable for Suffolk as a whole.	Suffolk					
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it increase the proportion of freight transported by rail or other sustainable modes?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Port Authorities / AMR)	BDC	N/A				
	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Port Authorities / AMR)	FHDC	N/A				
	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Port Authorities / AMR)	IBC	Port of Ipswich - to do.				
	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Port Authorities / AMR)	MSDC	N/A				
	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Port Authorities / AMR)	SEBC	N/A				
AMcC / SB	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Port Authorities / AMR)	SCDC	Felixstowe: % of containers moving inland. (Source: AMR) 2003 = 22% 2002 = 21% 2001 = 20%		Felixstowe: 1999 = 22% 1998 = 20 % 1997 = 18% 1996 = 17% (Source: Suffolk LTP) There was a steady increase in the proportion of freight carried by rail over the preceding three years to 1999. A second source shows a steady increase from 2001-3.		😐 Useful indicator to show proportion of freight taken by rail. Need to find more recent figures to be relevant though.
	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Port Authorities / AMR)	WDC	Port of Lowestoft – to do.				
AMcC / SB	Proportion of port freight carried by rail (Port Authorities / AMR)	Suffolk	Felixstowe: % of containers moving inland. (Source: AMR) 2003 = 22% 2002 = 21% 2001 = 20%		Felixstowe: 1999 = 22% 1998 = 20 % 1997 = 18% 1996 = 17% (Source: Suffolk LTP) There was a steady increase in the proportion of freight carried by rail over the preceding three years to 1999. A second source shows a steady increase from 2001-3.		😐 Useful indicator to show proportion of freight taken by rail. Need to find more recent figures to be relevant though.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it increase the consumption of locally produced food and goods?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (LAs)	BDC	Number of farmers markets = 5 Number of farm shops = 4 (Source: NFMA Website / Tastes of Anglia)		No previous data source identified.		😐 Figures can be obtained fairly easily. However, difficult to ascertain absolute figures from available sources.
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (LAs)	FHDC	Number of farmers markets = 0 Number of farm shops = 0 (Source: NFMA Website / Tastes of Anglia)		No previous data source identified.		😐 Figures can be obtained fairly easily. However, difficult to ascertain absolute figures from available sources.
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (LAs)	IBC	Number of farmers markets = 0 Number of farm shops = 0 (Source: NFMA Website / Tastes of Anglia)		No previous data source identified.		😐 Figures can be obtained fairly easily. However, difficult to ascertain absolute figures from available sources.
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (LAs)	MSDC	Number of farmers markets = 4 Number of farm shops = 3 (Source: NFMA Website / Tastes of Anglia)		No previous data source identified.		😐 Figures can be obtained fairly easily. However, difficult to ascertain absolute figures from available sources.
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (LAs)	SEBC	Number of farmers markets = 1 Number of farm shops = 1 (Source: NFMA Website / Tastes of Anglia)		No previous data source identified.		😐 Figures can be obtained fairly easily. However, difficult to ascertain absolute figures from available sources.
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (LAs)	SCDC	Number of farmers markets = 2 Number of farm shops = 7		No previous data source identified.		😐 Figures can be obtained fairly easily. However, difficult to ascertain absolute figures from available sources.
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (LAs)	WDC	Number of farmers markets = 3 Number of farm shops = 0 (Source: NFMA Website / Tastes of Anglia)		No previous data source identified.		😐 Figures can be obtained fairly easily. However, difficult to ascertain absolute figures from available sources.
AMcC	Number of farmers markets and farm shops (LAs)	Suffolk	Number of farmers markets = 15 Number of farm shops = 15 (Source: NFMA Website / Tastes of Anglia)		No previous data source identified.		😐 Figures can be obtained fairly easily. However, difficult to ascertain absolute figures from available sources.
Headline Objective: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth							
Will it increase the consumption of locally produced food and goods?							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (contact supermarkets directly)	BDC	Still to do (each local authority to contact local supermarkets directly).				
