

Sustainability Appraisal Report

Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies
Development Plan Document
Preferred Options Report



Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

Sustainability Appraisal Report

Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies
Development Plan Document
Preferred Options Report

IN PROGRESS DRAFT

Date: January 2009

Sustainability Appraisal Report



Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Preferred Options Report

Report Control

Document: Sustainability Appraisal of the Hinckley and Bosworth Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Preferred Options Report

Project: Sustainability Appraisal of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Development Framework

Client: Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

Job Number: E09615-132

File Origin: N:\Projects\E6501-E7000\E006915-132\reports\Site Allocations\Site Allocation - Preferred Options Report 190109.doc

Document Checking:

Primary Author	Initialled:
----------------	-------------

Contributors	Initialled:
--------------	-------------

Review By	Initialled:
-----------	-------------

Issue	Date	Status	Checked for Issue
1	January 2009	In Progress Draft	
2			
3			
4			



Contents

0.0	NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY	1
0.1	Introduction	1
0.2	Development of the Sustainability Appraisal Framework	1
0.3	Development and Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document	2
1.0	INTRODUCTION	3
2.0	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL PROCESS	5
2.1	Requirements for Sustainability Appraisal	5
2.2	Sustainability Appraisal Regulations and Guidance	5
2.3	Sustainability Appraisal Process	6
2.4	Sustainability Appraisal Stages	6
2.4.1	Stage A	8
2.4.2	Stages B and C	16
2.5	Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive Compliance	16
3.0	BACKGROUND	19
3.1	Study Area	19
3.2	Hinckley and Bosworth Local Development Framework	19
3.3	Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document	20
3.3.1	Development of the Development Plan Document	20
3.3.2	Contents of the Preferred Options Report	21
4.0	BASELINE AND KEY ISSUES	23
4.1	Introduction	23
4.2	Socio-Economic Baseline	24
4.2.1	Local Economy and Employment	24
4.2.2	Population	26
4.2.3	Deprivation	27
4.2.4	Crime	27
4.2.5	Health	28
4.2.6	Education	28
4.2.7	Housing	29
4.2.8	Traffic and Transport	31
4.2.9	Tourism, Leisure and Recreation	34
4.2.10	Key Sustainability Issues	35
4.3	Environmental Baseline	36
4.3.1	Introduction	36
4.3.2	Water Environment	37
4.3.3	Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	38
4.3.4	Landscape and Visual Amenity	41
4.3.5	Geology	47
4.3.6	Waste Management	49
4.3.7	Cultural Heritage and Archaeology	49



4.3.8	Noise	52
4.3.9	Air Quality	53
4.3.10	Climate Change	53
4.3.11	Key Sustainability Issues	54
4.4	Summary of Key Sustainability Issues.....	55
5.0	DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS.....	66
5.1	Introduction.....	66
5.2	Site Allocations Development Plan Document Issues and Options.....	66
5.3	Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Issues and Options	66
5.4	Outcomes of the Options Development and Appraisal.....	67
5.5	Additional Options Appraisal.....	67
6.0	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE PREFERRED OPTIONS	68
6.1	Introduction.....	68
6.2	Appraisal Methodology.....	68
6.2.1	Assessment of Effects	70
6.2.2	Limitations	70
6.3	Likely Effects of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options	71
6.3.1	Site Allocations	71
6.3.2	Non-Settlement Specific Site Allocations.....	84
6.3.3	Generic Development Control Policies	85
6.4	Recommendations.....	86
7.0	IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING	87
7.1	Next Steps	87
7.2	Links to the Planning Process.....	88
7.3	Proposals for Monitoring	88



FIGURES

Figure 1 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough

TABLES

Table 2.1 Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
Table 2.2 Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive Compliance
Table 4.1 Hinckley and Bosworth Landscape Character Areas
Table 4.2 Key Sustainability Issues
Table 6.1 Determining Magnitude of Effects
Table 6.2 Significance of Effects
Table 7.1 Next Steps in the Sustainability Appraisal

APPENDICES

Appendix A Report Conditions
Appendix B Plans and Programmes Review
Appendix C Baseline Information
Appendix D Scoping Consultation Responses
Appendix E Appraisal Tables
Appendix F Targets and Indicators
Appendix G Constraints Maps
Appendix H Generic Development Control Policies

ABBREVIATIONS

BAP Biodiversity Action Plan
BHM Balanced Housing Markets
BNAM Basic Needs Assessment Model
BVPI Best Value Performance Indicator
CABE Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
DEFRA Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DPD Development Plan Document
EAR Economic Activity Rate
FIT Fields In Trust
HBBC Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
HER Historic Environment Record
HQI Housing Quality Indicator

Sustainability Appraisal Report



Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Preferred Options Report

KS	Key Stage
LDF	Local Development Framework
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LNR	Local Nature Reserve
NAHP	National Affordable Housing Programme
NPFA	National Playing Fields Association
NVQ	National Vocation Qualification
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
RSL	Registered Social Landlord
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems

IN PROGRESS DRAFT



0.0 NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

0.1 Introduction

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC), as the Local Planning Authority for Hinckley and Bosworth, is developing a Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (DPD). The DPD will comprise site specific proposals (which will include sites to deliver housing and other major development needs such as employment, recreation, open space and community uses) and Development Control Policies that will supplement and assist the Site Allocations decisions. In due course the DPD will be incorporated into the Local Development Framework (LDF) being developed by the Council to replace the existing Local Plan (Adopted 2001).

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a process by which plans under preparation can be assessed for sustainability. Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Local Planning Authorities must subject their LDFs to SA, thus promoting sustainable development by enabling communities to satisfy their basic needs and enjoy a better quality of life without compromising future generations. Similarly, under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, where planning documents setting a framework for future development consent are likely to have significant environmental effects it is a requirement that Local Planning Authorities subject them to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

WYG has been commissioned by HBBC to undertake a combined SA and SEA of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD. This combined approach is simply referred to as SA.

0.2 Development of the Sustainability Appraisal Framework

In 2005 WYG undertook Stage A (Scoping) of the SA of the HBBC LDF. This resulted in the production of a SA Scoping Report, including development of a SA framework for use in appraising LDF documents.

The SA Scoping Report details the outcomes of the following activities:

- Review of plans and programmes of relevance to the HBBC LDF.
- Collation of social, economic and environmental baseline data.
- Identification of the social, economic and environmental situation in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough.
- Identification of key sustainability issues.
- Development of SA objectives.
- Consultation on the scope of the SA.



To ensure that the SA framework for the HBBC LDF was up-to-date, WYG has undertaken the following activities:

- A Scoping Consultation Document was sent to statutory and non-statutory consultees in May 2007 to allow for comments on the proposed approach to the SA.
- Review of plans and programmes that have been published since the SA Scoping Report was produced.
- Updating the social, economic and environmental baseline data for the Borough.
- Review of the key sustainability issues.

0.3 Development and Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document

HBBC initially proposed that the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD would comprise two separate DPDs: The Site Allocations DPD and the Generic Development Control DPD. In 2007, Issues and Options were produced for each of the proposed DPDs.

The Site Allocations DPD Issues Paper (HBBC, 2007) and the Generic Development Control DPD Issues and Options (HBBC, 2007) were both subject to SA using the SA framework developed in Stage A. The outcome of the SAs is detailed within the Site Allocations DPD Options Appraisal Explanatory Notes (WYG, 2007) and the Generic Development Control Policies DPD Options Appraisal Explanatory Notes (WYG, 2007). All four reports were issued for consultation in 2007.

Following consultation on the reports, HBBC produced the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008); a combined document detailing HBBC's preferred approach relating to future development in the Borough. The Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008) has also been subject to SA using the SA framework developed in Stage A, and this SA Report details the outcome of that SA.

The SA of the Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008) identified a number of likely social, environmental and economic effects associated with implementation of the DPD.

Potential effects of the DPD include:

SUMMARY TO BE INSERTED



1.0 INTRODUCTION

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC), as the Local Planning Authority for Hinckley and Bosworth, is developing a Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (DPD). The DPD will comprise site specific proposals (which will include sites to deliver housing and other major development needs such as employment, recreation, open space and community uses) and Development Control Policies that will supplement and assist the Site Allocations decisions. In due course the DPD will be incorporated into the Local Development Framework (LDF) being developed by the Council to replace the existing Local Plan (HBBC, 2001).

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a process by which plans under preparation can be assessed for sustainability. Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Local Planning Authorities must subject their LDFs to SA, thus promoting sustainable development by enabling communities to satisfy their basic needs and enjoy a better quality of life without compromising future generations. Similarly, under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, where planning documents setting a framework for future development consent are likely to have significant environmental effects it is a requirement that Local Planning Authorities subject them to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). Such documents include those that form a LDF.

WYG has been commissioned by HBBC to undertake a combined SA and SEA of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD. This combined approach is simply referred to as SA throughout this Sustainability Report. The purpose of this Sustainability Report is to present the findings of the SA of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008). Further details relating to the development of the DPD can be found in Chapter 3.

This report has the following format:

Non Technical Summary

Offers a non technical overview of the SA process and its findings.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Chapter 2 Sustainability Appraisal Process

Provides an overview of the SA process undertaken including details of the SA objectives used to appraise the DPD.

Chapter 3 Background

Details the background to the DPD.



Chapter 4 Baseline and Key Issues

Describes baseline conditions in relation to a series of social, economic and environmental parameters and outlines key sustainability issues that have been considered during the SA process.

Chapter 5 Development of the Development Plan Document

Provides details on how the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options have been developed.

Chapter 6 Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Options

Predicts the likely social, economic and environmental effects of the DPD Preferred Options.

Chapter 7 Implementation and Monitoring

Provides details on how the DPD will be implemented and proposals for monitoring its implementation.

Report Conditions are set out in Appendix A.

IN PROGRESS DRAFT



2.0 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL PROCESS

2.1 Requirements for Sustainability Appraisal

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Local Planning Authorities are required to undertake SA for all DPDs and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) that make up a LDF.

Article 1 of the European Union (EU) Directive 2001/42 on the Assessment of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment determines its objective as being '...to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans ... with a view to promoting sustainable development...'.

Directive 2001/42 is implemented in the UK through the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. Under these Regulations Local Planning Authorities are required to undertake SEA for any planning documents setting a framework for future development consent where they are likely to have significant environmental effects. Such planning documents include DPDs and SPDs.

Although the statutory requirements for carrying out SA and SEA are distinct it is possible to satisfy both through a single but integrated SA process. Such a joint approach is advocated in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) guidance. For ease the combined SEA and SA process is simply referred to as SA throughout this SA Report.