	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (contact supermarkets directly)	FHDC	Still to do (each local authority to contact local supermarkets directly).				
	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (contact supermarkets directly)	IBC	Still to do (each local authority to contact local supermarkets directly).				
	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (contact supermarkets directly)	MSDC	Still to do (each local authority to contact local supermarkets directly).				
	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (contact supermarkets directly)	SEBC	Still to do (each local authority to contact local supermarkets directly).				
	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (contact supermarkets directly)	SCDC	Still to do (each local authority to contact local supermarkets directly).				
	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (contact supermarkets directly)	WDC	Still to do (each local authority to contact local supermarkets directly).				
	Number of locally sourced products stocked by major supermarket chains (contact supermarkets directly)	Suffolk	Still to do (each local authority to contact local supermarkets directly).				
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it encourage indigenous business?							
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from within area (business link, LAs)	BDC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from within area (business link, LAs)	FHDC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from within area (business link, LAs)	IBC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from within area (business link, LAs)	MSDC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from within area (business link, LAs)	SEBC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from within area (business link, LAs)	SCDC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from within area (business link, LAs)	WDC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from within area (business link, LAs)	Suffolk	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it encourage inward investment?							
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from outside of area (business link, LAs)	BDC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from outside of area (business link, LAs)	FHDC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from outside of area (business link, LAs)	IBC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from outside of area (business link, LAs)	MSDC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from outside of area (business link, LAs)	SEBC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from outside of area (business link, LAs)	SCDC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from outside of area (business link, LAs)	WDC	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
	Number of enquiries to business advice services from outside of area (business link, LAs)	Suffolk	Still to do (each local authority to complete).				
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
Will it make land available for business development?							
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	BDC	**Not recorded**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns			😐 No data available
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	FHDC	Not recorded	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Limited data available for 2002/3 only: Development gained (Ha) **0** Development lost to other users (Ha) **0.98** Net Development change (Ha) **-0.98** Development gained on PDL (Ha) **0**		😐 Limited data available
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	IBC	Development gained (Ha) **4.14** Development lost to other users (Ha) **Not recorded** Net Development change (Ha) **Not recorded** Development gained on PDL (Ha) **3.09**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Development gained, both in total and on PDL, is higher than recorded in previous years.		😐 Gaps in information means trend observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	MSDC	Not recorded	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Data from previous years has shown a declining trend, with less development gained in total and on PDL each year. No 2003/4 figures available for comparison.		😐 No data this year, which means time series observations are difficult to make. Allocations in Eye are still to be taken up and employment completion rates have been continually slow.
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	SEBC	Development gained (Ha) **3.36** Development lost to other users (Ha) **0.46** Net Development change (Ha) **2.9** Development gained on PDL (Ha) **0.77**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Development gained is lower than 2002/3 while area on PDL is slightly higher. However figures have fluctuated in past years (where available) and show no clear trend.		😐 Fluctuation and gaps in data means time series observations are difficult to make
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	SEBC	Development gained (Ha) **1.51** Development lost to other users (Ha) **0.88** Net Development change (Ha) **0.63** Development gained on PDL (Ha) **1.51**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Development gained is lower than 2002/3 while area on PDL is higher. However figures have fluctuated in past years (where available) and show no clear trend.		😐 Fluctuation and gaps in data means time series observations are difficult to make
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	SCDC	Not recorded	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Data only available for 2002/3: Development gained (Ha) **4.60** Development lost to other users (Ha) **Not recorded** Net Development change (Ha) **Not recorded** Development gained on PDL (Ha) **0.42**		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	WDC	Development gained (Ha) **0.45** Development lost to other users (Ha) **5.66** Net Development change (Ha) **-5.21** Development gained on PDL (Ha) **0.45**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Compared to 2002/3, development gained is lower and less was on PDL (with a net loss recorded). Not recorded for previous years.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make. Little change takes place in the slow rate of employment completions.