2.2 Sustainability Appraisal Regulations and Guidance

The SA process undertaken by WYG has been developed in accordance with the following National and European guidance:

- Department of Health (2007) Draft Guidance on Health in Strategic Environmental Assessment.
- English Nature, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), Countryside Agency and Environment Agency (2004) Strategic Environmental Assessment and Biodiversity: Guidance for Practitioners.
- Environment Agency (2004) Strategic Environmental Assessment of External Plans and Programmes.
- Environment Agency (2007) Strategic Environmental Assessment and Climate Change Guidance Note.
- European Community (2001) Strategic Environmental Assessment and Integration of the Environment into Strategic Decision Making.
- ODPM (2005i) Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks: Guidance for Regional Planning Bodies and Local Planning Authorities.
- ODPM (2005ii) A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive.



- RSPB (2007) Strategic Environmental Assessment – Learning From Practice.

2.3 Sustainability Appraisal Process

SEA is a means of evaluating the environmental acceptability of a plan in a formalised and systematic manner by identifying key environmental issues associated with the study area and how adoption of the plan will influence them. SEA occupies a central position in the hierarchy of land use planning sitting between high level government planning policy and environmental assessment at project level. The SEA process considers similar issues to project level environmental assessment but differs in that the existing environment is examined in broad terms and strategic options are evaluated against environmental objectives. This is because the site specific information needed to complete a project level environmental assessment and quantify environmental effects is not available at the strategic stage.

SA differs from SEA in that it expands the focus of the assessment process to encompass social and economic issues. SA is described by the ODPM (2005ii) guidance as:

'...An iterative process that identifies and reports on the likely significant effects of the plan and the extent to which implementation of the plan will achieve the social, environmental and economic objectives by which sustainable development can be defined...'

The combined SA process will identify key social, economic and environmental issues associated with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough and how adoption of the DPD will influence them. It will help to ensure that significant adverse effects arising from the DPD are either avoided or mitigated. The process will also identify requirements (or indicators) for monitoring the implementation of the DPD following its adoption. Monitoring will identify any unforeseen impacts and inform the next revision or replacement.

Undertaking SA allows for the social, economic and environmental acceptability of the development options to be determined and thus taken into account in the decision making process. However it should be noted that whilst SA will inform the decision making process, the DPD may not always reflect the option that is considered most sustainable.

2.4 Sustainability Appraisal Stages

The SA process adopted by WYG for the DPD has been developed following current guidance produced by the ODPM (2005ii). It involves the following steps:



STAGE A Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope

- Identifying other plans and programmes of relevance to the DPD.
- Collating baseline data and identifying gaps in the current baseline.
- Identifying baseline conditions and key sustainability issues on the basis of the baseline data collated.
- Developing SA objectives.
- Consulting on the scope of the SA.

STAGE B Developing and refining options and assessing effects

- Testing the DPD objectives against the SA objectives (WYG is unable to undertake a compatibility test as the SPD does not propose any specific objectives).
- Developing and appraising the DPD Issues Paper (HBBC, 2007).
- Predicting and evaluating the likely effects of the DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008).
- Developing mitigation for any adverse effects and to maximise beneficial effects.
- Developing recommendations for future monitoring requirements or indicators.

STAGE C Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report

Subsequent to the publication of this SA Report the following stages of the SA process will need to be undertaken by HBBC.

STAGE D Consulting on the DPD Preferred Options Report and the Sustainability Appraisal Report

- Public consultation on the DPD Preferred Options Report and the associated SA Report.
- Appraising any significant changes to the DPD Preferred Options Report as a result of the SA and the public consultation.
- Providing information on how the SA and consultation responses were taken into account in preparing the DPD.

STAGE E Monitoring implementation of the plan

- Monitoring significant effects of the DPD once adopted.
- Responding to any adverse effects arising from the DPD following adoption.



2.4.1 Stage A

WYG undertook Stage A (scoping) for the overall HBBC LDF process in 2005, and produced a Scoping Report (WYG, 2005) detailing the outcomes of Stage A, including the SA framework to be used in appraising LDF documents. Since the Scoping Report (WYG, 2005) was produced, WYG have undertaken a number of activities to ensure that Stage A for the HBBC LDF is up-to-date.

The following sections summarise the activities undertaken at Stage A and the outcomes of these activities.

Consultation

The following statutory and non-statutory consultees were contacted during March 2005 as part of the initial round of consultation for the overall Hinckley and Bosworth LDF SA, in conjunction with Blaby District Council and Oadby and Wigston Borough Council:

- Environment Agency
- English Nature
- Countryside Agency
- English Heritage
- University of Leicester
- South Leicestershire Primary Care Trust
- Leicestershire Constabulary
- Leicestershire Chamber of Commerce & Industry
- British Waterways
- Leicestershire Economic Partnership
- Government Office for the East Midlands
- Sport England East Midlands Region
- East Midlands Regional Assembly
- Transport 2000
- East Midlands Development Agency
- DEFRA Rural Development Service
- Forestry Commission
- Highways Agency
- Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust
- East Midlands Community Renewables Initiative
- Severn Trent Water
- National Farmers Union
- Leicestershire County Council
- RSPB Central England
- National Playing Fields Association



- Arriva Midlands
- Network Rail
- Leicestershire Development Agency
- Leicestershire Rural Transport Partnership
- First Buses
- Leicestershire Rural Partnership
- Brocks Hill Environment Centre
- Oadby Civic Society
- Wigston Civic Society

Consultees were issued with a letter outlining the background to the Hinckley and Bosworth LDF and asked to complete a consultation questionnaire. The purpose of the consultation questionnaire was to:

- Determine what interest consultees had in the Hinckley and Bosworth area.
- Identify social, economic and environmental issues that may need to be considered during the SA process.
- Identify baseline information which consultees held in relation to the Hinckley and Bosworth area.
- Identify any development studies or strategies produced by consultees that needed to be reviewed as part of the SA process.

This consultation also provided an opportunity to get feedback and suggestions from consultees on the objectives to be used in the SA process.

Details of questionnaire consultation responses are provided in the SA Scoping Report (WYG, 2005).

Consultees who expressed an interest (on the questionnaire) in being involved in further rounds of consultation were invited to attend a consultation forum. The consultation forum was hosted jointly by HBBC, Oadby and Wigston Borough Council and Blaby District Council. It was held in Oadby on the 22nd April 2005 at the Brocks Hill Environment Centre.

The following consultees attended:

- Environment Agency
- Highways Agency
- University of Leicester
- Transport 2000
- Leicestershire Constabulary



Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Preferred Options Report

- Leicestershire County Council: Planning
- Leicestershire County Council: Education
- Leicestershire County Council: Historic and Natural Environment
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council: Environment
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council: Environmental Health
- Hinckley and Bosworth Council: Energy Conservation
- Hinckley and Bosworth Council: Housing
- Oadby and Wigston Borough Council: Environmental Health
- Oadby and Wigston Borough Council: Community Development
- Oadby and Wigston Borough Council: Development Control
- Blaby District Council: Housing
- Blaby District Council: Community Development

The consultation forum consisted of two sessions: a series of presentations on the SA process in the morning session, and two workshops to discuss the SA objectives in the afternoon session.

The first workshop was split into three groups: environmental, social, and economic. Each group discussed the objectives most relevant to their group topic. For each objective the participants were asked to consider the following questions:

- What are the key issues that should form the appraisal criteria in relation to each objective?
- Can the LDF deliver in relation to the key issues?
- Are the issues environmental, social or economic issues?
- Do key issues differ between localities?
- What should the priority issues be?

The second workshop was split into groups according to the District or Borough participants represented. The purpose of this workshop was to identify local issues of concern. For each objective the participants were asked to consider the following questions:

- How many targets should be considered in relation to each objective?
- What targets should be adopted in relation to each objective?
- Can the LDF help to meet these targets?
- Do the targets reflect the local situation?
- What are the priority targets for each local area?
- How can we measure the targets developed?
- Is data available to measure the targets?

Details of the outcomes of the consultation forum are provided in the SA Scoping Report (WYG, 2005).



To ensure that the SA framework for the HBBC LDF was up-to-date, a Scoping Consultation Document was sent to the following statutory and non-statutory consultees in May 2007 to allow for comments on the proposed approach to the SA:

- Natural England.
- Environment Agency.
- English Heritage.
- East Midlands Development Agency.
- Government Office for the East Midlands.
- East Midlands Regional Assembly.
- Leicestershire County and Rutland Primary Care Trust.
- Leicestershire Constabulary.
- Leicestershire Chamber of Commerce and Industry.
- Leicestershire Economic Partnership.
- British Waterways.
- Sport England.
- Transport 2000.
- DEFRA Rural Development Service.
- Forestry Commission.
- Highways Agency.
- Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust.
- East Midlands Community Renewables Initiative.
- Severn Trent Water.
- National Farmers Union.
- Leicestershire County Council.
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds.
- National Playing Fields Association.
- Arriva Midlands.
- Network Rail.
- Leicestershire Development Agency.
- First Buses.

The purpose of the consultation was to:

- Gain feedback and suggestions from consultees on the suitability of the SA objectives.
- Identify plans and programmes that need to be reviewed as part of the SA process.
- Identify social, environmental and economic issues of specific relevance that need to be considered as part of the SA process.



- To determine whether the list of key sustainability issues presented in the SA Scoping Report for LDF are comprehensive.

Consultee comments received following the May 2007 consultation are provided in full in Appendix D.

Links to Relevant Plans and Programmes

It is a requirement of the SEA Directive that an analysis of the plan's '*...relationship with other relevant plans and programmes...*' (Annex 1a of the SEA Directive) and of '*...the environmental protection objectives...which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation...*' (Annex 1e of the SEA Directive) is undertaken.

A review of plans and programmes of relevance to Hinckley and Bosworth was undertaken as part of the SA of the Hinckley and Bosworth LDF in 2005. The review can be found in Appendix D of the Scoping Report (WYG, 2005).

To ensure that the SA framework for the HBBC LDF was up-to-date, the following additional plans and programmes were reviewed:

- Planning Policy Guidance 13.
- Leicestershire Local Area Agreement (2006).
- Hinckley and Bosworth Community Plan 2007-2012.
- Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 (2006).

Key aims and objectives (including sustainability objectives) of each plan were identified and then the implications for the DPD were determined. The review of plans and programmes is provided in Appendix B. Key points arising from this review are that the DPD should:

- Maximise opportunities to reduce levels of private car use.
- Maximise opportunities to encourage walking and cycling.
- Maximise opportunities to encourage the use of public transport.
- Maximise opportunities to improve traffic flow and road safety issues.
- Maximise opportunities to improve community safety.
- Maximise opportunities to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases.
- Maximise opportunities to improve physical access to services.
- Maximise opportunities to tackle congestion.
- Maximise opportunities to improve air quality.
- Maximise opportunities to manage transport assets in the most cost effective way.



Baseline and Key Sustainability Issues

Baseline data was collated and reviewed in order to establish the baseline conditions and to help identify key sustainability issues as part of the SA of the Hinckley and Bosworth LDF in 2005. The baseline conditions provide the basis against which significant effects of the DPD can be predicted. To ensure that the SA framework for the HBBC LDF was up-to-date, this information has been updated. Section 4.0 of this SA Report summarises the current baseline and key sustainability issues for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

At the end of Stage A of the SA of the Hinckley and Bosworth LDF SA objectives were developed. These objectives provide a basis against which to appraise Hinckley and Bosworth LDF documents, and cover social, environmental and economic issues.

The objectives used to appraise the DPD are listed in Table 2.1. The LDF SA objectives have been slightly amended following consultation (see the previous section). Consultee comments received following the March 2005 consultation can be found in the SA Scoping Report (WYG, 2005). Consultee comments received following the May 2007 consultation are provided in full in Appendix D of this report.

The DPD should aim to fulfil the SA objectives as this will allow it to be consistent with environmental regulations and high level sustainable development policies. However, there may be some objectives on which the DPD will have limited impact or which are in conflict with one another.

Table 2.1 Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

SPD SA Objectives	Economic	Social	Environmental
1. To ensure the provision of decent and affordable housing that meets local needs and links into the provision of services.	✓	✓	
2. To improve health and reduce health inequalities by promoting healthy lifestyles, protecting health and providing access to health services.		✓	



SPD SA Objectives	Economic	Social	Environmental
3. To provide better opportunities for local people and tourists to access and understand local heritage.	✓	✓	✓
4. To improve access to and participation in cultural and leisure activities.		✓	✓
5. To improve community safety, reduce the fear of crime and reduce anti-social behaviour, particularly in Hinckley Town Centre.		✓	
6. To promote and support the empowerment of local communities in creating and implementing solutions that meet their needs focusing particularly on young, elderly and deprived people.		✓	
7. To protect and enhance the natural environment (species and habitats) whilst contributing to the achievement of Biodiversity Action Plan targets.			✓
8. To conserve and enhance the character, diversity and local distinctiveness of towns and villages in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough.			✓
9. To preserve and enhance the character, appearance and setting of archaeological sites, historic buildings, conservation sites, historic parks and other cultural assets.			✓
11. To conserve and enhance woodland cover in the Borough, particularly in the National Forest area.			✓
12. To manage prudently water resources, improve water quality and protect the floodplain.			✓
13. To improve air quality particularly through reducing transport related pollutants.		✓	✓



SPD SA Objectives	Economic	Social	Environmental
14. To manage prudently mineral resources and avoid / reduce pollution of land.	✓	✓	✓
15. To minimise energy use and develop renewable energy resources.			✓
16. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions to mitigate the rate of climate change.			✓
17. To involve people, through changes to lifestyle and at work, in preventing and minimising adverse local, regional and global environmental impacts.			✓
18. To improve access to education and training for children, young people and adult learners.	✓	✓	
19. To develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation whilst providing access to appropriate employment opportunities for the local population, particularly in rural areas.	✓	✓	
20. To help farmers diversify their agricultural activities or venture into new rural businesses. To help other rural businesses diversify their activities.	✓	✓	✓
21. To optimise the use of previously developed land, buildings and existing infrastructure.	✓		✓
22. To promote and ensure high standards of sustainable design and construction.	✓		✓
23. To minimise waste and to increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials.	✓		✓



SPD SA Objectives	Economic	Social	Environmental
24. To improve access to services, particularly for the rural population, those without a car and for disabled, elderly and deprived people.		✓	✓
25. To encourage and develop the use of public transport, cycling and walking as alternatives to the private car.		✓	✓

2.4.2 Stages B and C

Stages B and C of the SA process involve a broad appraisal of the initial Issues and Options proposed, followed by a more detailed appraisal of the Preferred Options once these have been selected.

- Stage B2: Developing and appraising the Site Allocations DPD and the Generic Development Control Policies DPD Issues and Options.
- Stage B3: Developing and assessing the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options.

This SA Report details the findings of Stages B and C of the SA process for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD. Further details of the appraisal methodology adopted are provided in Chapter 7.0.

2.5 Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive Compliance

This SA Report incorporates the requirements for an Environmental Report as set out in the SEA Directive (Annex I). Table 2.2 summarises the requirements of the SEA Directive, identifies how the requirements have been met and where these are located in the SA Report.

Table 2.2 Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive Compliance

Requirement of SEA Directive	Where detailed in this SA Report
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan... ...and its relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.	Section 3.3 of the SA Report. Plans and programmes reviewed during development of the SA framework are provided in the separate Scoping Report (WYG, 2005).



Requirement of SEA Directive	Where detailed in this SA Report
	Additional plans and programmes reviewed are provided in Appendix B. A summary of the key points arising from this review is provided in Section 2.4.1.
b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan.	Section 4.0 of the SA Report.
c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.	Section 4.0 of the SA Report.
d) The environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including, in particular those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance.	Section 4.0 of the SA Report.
e) Any existing environmental protection objectives which are relevant to the plan... ...and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation.	Section X.X of the SA Report. Environmental objectives of relevance to the DPD are also provided in the separate Scoping Report (WYG, 2005).
f) The likely significant effects on the environment including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors.	Section 6.3 and Appendix E of the SA Report.
g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme.	Section 6.4 and Appendix E of the SA Report.
h) An outline for the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with... ...and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties encountered in compiling the required information.	Sections 5.4 and 6.22 of the SA Report.



Requirement of SEA Directive	Where detailed in this SA Report
i) A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10 of the SEA Directive.	Section 7.0 and Appendix F of the SA Report.
j) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings.	Section 0.0 of the SA Report.

IN PROGRESS DRAFT



3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 Study Area

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough is located in west Leicestershire. It is situated between the western fringe of Leicester to the east and Warwickshire to the west. The M1 motorway runs partially along the north-eastern edge of the Borough while the M69 motorway runs partially along the south-eastern edge. Figure 1 shows the location of the Borough in relation to adjacent Council administrations.

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough covers an area of 29,700 hectares and has a population of approximately 101,500 people. Rural and agricultural land use accounts for approximately 92% of the Borough. The remaining 8% comprises villages and urban areas. The main settlements are the towns of Hinckley, Earl Shilton, Burbage and Barwell. The western half of the Borough has socio-economic links with the cities of Coventry and Birmingham.

3.2 Hinckley and Bosworth Local Development Framework

Fundamental changes to the planning system have been introduced through the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). This requires HBBC to adopt a LDF in place of their existing Local Plan. The LDF will set out guidelines for the development of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough. In the transitional period the Local Plan will retain development plan status until the policies within it are superseded by those within the LDF documents.

Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 12 sets out the new LDF process. It requires Local Planning Authorities to adopt a spatial planning approach. The LDF will not be restricted solely to land use issues, such as identifying where new houses, employment, retail and leisure facilities should be located, but it will go beyond traditional land use planning by integrating policies for development with policies that influence the nature of places and how they function.

The Hinckley and Bosworth LDF will comprise a number of DPDs which will have statutory status. The proposals and policies set out in these will guide planning decisions. The LDF will also comprise a number of SPDs which are non-statutory documents prepared to support the delivery of major development sites or complex policy areas.

The Hinckley and Bosworth Local Development Scheme (LDS) outlines HBBC's timetable and programme management details for the preparation of the LDF. The 2007-10 LDS is the second LDS that the council has produced. HBBC have also produced a Statement of Community Involvement which was adopted in November 2006. This document sets out the standards to which HBBC will engage and consult the public and other stakeholders during the production of the LDF and when dealing with planning applications.



In addition to the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD, other DPDs yet to be adopted include the Core Strategy DPD and the Hinckley Town Centre Area Action Plan DPD.

A number of SPDs have already been adopted. These include the Shopping and Shop Fronts SPD (adopted October 2007), the Affordable Housing DPD (adopted April 2008), the Sustainable Design SPD (adopted April 2008), and the Play and Open Space SPD (adopted September 2008). The Hinckley Town Centre Strategic Developer Contributions SPD and the Ratby Village Design Statement SPD have yet to be adopted.

The East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) was produced by the Government Office of the East Midlands in 2005. A review of the RSS was undertaken in 2006, and consultation on a partial review commenced in October. The RSS will also form part of the statutory development plan for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough.

3.3 Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document

3.3.1 Development of the Development Plan Document

The Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD will support the policies set out in the Core Strategy DPD and will allocate land for specific uses in the Borough. Whilst the Core Strategy DPD will discuss the broad locations for development in the Borough, it is the role of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD to determine the exact location for development and to allocate sites to deliver housing and other major development needs such as employment, recreation, open space and community uses. The Development Control Policies will supplement and assist the Site Allocations decisions. The policies and proposals included in the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD will provide a framework for the determination of planning applications in the Borough.

HBBC initially proposed that the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD would comprise two separate DPDs: A Site Allocations DPD and a Generic Development Control DPD. In 2007, an Issues and Options paper was produced for each DPD.

The Site Allocations DPD Issues Paper (HBBC, 2007) and the Generic Development Control DPD Issues and Options (HBBC, 2007) were both subject to SA using the SA framework developed in Stage A. The outcome of the SAs is detailed within the Site Allocations DPD Options Appraisal Explanatory Notes (WYG, 2007) and the Generic Development Control Policies DPD Options Appraisal Explanatory Notes (WYG, 2007). All four reports were issued for consultation in 2007.



Following consultation on the reports, HBBC produced the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008); a combined document detailing HBBC's preferred approach relating to future development in the Borough. The reasons for selection of the Preferred Options are provided within the Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008).

3.3.2 Contents of the Preferred Options Report

The Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008) comprises two parts: Part A: Context and Part B: Generic Development Control Policies and Site Allocations.

Part A: Context (Chapters 1 and 2) provides the background and sets the policy context for the DPD.

Part B: Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies comprises Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6:

Chapter 3: Site Allocations

The Site Allocations chapter outlines HBBC's preferred sites for the following uses:

- Residential.
- Employment.
- Open space.
- Local centre.
- Green space.
- Area of Special Character.
- District centre.
- Gypsy and traveller pitches.
- Show persons accommodation.
- Allotments.
- Community facilities.