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	WDC	Development gained (Ha) **1.92** Development lost to other users (Ha) **0** Net Development change (Ha) **1.92** Development gained on PDL (Ha) **0.06**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Compared to 2002/3, development gained is higher but less was on PDL. Not recorded for previous years		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make. Little change takes place in the slow rate of employment completions.
SSAG	Employment land availability (SSAG)	Suffolk	Too much data missing to calculate a meaningful county total.	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too much data missing to evaluate a meaningful county trend.		😐 Gaps in information means overall and time series observations are difficult to make.
Headline Objective: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment							
Will it make land available for business development?							
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	BDC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **Not recorded** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **Not recorded** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **9** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 0	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	BDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **33000** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **14017** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **1.8** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1.4	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Rural/urban split not available for previous years. Total outstanding allocations higher than last year.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	FHDC (All rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **Not recorded** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **Not recorded** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **20.57** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Little change in outstanding allocations since last year.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make. There are major employment allocations at Brandon, Newmarket and Red Lodge still to be implement, the latter has outline planning permission. Completion rates have been low in recent years.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	IBC (All urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) 19,438 Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **19,438**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development	All measures have decreased since March 2003.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
			Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **6** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) 1.9**4**	Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns			
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	MSDC (All rural)	Not recorded	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Data available for 2003: Total outstanding permissions at March 2003 (m^2) **179002** Outstanding permissions March 2003 on PDL (m^2) **0** Total outstanding allocations at March 2003 (Ha) **23.73** Outstanding allocations at March 2003 on PDL (Ha) **3.9**		😐 Figures indicate a good supply of land with outstanding employment permissions available. Note: Completion rates are slow and need to ensure that take up of employment sites take place.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	SEBC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) 27,977.5 Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **4,774.0** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **3** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **1.83**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Outstanding business permissions are much lower than last year, but outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	SEBC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) 31,807.6 Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **20,987.6** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **43.72** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **31.62**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Outstanding business permissions are much lower than last year, but outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	SCDC (All rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **98,440** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **81,507** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **54.75** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **14.07**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Outstanding business permissions are much lower than last year although the amount on PDL has increased. Outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	WDC (Urban)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **104,040** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) 101,733 Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **4** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **0**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Number of outstanding permissions has increased and amount on PDL had increased significantly. Outstanding allocations show relatively little change.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make. Little change takes place in the amount of land with permission or allocated. Employment land study to be carried out to assess the amount and quality of employment land needed.
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	WDC (Rural)	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **184,257** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) 89,709 Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **4.8** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **0**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Number of outstanding permissions has decreased but amount on PDL has increased. Outstanding allocations has decreased.		😐 Limited information means time series observations are difficult to make. Little change takes place in the amount of land with permission or allocated. Employment land study to be carried out to assess the amount and quality of employment land needed.

Collected by?	Indicator	District or Borough	Quantified Data (figures in brackets relate to data sources)	Comparators and Targets (figures in brackets relate to data source)	Trend	Issue Identified?	Comments/problems/ issues for SA
SSAG	Employment permissions and allocations (SSAG)	Suffolk	Total outstanding permissions at March 2004 (m^2) **Data missing from 3 authorities** Outstanding permissions March 2004 on PDL (m^2) **Data missing from 3 authorities** Total outstanding allocations at March 2004 (Ha) **Total 147.64 (excluding MSDC)** Outstanding allocations at March 2004 on PDL (Ha) **Total 51.86 (excluding MSDC)**	Target-To maintain a supply of available land where appropriate and to encourage year on year employment development Source- Regional AMR Employment Land Returns	Too many values missing this year to look at county trends in outstanding permissions. Outstanding land allocations (total and on PDL) have both decreased from March 2003.		😐 Gaps in information mean trend and time series observations are difficult to make.