The Site Allocations chapter sets out the preferred sites by settlement. Settlements are divided into those that are found within Urban Areas and those that are found within Rural Areas. Within Rural Areas, the Site Allocations are further divided into those that form Key Rural Centres, Rural Villages, Rural Hamlets and Other Settlements.



Chapter 4: Non-Settlement Specific Site Allocations

The Non-Settlement Specific Site Allocations outlines HBBC's preferred sites that are non-settlement specific. The sites are divided into those allocated for Green Infrastructure (comprising Green/Wildlife Corridors and Green Wedges), Wind Power and Tourism.

Chapter 5: Overarching Generic Development Control Policies

The four Overarching Generic Development Control Policies are policies that apply to the majority of the developments that are proposed.

Chapter 6: Generic Development Control Policies

The 16 Generic Development Control Policies are policies that are more specific to certain types of application.

Copies of all 20 Generic Development Control Policies can be found in Appendix H.

IN PROGRESS DRAFT



4.0 BASELINE AND KEY ISSUES

4.1 Introduction

The SEA Directive requires the "...current state of the environment..." (Annex 1b of the SEA Directive) and the "environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected..." (Annex 1c of the SEA Directive) to be identified.

This chapter provides a broad overview of the social, economic and environmental features of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough and parts of adjacent authorities which have environmental and socio-economic links with the Borough. Figure 1 shows the location of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough in relation to other administrative areas.

The following social, economic and environmental parameters have been considered:

Socio-Economic

- Local Economy and Employment.
- Population.
- Deprivation.
- Crime.
- Health.
- Education.
- Housing.
- Traffic and Transport.
- Tourism, Leisure and Recreation.

Environmental

- Water Environment.
- Biodiversity and Nature Conservation.
- Landscape and Visual Amenity.
- Geology and Soils.
- Waste Management.
- Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.
- Noise.
- Air Quality.
- Climate Change.



Baseline data for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough is also provided in the SA Scoping Report for the SA of the Hinckley and Bosworth LDF produced by WYG in 2005. Baseline data presented in this SA Report has been updated to reflect the current situation.

4.2 Socio-Economic Baseline

This section sets out the existing situation in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough with regards to economy, employment, population, deprivation, crime, health, education, housing, traffic and transport, walking and cycling, leisure and recreation and access to services. The socio-economic baseline has been established with reference to:

- National Statistics website (www.statistics.gov.uk).
- NOMIS - Official Labour Statistics (www.nomisweb.co.uk).
- Government Office for the East Midlands (www.goem.gov.uk).
- The Sustainable Development Unit (www.sustainable-development.gov.uk).
- The Department for Communities and Local Government (www.bvpi.gov.uk).
- The Hinckley and Bosworth Corporate Performance Plan 2006 – 2011.
- The Land Registry (www.landregistry.gov.uk).
- The National Land Use Database (www.nlud.org.uk).
- DEFRA (www.defra.gov.uk).
- Leicestershire County Council (www.leics.gov.uk).
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (April 2007).
- Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Strategy 2005-2008.
- Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Needs Study (2004).
- Hinckley Town Centre Renaissance Masterplan (May 2006).
- Leicestershire Economic Partnership (2006) Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Profile – Leicestershire Economic Baseline Study.
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Economic Study (2002).
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Economic Development Strategy.
- Hinckley and Bosworth Crime, Disorder and Drug Strategy 2005-2008.
- Department of Health Community Health Profiles (www.communityhealthprofiles.info/).
- Hinckley and Bosworth Community Plan 2007-2012.
- Leicestershire Community Strategy.
- Leicestershire Rural Strategy (Draft) 2007-2014.
- Fields In Trust (www.npfa.co.uk).
- Hinckley and Bosworth Green Space Strategy.

4.2.1 Local Economy and Employment

In the past the main industry in Hinckley and Bosworth has predominantly been manufacturing with textile clothing, footwear and mechanical engineering sectors.



In 2004 the largest employment sectors in Hinckley and Bosworth were manufacturing (26.1%), distribution, hotels and restaurants (26.1%) and financial and business services (15.0%). In May 2006, the largest employer in the Borough was Tesco Stores Limited, which has a distribution site employing over 1,000 people. Transco, MIRA and Triumph Motorcycles are also major employers in the Borough.

Geographically, the urban area in the south accounts for much of the manufacturing but also distribution. The east has limited employment and there is significant commuting into Leicester, the west is rural and based mainly upon agriculture and a limited amount of manufacturing. While the north is the former coal mining area, which has declined economically since the early 1980's.

The proportion of people working in the manufacturing sector in Hinckley and Bosworth is considerably higher than the county (19.0%) and national averages (11.9%) with significant numbers of manufacturing jobs still found in the traditional textile, hosiery, clothing, footwear and mechanical engineering sectors.

Employment percentages by industry sector reinforce the image of Hinckley and Bosworth's reliance on manufacturing as compared to the wider region. The Borough remains underrepresented in growth sectors such as public administration, education and health and financial and business services relative to the county, regional and national averages. Similarly, the development of knowledge sectors in the Borough has not been as strong as the county and considerably weaker than the national picture. Such sectors employ high proportions of graduate labour and are capable of sustaining local competitive advantage. Hinckley and Bosworth is therefore considered to be at a disadvantage compared to other areas of the county. In 2004, only 1.0% of employees were employed in high technology manufacturing in the Borough, compared to 2.0% in Leicestershire and 1.9% in Great Britain.

In 2004, the business registration rate in Hinckley and Bosworth was 51.5 (number of business start ups per 1,000 people working age population) compared to 48.6 in Leicestershire, 43.4 in the East Midlands and 46.3 in Great Britain. Between 2000 and 2004 the number of businesses grew by 6.1% in the Borough, which is above the proportionate change for Leicestershire, the East Midlands and Great Britain. However, the proportion of business start ups in the financial and business service sector in Hinckley and Bosworth was slightly below the county and national averages, which is reflected in the employment sectors statistics for the Borough.

During the period 2004-2005, the employment rate for Hinckley and Bosworth was 79.7% respectively, compared to 76.1% in the East Midlands and 75.1% in England as a whole. However, long term unemployment is higher than most other Districts / Boroughs. According to the Leicestershire Economic Baseline Study (2006), since 2000 employment in Hinckley and Bosworth



has decreased by 3.7% (1,500 jobs). This was compared to an 8.8% increase in the county and a 3.2% increase nationally.

In 2004-2005 the Economic Activity Rate (EAR) (% of working age population) for Hinckley and Bosworth in 2004-2005 was 83.4%. The EAR for the Borough saw a reduction of 1.7% from the previous year (2003-2004), but compares favourably with the EAR for the East Midlands (79.5%) and England as a whole (78.8%).

The average gross weekly pay for full time workers in the Borough is below both county and national averages. During 2004-2005 the average gross weekly pay for full time workers in the Borough was £506.30, compared to £528.4 in Leicestershire and £548 in England respectively. Similarly, the average gross weekly pay for part time workers is lower than that of Leicestershire, with the average gross weekly pay being £174.20 in the Borough in 2004-2005, compared to £176.40 in Leicestershire. The average gross weekly pay for part time workers in the Borough is, however, higher than the national average of £172.50 for the same period respectively.

4.2.2 Population

According to the 2005 mid-year population estimates, the population of Hinckley and Bosworth was 102,200 people. This represents an estimated 4.4% increase since 1994, compared to an increase of 6.4% in Leicestershire. Providing that current population trends continue, the Leicestershire Economic Baseline Study (2006) estimates that the number of people living in the Borough will increase by 11.5% over the next 30 years, compared to a forecast increase of 15.2% in the county.

The population density (persons per km²) of Hinckley and Bosworth was 3.37 in 2001, compared to 2.93 in Leicestershire, 2.67 in the East Midlands and 3.77 in England.

Compared to the county, region and national averages, Hinckley and Bosworth has a higher proportion of the population aged above retirement age and a lower proportion of people aged less than 15 years. In 2005 there were a lower proportion of people aged 0-4 years (5.4%), 5-14 years (11.6%) and 15-19 years (6.1%) in Hinckley and Bosworth, and higher proportions of people aged 45-64 years (28.1%) and 65 years and over (16.7%). Hinckley and Bosworth's demographic profile is predicted to alter in line with national forecasts, with strong growth in the retired population.

The ethnic diversity of the Borough is limited, with the vast majority of the population being classed as 'White British'. In 2001, 97.93% of the population of the Borough were 'White British', compared to 94.71% in Leicestershire, 93.49% in the East Midlands and 86.99% in England as a whole. The next most dominant ethnic group in the Borough, as measured in the 2001 Census, were the 'Asian or Asian British'.



4.2.3 Deprivation

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG, formerly the ODPM) produce the Indices of Deprivation to identify areas of social and economic deprivation in England. The Index of Multiple Deprivation incorporates various measures of deprivation including income, employment, health, education, barriers to housing, living environment and crime. The Indices are produced at local authority, ward and Super Output Area levels. The lower the rank/percentile the more deprived the area is.

Hinckley and Bosworth is ranked 278 out of 374 Local Authorities nationally (74th percentile) in the Index of Multiple Deprivation (Rank of Average Score). This indicates that the Borough as a whole is significantly less deprived in comparison to the majority of other Districts / Boroughs in England. Within Leicestershire, Hinckley and Bosworth is the third most deprived District / Borough.

However, deprivation does vary across the Borough and there are pockets of much higher deprivation in certain areas. Lack of skills, low incomes, crime and a poor environment variously affect parts of the urban areas and the former coalfield. In contrast, isolation from local services is an issue in the rural areas, especially parts of the more sparsely populated west of the Borough.

4.2.4 Crime

Crime in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough is significantly below the national average. The overall crime rate (British Crime Survey Comparator) in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough was 43.5 in 2005, compared to 63.3 in the East Midlands and 62.7 in England as a whole. The overall crime rate was, however, higher than that for Leicestershire (42.7) in 2005.

In 2005 the burglary rate (offences per 1,000 households) in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough was 11.4, which was below the regional and national rates of 14.8 and 13.8. However, the burglary rate for the Borough was slightly above the county rate (10.8) and has increased by 0.2 since the previous year.

Robbery rates (offences per 1,000 people) for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough were significantly below the regional and national rates for the period 2003-2005. In 2005 the robbery rate in the Borough was 0.4, compared to 1.3 in the East Midlands and 1.9 in England as a whole respectively.

Data for 'Violence against the Person' and 'Theft of a Motor Vehicle' (offences per 1,000 population) for the period 2000-2001 in the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough were both below the national rates; although it is important to note that the 'Theft of a Motor Vehicle' rate in 2000-2001 was higher in the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough than over the East Midlands region.

A Crime Disorder and Drugs Audit was undertaken by Leicestershire County Council in 2005. According to the findings of the audit, domestic violence, racist incidents and criminal damage



account for the highest volume of crime in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough (39% of all crime in the Borough). Vehicle crime has also increased over the last 3 years but remains lower than it was in the late 1990's. Youth nuisance, burglary and drug abuse were also identified as being of concern.

4.2.5 Health

Health in Hinckley and Bosworth is good when compared with the East Midlands region and England as a whole. In the 2001 Census, 69.41% of the population described their health as good, compared to 67.58% in the East Midlands and 68.76% in England as a whole. Similarly, the life expectancy for both males and females in 2002 and 2003 were above both the regional and national averages. There is, however, a 5 year gap between female life expectancy in the fifth most and least deprived areas within Hinckley and Bosworth.

In 2004 the mortality rate due to circulatory diseases (per 100,000 population of those under 75) in the Borough was 75.4, which is significantly lower than mortality rates in Leicestershire (76.0), the East Midlands (91.4) and England as a whole (90.5). The mortality rate due to circulatory diseases has also decreased by 8.8 since 2002, which is in line with the reduction seen over the same period at the county, regional and national scales.

Similarly, the mortality rate due to cancer (per 1,000 population of those under 75) for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough is below the county, regional and national rates. However, whilst the cancer mortality rate for the Borough is lower than the national average, the mortality rate has increased from 96.9 in 2002 to 107.2 in 2004.

According to the 2007 Health Profile for Hinckley and Bosworth death rates from smoking and early death rates from heart disease and strokes are lower than the national average. Teenage pregnancy rates are also low compared to the national average. However, it is estimated that 1 in 4 adults are obese in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, which is above the national average. Tobacco control, physical activity, food and health, accidents, sexual health, mental health and well being have been identified as priorities for the Borough.

4.2.6 Education

Leicestershire County Council is the Local Education Authority for Hinckley and Bosworth. Generally education and academic achievement for children in the Borough is good when compared to regional and national averages. Throughout the period 2003-2005, 100% of pupils achieved 5 or more GCSEs at grades A* to C (or equivalent). Similarly, a high percentage of 11 year olds achieved Level 4 or above in Key Stage (KS) 2 Maths and English and a high percentage of 14 year olds achieved Level 5 or above in KS 3 Maths and English in the Borough. There are, however, significant disparities in learning levels at ward level, with wards such as Bagworth and Earl Shilton ranked amongst the top 20% of wards in the country in terms of educational disadvantage.



In terms of adult education, in 2003-2004, the percentage of the working age population educated to at least National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) Level 3 in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough was 16.3%. This figure is slightly below that of Leicestershire (17.6%) and the East Midlands (16.4%), but greater than that for England as a whole (15.2%). The percentage of the working age population educated to at least NVQ Level 1 and NVQ level 2 were both above the county, regional and national averages. Hinckley College is the Borough's one centre for further education, providing valuable training in emerging industries such as creative design and logistics.

Fewer people in Hinckley and Bosworth have trade apprenticeships, in comparison to Leicestershire, the East Midlands and England as a whole. In 2003-2004 only 9.5% of the working age population of the Borough had trade apprenticeships, compared to 10.5% in Leicestershire, 12.2% in the East Midlands and 10.5 in England as a whole. The percentage of the working age population with trade apprenticeships has also fallen from 12.7% in 2002-2003, to 9.5% in 2003-2004. Leicestershire, the East Midlands and England as a whole however, have an experienced an increase over this period.

In 2003-2004 10.1% of the working age population of Hinckley and Bosworth had no qualifications respectively, compared to 10.5% in Leicestershire, 12.2% in the East Midlands and 10.5% in England as a whole. The percentage of the working age population with no qualifications in the Borough has decreased by 6.4% since 2001-2002.

4.2.7 Housing

The main settlements in Hinckley and Bosworth are the towns of Hinckley, Earl Shilton, Burbage and Barwell in the south west of the Borough. Over 60% of the population of the Borough lives in these urban areas. A further 19% live in the north eastern parishes close to the City of Leicester (Grobby, Markfield, Ratby and Desford). The remaining 20% live in 17 rural parishes, only one of which has a population of more than 3,000.

In 2004 the dwelling stock in Hinckley and Bosworth was 43, 623 properties. Of these, 76.5% are houses, 16% are bungalows, 7% are flats or maisonettes and 0.5% are mobile homes. The proportion of flats is lower than for the East Midlands (10%) and well below the 19% of flats nationally. In terms of property size there is a very low proportion of one bedroom properties, just 6%, with a quarter having 2 bedrooms, almost half (47%) having 3 bedrooms and the remaining 22% having 4 or more.

The tenure pattern in Hinckley and Bosworth also differs significantly from the national and regional picture. In 2001, 82% of housing in the Borough was owner occupied (owned outright or with a mortgage / loan), compared to 80% in Leicestershire, 71.6% in the East Midlands and 68% in England as a whole.



Conversely, the percentage of households renting from the council / housing association in Hinckley and Bosworth in 2001 was 10.6%, which is lower than the county (11%), regional (17.5%) and national averages (19.3%).

Generally, the condition of the housing stock in the Borough is good in comparison to the regional and national averages. In 2005, the percentage of the total dwelling stock that was classified as being unfit in Hinckley and Bosworth was 2.1%, compared to 3.7% in the East Midlands and 4.4% in England. In 2005 0% of local authority dwellings in the Borough were classified as unfit, compared to 1.7% in the East Midlands and 3.8% in England. The percentage of total owner occupied and private rented dwellings in the Borough classified as unfit in 2005 was 2.3%, compared to 4.8% in the East Midlands and 4.9% in England as a whole.

On a scale of 1 to 120 private housing stock in Hinckley and Bosworth achieved an average of 50 for energy efficiency in 2004. This is better than the national average (35) but still leaves notable room for improvement. There are an estimated 7,100 households who could be experiencing, or at risk from, fuel poverty.

In 2006 the average house price in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough was £171,367. This was above the average house price in the East Midlands (£163,225), but below the average house price in Leicestershire (£186,669) and England as a whole (£207,573) in the same year. However, house prices in the Borough have more than doubled since 1999, rising faster than regional and national averages, and consequently are now out of the reach of most first time buyers.

Local variations within the Borough are typified by five housing sub-markets: Central Hinckley; Outer Hinckley; Barwell / Earl Shilton; Rural North East; and Rural West.

Rural West and Outer Hinckley are the most expensive areas and Barwell / Earl Shilton is the cheapest. Housing is more expensive in the rural areas, with a high demand for all types, sizes, locations and prices of property.

The Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Needs Study (2004) estimated the need for affordable housing in the Borough based on the Basic Needs Assessment Model (BNAM), in accordance with Government guidance. The results of this study concluded that there was a shortfall of around 254 affordable homes per annum, smaller properties with 1 or 2 bedrooms being needed most. There will also be a shortfall in the amount of housing for owner occupation. Shortfalls are more pronounced in Barwell, Earl Shilton, Hinckley and Burbage.

In addition, as part of the Housing Needs Study, a Balancing Housing Markets (BHM) analysis was undertaken to examine the extent to which housing supply and demand are 'balanced' across



tenure and property size. The BHM analysis suggested a shortfall in affordable housing of 178 homes per annum, in accordance with the conclusions of the BNAM.

A Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment is currently being undertaken which will, once completed, supersede the Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Needs Survey.

According to the Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Strategy 2005-2008 11% of households in the Borough included someone with a specific need, many of which are accommodated in unsuitable housing. Physical disability is the biggest specific need in the Borough, followed by the elderly, people with mental problems and people with learning disabilities. According to the Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Strategy 23.6% of households in the Borough contain older persons only. 49.7% of all Council accommodation is occupied by older persons only.

Homelessness has been identified as being a growing problem in the Borough. According to the Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Strategy 2005-2008 homelessness has more than doubled in 4 years and is an increasing problem among young single people.

In April 2007 local authorities across Leicestershire commissioned an assessment of the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers. There is no source of information regarding the Gypsies and Traveller population size in Leicestershire; the assessment estimates that the population stands at 1,815 and is unevenly distributed across the county. However, the majority of larger sites tend to be concentrated in the west of the county in Blaby, North West Leicestershire and Hinckley and Bosworth.

Within the Hinckley and Bosworth there are three authorised sites, three temporary permission sites and one unauthorised site. In addition, there is a further authorised site and two unauthorised sites along the Borough's border with Warwickshire. The needs assessment determined that between 2006 and 2011 a further 26 residential pitches will be required across the Borough, along with accommodation for two 'Showpeople' families and capacity for up to ten transit caravans. Between 2011 and 2016 it is predicted that 16 residential pitches will be required with accommodation for one further family of Showpeople.

4.2.8 Traffic and Transport

Road Network

In strategic terms Hinckley Borough has reasonable links to core national and regional networks. The M69 skirts the south eastern edge of the Borough, the M1 runs through the north east of the Borough and the M42 runs parallel to the Borough's western boundary.



The local highway network within the Borough is dominated by the A447, A47 and A444 which provide the main north south linkages, with the M69 part of the national highway network, providing a link to Leicester in the north east and Coventry and Nuneaton to the south west. The A5 runs along the southern boundary of the Borough, and is also an important link in the national trunk road network. Accessibility to the strategic road network is good from many areas although access is limited from some isolated rural areas.

Private Car Use

Car ownership in Hinckley and Bosworth is high. In 2001 83.26% of households in the Borough owned at last one car or van; a significantly higher rate than Leicestershire (83.19%), The East Midlands (83.19%) and England as a whole (73.16%).

The rural nature of Hinckley and Bosworth, and the relatively good access to major road routes, means that more people tend to use cars than other forms of transport. In 2001, 66% of working residents drove a car or van to work in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, compared to 64.6% in Leicestershire, 60.4% in the East Midlands and 54.9% in England as a whole.

Data for Hinckley and Bosworth indicates that road safety in the Borough is good. In 2005, the road accident casualty rate (people killed or seriously injured per 1,000 population) was 0.5. This figure was the same as that seen in Leicestershire as a whole, and was below the figures seen at the regional (0.6) and national (0.6) scales. This rate remained approximately stable over the period 2003-2005, in line with the figures for the same period seen at the county, regional and national scales.

Similarly, in 2005 the road accident casualty rate (children killed or seriously injured per 1,000 population) for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough was 0.2, this being the same as that for the county of Leicestershire, and below that for the East Midlands (0.4) and England (0.3).

However, despite road safety being good in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, certain parts of the Borough suffer from problems of congestion. There are often high levels of traffic congestion during peak times on the motorways, intensified by the larger number of Heavy Goods Vehicles. Congestion problem areas include the A5 corridor and the A47. A number of road accident hotspots also exist in the Borough, in particular along the A47 in Earl Shilton.

The Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 proposes one major transport scheme for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough; the Earl Shilton bypass. It is hoped that the bypass will address the significant road safety and congestion problems currently experienced on the A47 through Earl Shilton. All statutory procedures for the bypass are complete and the project is expected to be completed by 2009.



Public Transport

Public transport use in Hinckley and Bosworth is significantly below the rates for the county, region and country, which reflects the high levels of private car use in the Borough. In 2001, the percentage of working residents using public transport to get to work was 4.39%, compared to 6.05% for Leicestershire, 8.44% for the East Midlands and 15.43% for England.

Similarly, fewer people in Hinckley and Bosworth cycle or walk to work. In 2001 12.2% of working residents in the Borough walked or cycled to work, compared to 12.2% in Leicestershire, 13.8% in the East Midlands and 12.8% in England.

The main form of public transport in the Borough is bus. A network of bus services operate in the Borough which link the main settlements of Hinckley, Earl Shilton, Burbage and Barwell. There is also a Park and Ride facility located on the A47 near Braunstone crossroads, and there are proposals for a Park and Ride into Leicester near junction 21 of the M1.

The frequency of public transport services is, however, a problem, especially in rural villages. In addition, there are few linkages between smaller villages and Hinckley Town Centre, and to Coalville outside of the Borough. Many people rely on facilities outside their own village and the cost and low frequency of public transport can contribute to rural isolation, especially for those without access to a car.

Train services in Hinckley and Bosworth are limited. Hinckley is served by trains from Birmingham New Street, Nuneaton and Leicester. Local rail services from Hinckley allow connections to main line services. The West Coast Main Line can be accessed at Nuneaton, and the Midland Main Line at Leicester. Rail services are provided by Central Trains.

Walking and Cycling

Hinckley and Bosworth has a network of Public Rights of Way and cycle routes which provide informal recreation opportunities and allow access to open space. Popular routes include the Ashby Canal from Snarestone to Marston Junction on the Coventry Canal and the 'Leicestershire Round', a 100 mile circular route which extends around the county of Leicestershire. A number of cycle routes within the Borough form part of the Sustrans National Cycleway.

The Hinckley and Bosworth Community Plan identifies a need to increase safe cycling routes and a need for improved safety for pedestrians including providing more pavements. HBBC has prepared a cycle network plan for the Hinckley urban and rural area.



4.2.9 Tourism, Leisure and Recreation

Tourism provides a significant contribution to the economy of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough. The Borough offers a number of visitor attractions, including Bosworth Battlefield Visitor Centre, Market Bosworth Country Park, Twycross Zoo, Shackerstone Light Railway and Mallory Park Race Track.

Hinckley and Bosworth also has a range of recreational and cultural facilities. This includes parks, open spaces, countryside sites such as Newbold Vernon Country Park, museums, libraries, sport, community facilities, youth centres and play provision.

The Ashby Canal runs from the north to the south of Hinckley and Bosworth and is a major recreational / ecological resource. The canal towpath forms part of the proposed Midlands Long Distance Footpath. The National Forest, situated in the north east of the Borough has significant potential for enhancing tourism and recreation in the area. The plans for the National Forest include the development of visitor centres, woodland trails, cycle ways, woodland / field based sports and visitor car parking.

Open space and playing fields provide informal and formal recreation for all ages. The National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) published the Six Acre Standard in 2002. This is a planning guide to ensure that sufficient land is set aside in appropriate locations to enable people of all ages, especially the young, to participate in outdoor play, games, sports and other physical recreation. The NPFA suggests a minimum standard of outdoor playing space of 2.4 hectares for 1,000 people, comprising 1.6 hectares for outdoor sport and 0.8 hectares for children's play.

In addition, English Nature has developed an Accessible Natural Green Space Standard to guide the creation of green space which recommends:

- An Accessible Natural Greenspace less than 300 metres (in a straight line) from home;
- Statutory Local Nature Reserve (LNR) provided at a minimum level of one hectare per 1,000 population;
- At least one accessible 20 hectare site within 2 kilometres of home;
- At least one accessible 100 hectare site within 5 kilometres of home; and
- At least one accessible 500 hectare site within 10 kilometres of home.

The Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Green Space Strategy highlights that the majority of local people in the Borough are satisfied with the amount of parks and open spaces provided where they lived (63%). However, satisfaction in local parks and open spaces has decreased since previous years. In 2004-2005 71% of people in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough were very / fairly satisfied with the parks and open spaces available within the Borough.



According to the Green Space Strategy many of the existing green spaces within the Borough are below recognised standards. There are also significant deficiencies in the amount of play provision for children and young people across the Borough. When compared with the NPFA Six Acre Standard there is a shortfall of 4.62 hectares, which is equivalent to approximately 46 equipped children's play areas throughout the Borough. The biggest quantitative shortfalls in the provision of equipped play space are in Hinckley (1.2 ha), Burbage (1.11 ha), Earl Shilton (0.60 ha) and Groby (0.59 ha). Within these settlements it is recommended that as well as new provision existing equipped areas are improved and expanded to include a range of facilities.

In 2004-2005 only 47% of people in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough were very / fairly satisfied with the sports and leisure facilities available to them.

4.2.10 Key Sustainability Issues

The key sustainability issues relating to the socio-economic situation in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough are:

- **The need to diversify the economic base to reduce reliance upon traditional manufacturing industries.**
- **Poor growth in emerging key service / knowledge sectors.**
- **High long term unemployment rate in comparison to other Boroughs / Districts.**
- **The need to maintain the Economic Activity Rate of the Borough.**
- **Below average gross weekly pay rates in the Borough in comparison to county and national averages.**
- **Rising population of the Borough.**
- **Ageing population of the Borough.**
- **Pockets of local deprivation within the Borough.**
- **The need to reduce crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour.**
- **The need to tackle health issues in the Borough, in particular obesity, smoking and cancer.**
- **The need to improve education and skills attainment levels, in particular for adults.**
- **The need to improve the energy efficiency of housing.**
- **Rising house prices in the Borough, in particular in rural areas.**
- **Shortfall in affordable housing provision in the Borough.**
- **Shortfall in amount of housing for owner occupation in the Borough.**
- **The need to address specific housing needs, including housing for the disabled, the elderly, those with mental problems and those with learning disabilities.**
- **High levels of homelessness in the Borough.**
- **Road traffic congestion and road safety issues.**
- **High levels of private car use.**



- **The need to improve public transport service provision in both urban and rural areas, in particular the frequency and reliability of public transport services.**
- **The need to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport as viable alternatives to the private car.**
- **The need to improve the standard of parks and open spaces within the Borough.**
- **The need to increase provision of open space and equipped play space.**

4.3 Environmental Baseline

4.3.1 Introduction

This section sets out the existing environment in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough with regards water, biodiversity, landscape, waste management, cultural heritage, noise, air quality and climate change. The environmental baseline has been established with reference to:

- Environment Agency website (www.environment-agency.gov.uk).
- The Sustainable Development Unit [UK Govt.] (www.sustainable-development.gov.uk).
- The Department for Communities and Local Government (www.bvpi.gov.uk).
- The Land Registry (www.landregistry.gov.uk).
- The National Land Use Database (www.nlud.org.uk).
- The Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (www.defra.gov.uk).
- Leicestershire County Council (www.leics.gov.uk).
- The Renewable Energy Statistics database for the UK (www.restats.org.uk).
- The UK Air Quality Archive (www.airquality.co.uk).
- The Environment Agency (www.environment-agency.gov.uk).
- Natural England (www.naturalengland.org.uk).
- The Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside database (www.magic.gov.uk).
- English Heritage (www.english-heritage.org.uk).
- The UK Database of Historic Parks and Gardens.
- Hinckley Town Centre Renaissance Masterplan – Baseline Report (2005).
- Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Biodiversity Action Plan (2002).
- National Forest Biodiversity Action Plan (2004).
- Leicestershire Municipal Waste Management Strategy.
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Contaminated Land Strategy (2004).
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Air Quality Updating and Screening Assessment (2003).
- Hinckley and Bosworth Air Quality Review and Assessment Report (2004).
- Hinckley and Bosworth Air Quality Review and Assessment Report (2005).
- Climate Change Strategy for Leicestershire (2005).
- Nottingham Declaration on Climate Change (2000).
- Hinckley and Bosworth Landscape Character Assessment (2006)



4.3.2 Water Environment

Surface Water

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough lies within the River Tame, Anker and Mease catchment area. This catchment area covers approximately 1800km² which includes not only the Rivers Tame, Anker and Mease, but also the Rivers Sence, Cole and Blythe. It also includes part of the River Trent from its confluence with the Tame to that with the Dove.

The main river in Hinckley and Bosworth is the River Sence. This flows across the west of the Borough from Atherstone in the south to Ibstock in the north. A number of other watercourses also exist in the Borough. These include the River Anker, which runs along a section of the western boundary of the Borough and the Ashby Canal, which flows through the centre of the Borough from Hinckley in the south, through Bosworth Field, to the north eastern corner of the Borough.

The Environment Agency has a number of water quality monitoring points within the Borough, which are situated on stretches of the River Anker and Sketchley Brook. Both the River Anker and Sketchley Brook are currently meeting their river water quality targets.

Groundwater

In terms of groundwater, the Environment Agency Groundwater Vulnerability Map Sheet Number 23 (Leicestershire) shows that the majority of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough is underlain by a Non Aquifer with soils of negligible permeability. Non Aquifers are generally regarded as containing insignificant quantities of groundwater.

However, a number of Minor Aquifers with soils of high, intermediate and low leaching potential are located within the Borough. Hinckley Town and Earl Shilton are partially underlain by Minor Aquifers. Although Minor Aquifers seldom produce large quantities of water for abstraction, they are important both for local supplies and in supplying base flow to rivers. Major Aquifers may occur beneath Minor Aquifers. Formations of high permeability are highly vulnerable to contaminants, and have the potential to transmit a wide variety of pollutants.

No groundwater source protection zones have been designated in the Borough.

Flood Risk

The Environment Agency online flood mapping service provides an indication of the likelihood of flooding in an area. Floodplain maps for the Hinckley and Bosworth indicate that a number of areas within the Borough have been designated as floodplain. These areas are primarily associated with



the watercourses in the Borough, in particular the River Sence. The chance of flooding in these areas is generally considered to be 0.5% (equivalent to 1 in 200 years) or less.

According to the Environment Agency the urban areas of Hinckley, Earl Shilton, Burbage and Barwell fall outside of areas at risk from flooding by rivers. The chance of flooding in these areas each year is therefore 0.1% (equivalent to 1 in 1000) or less.

It should be noted that the flooding can occur at any time and in any place from sources such as rising groundwater levels, burst water mains, road drains, run-off, sewer overflows etc, which should be taken into consideration.

Water Resources and Foul Drainage

Severn Trent Water plc provides water supplies in Hinckley and Bosworth. The Water Resources Strategy for the East Midlands produced by the Environment Agency indicates that there is additional water available for extraction in the Borough. However, the Environment Agency emphasises the increasing scarcity of water in the region. The Water Resources Strategy identifies the East Midlands as one of the driest regions in England and Wales with an average rainfall of less than 600mm in some places, compared to the national average of 1080mm (average from 1961-1990). Future developments in the East Midlands will therefore need to recognise the limited availability of water as an influence on location, and should seek to incorporate water efficiency measures and sustainable drainage systems at the feasibility or planning stage.

Severn Trent Water plc is the sewerage undertaker for the area. In 2006 the Environment Agency assessed whether existing sewage treatment works (over 10,000 population equivalent) in the East Midlands Region were close to the limits of their current consents. The assessment concluded that Leicester City and the surrounding area are at risk of having insufficient sewage treatment capacity to accommodate new housing development.

4.3.3 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation

Statutory Sites

Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) are sites designated under the EU Directive 92/43/EC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Fauna and Flora (more commonly known as the EC Habitats Directive) to protect internationally important natural habitats and species.

Special Protection Areas (SPAs) are sites designated under the EC Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds (79/409/EEC) to protect internationally important bird species.



Together, SACs and SPAs form the Natura 2000 network. Under the EC Habitats Directive Local Authorities are required to undertake an Appropriate Assessment of any plan or project which is likely have a significant adverse effect upon Natura 2000 sites. The EC Habitats Directive is implemented in the UK via the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994.

A search undertaken by WYG has identified that there are no Natura 2000 sites located within Hinckley and Bosworth. The nearest SAC is Ensor's Pool, located approximately 8km south west of Hinckley and Bosworth near Bermuda. There are no SPAs within the county of Leicestershire.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) are the finest sites for wildlife and natural features in England supporting many characteristic rare and endangered species, habitats and natural features. They are protected under Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended.

There are seven SSSIs within Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, which comprise of 27 SSSI units in total:

- Burbage Woods and Aston Firs;
- Kendalls Meadow;
- Sheepy Fields;
- Ashby Canal;
- Botcheston Bog;
- Cliffe Hill Quarry; and
- Groby Pool Woods.

Natural England assesses the condition of each SSSI in England every year. There are six reportable condition categories: favourable, unfavourable recovering, unfavourable no change, unfavourable declining, and part destroyed / destroyed. Favourable condition means that the SSSI land is being adequately conserved and is meeting its 'conservation objectives'; however, there is scope for the enhancement of these sites. Unfavourable means that the special interest of the SSSI unit is not being conserved and will not reach favourable condition unless there are changes to site management or external pressures.

In 2007 only 33.3% of the SSSI units in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough were classed as being in favourable condition. Similarly, 48.1% of the SSSI units in the Borough were classed as unfavourable, and 11.1% were classed as unfavourable and declining. The condition of the SSSIs in Hinckley and Bosworth is therefore considered to be poor.



Non Statutory Sites

Local wildlife sites represent some of the most important land for wildlife outside the statutory SSSI system and are given some protection in the policies of District / Borough council development plans.

There are a number of local wildlife sites (also know as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough which are significant to Leicestershire in terms of flora or fauna.

Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) are non-statutory habitats of local significance designated by Local Authorities where protection and public understanding of nature conservation is encouraged.

There are two LNRs within Hinckley and Bosworth:

- Burbage Common & Woods LNR (also designated a SSSI); and
- Billa Barra Hill LNR.

Habitats and Species

The Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) (2002) identifies local and national priority habitats and species present within the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland area. It also sets targets for their conservation and outlines mechanisms for achieving these.

The BAP identifies the following species which may be present in the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough area:

Mammals:

- Bat species
- Dormouse
- Otter
- Water vole

Birds:

- Barn owl
- Nightingale
- Redstart
- Sand martin



Invertebrates:

- Black hairstreak butterfly
- Dingy skipper
- Grizzled skipper
- White clawed crayfish

Plants:

- Purple small reed
- Black poplar
- Violet helleborine
- Wood vetch

In addition, a BAP for the National Forest has been produced, which outlines the work required to achieve the necessary protection and conservation of habitats and species at a local level within the National Forest. The National Forest covers 200 square miles of the Midlands, spanning across areas of Leicestershire, Derbyshire and Staffordshire, including the Charnwood and Needwood Forests. This area is important for wildlife, comprising of a range of protected and priority species and habitats including water vole, bats, otter, adder, barn owl and redstart. The National Forest contains 1143ha of ancient woodland accounting for 2.3% of the land area. Part of the National Forest is situated in the north east of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough.

HBBC are currently in the process of undertaking a Biodiversity Audit of the Borough. This will identify the habitats listed under the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland BAP that are of most relevance to the Borough.

4.3.4 Landscape and Visual Amenity

Hinckley and Bosworth falls within the Countryside Agency Landscape Character Area 94: Leicestershire Vales. The key characteristics of this area include:

- Gentle clay ridges and valleys with little woodland and strong patterns of Tudor and parliamentary enclosure.
- Distinctive river valleys with flat floodplain and gravel terraces.
- Large town of Leicester dominating much of the landscape.
- Frequent small towns and villages, often characterised by red brick buildings.
- Prominent parks and country houses.
- Frequent imposing, spired churches.
- Attractive stone buildings in older village centres and eastern towns and villages.



- Great diversity of landscape and settlement pattern with many sub units.

In 2006 HBBC undertook a Landscape Character Assessment of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough. The Landscape Character Assessment identifies ten Landscape Character Areas within the Borough, which are as follows:

- A) Charnwood Fringe Character Area
- B) Forest Hills Character Area
- C) Market Bosworth Parkland Character Area
- D) Desford Vales Character Area
- E) Stoke Golding Vales Character Area
- F) Hinckley, Barwell and Burbage Fringe Character
- G) Fen Lanes Character Area
- H) Upper Mease Character Area
- I) Gospall Parkland Character Area
- J) Upper Sence Character Area

Table 4.1 Hinckley and Bosworth Landscape Character Areas

Landscape Character Area	Key Characteristics
A) Charnwood Fringe Character Area	Prominent landform, which includes the highest land in the Borough. Localised steep slopes around rocky outcrops and quarries. Diverse land uses which relate to the varied geology. Dominated by pasture and woodland with quarries, pools and outcrops. Woodland cover of varying age from mature ancient to new National Forest plantations. Medium to small sized field pattern interspersed with large areas of woodland cover. Large clustered villages with strong suburban influences. Distinctive local assets such as Groby Pool and Billa Barra Hill. Good network of public footpaths. Distant wide views to the urban edges of Leicester and surrounding Charnwood Forest. Diverse range of habitats due to variable land use types. Strong, long established aesthetic appeal.



Landscape Character Area	Key Characteristics
B) Forest Hills Character Area	<p>Gently undulating landform with small plateaus on higher ground. Highest point centred around Bagworth.</p> <p>Predominantly rural landscape with arable and rough set-aside, influenced by industrial / urban features such as masts, poles and pylons.</p> <p>Fields enclosed by hedgerows with scattered trees.</p> <p>Industrial heritage of quarrying and mining resulting in areas of restored land and new woodland within the National Forest.</p> <p>Generally large scale field pattern with groups of smaller fields surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Linear settlements of former mining villages with sparsely scattered farms on slopes in between.</p> <p>Good public access and footpath network throughout, especially within National Forest area.</p> <p>Visually open due to immature plantations.</p> <p>Wide ranging views from higher ground.</p> <p>Thornton reservoir is an attractive focal point.</p>
C) Market Bosworth Parkland Character Area	<p>Rolling landform with gentle slopes which rise and fall reaching a high point around the town of Market Bosworth.</p> <p>Land use dominated by parkland, pasture and scattered trees.</p> <p>Increased tree cover associated with settlements.</p> <p>Field boundaries are predominantly hawthorn hedges with some post and rail or estate fencing.</p> <p>Scattered agricultural buildings are visible in wider views. Market Bosworth is mostly hidden by vegetation.</p> <p>Occasional narrow gated lanes with avenue trees.</p> <p>Open access within the parkland and country park supported by a good network of public footpaths.</p> <p>Area is semi-enclosed by trees and hedgerows which therefore limit views.</p> <p>Significant historic features typical of country estates including estate fencing, avenue trees, grazed pasture and lanes.</p> <p>Bosworth Battlefield has strong heritage associations.</p> <p>Market Bosworth provides an important focus within the area.</p>



Landscape Character Area	Key Characteristics
D) Desford Dales Character Area	<p>Gently rolling landform.</p> <p>Although predominately arable, clustered areas of industry and recreational facilities are locally prominent.</p> <p>Tree cover is limited with scattered trees and small linear woodland copses.</p> <p>Large to medium sized field pattern is defined by single species hawthorn hedges. Where hedgerows have been removed, open views across the landscape are possible.</p> <p>Clustered villages of varying size centre around crossroads. Desford is the largest settlement in the area.</p> <p>Good network of footpaths link settlements. Few major roads.</p> <p>Open views give an impression of a large scale landscape. Masts, poles, and pylons are often prominent.</p>
E) Stoke Golding Vales Character Area	<p>Predominately flat with only gentle undulations.</p> <p>Mix of arable and pasture with frequent individual trees.</p> <p>Medium scale rectilinear field pattern bounded by mixed hedgerows with scattered hedgerow trees and small copses.</p> <p>Settlement usually associated with local high points.</p> <p>Area criss-crossed by network of small lanes and public footpaths.</p> <p>The Ashby Canal features numerous attractive canal bridges.</p> <p>Stoke Golding is an attractive settlement clustered around its prominent church, close to the Ashby Canal.</p> <p>Area is open and expansive with views occasionally limited by vegetation.</p> <p>This is generally a tranquil, rural character area despite the proximity of Hinckley and the A5.</p>
F) Hinckley, Barwell and Burbage Fringe Character Area	<p>Gently rolling landform with some areas of flat land such as Burbage Common.</p> <p>Medium sized rectilinear field pattern bounded by mixed hedgerows and few hedgerow trees. Agricultural land provides open areas of separating landscape between Barwell, Earl Shilton and Hinckley.</p> <p>Landscape heavily influenced by established settlements, often situated on higher ground, with masts and poles prominent.</p> <p>Mix of arable and pasture with isolated areas of woodland. Increasing industrial use around urban areas.</p> <p>Significant transport infrastructure subdivides area.</p> <p>Distinctive landscape features such as Burbage Common and Wood have local and national importance as ecological and recreational</p>



Landscape Character Area	Key Characteristics
	<p>resources.</p> <p>Localised containment provided by woodland, but urban areas frequently visible on ridgelines.</p>
<p>G) Fen Lanes Character Area</p>	<p>Predominantly flat valley landscape with areas of gentle undulations. Predominantly arable with some occasional pasture. Small woodland clumps and willow trees associated with watercourses. Mixed field pattern of large to medium size with broken hedgerows. Hedgerow trees are either scattered or in clumps along roads and near watercourses. Small dispersed settlements clustered around cross-roads, with isolated farmsteads. A444 forms main route through area with small lanes leading off and many public footpaths. Open aspect but views are occasionally curtailed by copses, hedgerow vegetation and limited vantage points. Frequent streams and ditches.</p>
<p>H) Upper Mease Character Area</p>	<p>Simple open landform of elevated rolling hills. Predominantly arable land use. Dispersed farm buildings visible within wide panoramic views. Mature trees largely associated with small clustered villages. Large fields bordered by mixed species hedgerows with scattered hedgerow trees. Ditches define field boundaries where hedgerows have been lost. A444 traverses an area of otherwise minor roads. Good network of public footpaths leading towards Twycross. Occasional woodland within surrounding landscape. Expansive and at times dramatic long ranging panoramic views are a notable characteristic feature, especially from the A444. Twycross Zoo is an important visitor attraction of international importance.</p>



Landscape Character Area	Key Characteristics
I) Gopsall Parkland Character Area	Distinctive parkland landscape with many mature specimen trees. Historic associations with Handel the composer adds to the sense of place. Medium field pattern bordered by a mix of hedgerows, barbed wire fencing and small sections of estate fencing. Large farms relating to former estate buildings i.e. Gopsall Hall Farm and Gopsall House Farm. Tranquil and remote pasture. Good network of public footpaths leading towards Twycross. Some woodland within surrounding landscape. Generally expansive open aspect. Relic follies add interest.
J) Upper Sence Character Area	Gentle undulating landform which rises generally to the east. Mix of arable and pasture with small copses and scattered trees within mixed hedgerows. Well treed appearance despite lack of actual woodland. Regular pattern of medium sized fields become smaller around settlements. Settlements predominantly small villages. Long distance footpaths pass through area. Some long distance views but mostly limited by trees.

The landscape of Hinckley and Bosworth is gently rolling and predominantly rural in nature. It consists of enclosed farmlands, large cropped fields, intact hedgerow patterns and scattered woodland and hedgerow trees. Several villages and hamlets, of mixed building styles, are scattered throughout the Borough. In the east lies the urban fringe of Leicester City Centre.

Industrial and residential developments, new roads and changing farming practises have contributed to the erosion of landscape character and diversity. Increasing pressure on the countryside from new housing and other developments around Burbage and Hinckley (and also smaller villages) was highlighted as an issue in the Hinckley and Bosworth Community Plan.

The presence of the National Forest, in the north west of the Borough has, however, had a significant impact upon the rural landscape and will continue to do so. In particular, restoration of derelict land in the Coalfield area has created more attractive forest uses.

An assessment of the urban character / townscape of the urban areas of Hinckley, Burbage, Earl Shilton, Barwell, Market Bosworth, Desford and Newbold Verdon has also been undertaken as part



of the Hinckley and Bosworth Landscape Character Assessment. Details of this are available on the HBBC website (www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk).

Landscape Designations

The Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan identifies Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside which *"...in a countywide and Borough-wide context have very high intrinsic landscape quality."* These areas, however, are not designated in the Leicestershire Structure Plan and so are unlikely to be designated by HBBC in the future.

The Local Plan also designates green wedges in the Borough. These are *"...structurally important areas of open land around the edge of Leicester and Hinckley, which maintain the physical separation between communities and helps protect their individual identities"*. The green wedges are located as follows:

- Area between Groby, Martinshaw Wood, Ratby and the Borough boundary;
- Area between Hinckley/Burbage and Barwell/Earl Shilton;
- Area between Ratby and Kirby Muxloe; and
- Area between Groby and Anstey.

4.3.5 Geology

The solid geology of Hinckley and Bosworth is predominantly sedimentary impermeable clays and marls from the Triassic period. The Triassic Mercia Mudstones (previously known as Keuper Marl) extend across the whole Borough punctured by a number of igneous intrusions in the north and extreme southeastern corner. These Diorite intrusions provide the granite extracted at Groby, Bradgate, Markfield, Mill Lane (Earl Shilton) and Stanton under Bardon.

The drift geology is predominantly superficial sand and gravel deposits and alluvial deposits across the middle of the Borough following former river paths and flood plains. This has provided sand and gravel extraction at Cadeby. Glacial deposits are highly variable in both thickness and distribution. Saturated sands are common across areas of Hinckley.

Designated Sites

Cliffe Hill Quarry has been designated a SSSI both for its nature conservation value and geological value. The quarry provides exposures of the contact between the southern-type diorite (markfieldite) and the volcanic and sedimentary rocks of the Precambrian Charnian Maplewell Series.



Contaminated Land

Contaminated Land is defined in Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 as:

"Any land which appears to the Local Authority in whose area it is situated to be in such a condition by reason of substances in, on or under the land, that (a) significant harm is being caused or there is significant possibility of such harm being caused (b) pollution of controlled waters is being or is likely to be caused".

For a site to meet the definition of contaminated land a pollutant linkage must be established. A pollutant linkage consists of three parts:

- A source of contamination in, on or under the ground
- A pathway by which the contaminant is causing significant harm or which presents a significant possibility of such harm being caused
- A receptor of a type specified in the regulations including humans, ecological systems, properties and controlled waters.

HBBC is the principle regulator with respect to contaminated land. HBBC produced a Contaminated Land Strategy in 2004, which sets out the approach that they take in inspecting land for contamination.

As highlighted previously Hinckley and Bosworth Borough has traditional connection with manufacturing industries, in particular the textile clothing, footwear and mechanical engineering sectors. Consequently, there are some areas of contaminated land within the Borough which have arisen as a result of industrial use or waste disposal. The extractive industries in particular have left a legacy of excavations, many of which have been filled with a wide range of waste materials. Some, such as Bradgate Landfill, have been filled under Waste Management Licences and others uncontrolled prior to 1974.

Potentially contaminative land uses in the Borough include:

- Industrial areas (historical and current);
- 'Part A' processes (the production of fuel and power, smelting processes etc)
- 'Part B' processes (petrol stations, coating processes etc)
- COMAH sites (sites with dangerous substances present)
- Landfill and waste processing sites
- Closed landfill sites
- Sewage works and land used for the disposal of sludge
- Mines and mineral extraction sites



- Waste or derelict land
- Previously developed sites

4.3.6 Waste Management

During the period 2005-2006 the average amount of household waste collected per head in Hinckley and Bosworth was 416.9kg, compared to 545.1kg in Leicestershire during the same period. However, despite waste production being lower in the Borough, the average amount of household waste collected per head has risen significantly, from 382kg in 2001-2002 to 405.6kg in 2004-2005.

However, according to Best Value Performance statistics for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough household waste recycling and composting rates are rising. In the period 2005-2006, 17.6% of household waste in the Borough was recycled. This figure had increased from 8.6% in 2001-2002, and 15.7% in 2004-2005. Similarly, in 2005-2006 22.7% of household waste from the Borough was composted, compared to 1.9% in 2001-2002 and 18.8% in 2004-2005.

In 2005-2006, 99.8% of the residents of Hinckley and Bosworth were served by a kerbside recycling scheme for two recyclables.

During the period 2004-2005, 80% of the residents of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough were satisfied with household waste collection services. In addition, during the same period 70% of residents were satisfied with the waste recycling facilities available to them in the Borough.

The Leicestershire Waste Management Strategy provides a framework under which new waste collection, treatment and disposal infrastructure can be developed. Future aims include new and enhanced kerbside collections for recyclable materials including the collection of green waste, increased separation of waste particularly green waste for composting, new treatment and processing capacity for waste collected and an education and awareness campaign.

4.3.7 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Cultural heritage and archaeology encompasses archaeological features, historic buildings, historic landscape features and geological attributes. Cultural heritage features comprise of upstanding structures and remains as well as earthworks, buried remains, artefact scatters or elements of soft heritage features that have appeared in arts or literature.

Listed Buildings

Listed Buildings are buildings of special architectural or historic interest recognised by the Government as being worthy of protection under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation



Areas) Act 1990. Listed Buildings are classified as Grade I, II* or II. Buildings listed as Grade I or II* are considered to be of outstanding interest.

According to records held by HBBC there are 296 Listed Buildings in the Borough, many of which are situated within designated Conservation Areas. Of these, 7 buildings are Grade I, 35 are Grade II* and 254 are Grade II.

English Heritage keeps a Buildings at Risk register which brings together information on all Grade I and II* Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments known to English Heritage to be 'at risk'. Two Listed Buildings in the Borough are currently registered on the Buildings at Risk Register: the stables and kennels to Bradgate House on Bradgate Hill and The Old Hall on Markfield Road, both in Groby. The stables and kennels are considered to be in very bad condition. The Old Hall is in fair condition.

Scheduled Monuments

Scheduled Monuments are protected archaeological sites or historic buildings considered to be of national importance.

According to records held by HBBC there are 22 Scheduled Monuments within the Borough. These are located in the parishes of Bagworth, Groby, Higham on the Hill, Hinckley, Market Bosworth, Newbold Verdon, Peckleton, Ratby, Shackerstone, Sheepy, Stoke Golding, Sutton Cheney, Twycross and Witherley.

Scheduled Monuments in the Borough include Motte and Bailey Castle and Manorial Complex at Groby, Hinckley Castle, the remains of the Chapel in Lindley Park at Higham on Hill and Ratby Camp.

Conservation Areas

Conservation Areas are designated areas of special architectural or historic interest, the characters of which are important to preserve. There are 26 Conservation Areas within Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, many of which are situated within urban areas. The Conservation Areas are as follows:

- Ashby Canal
- Barwell A
- Barwell B
- Burbage
- Cadeby
- Congerstone



- Desford
- Druid Street
- Earl Shilton
- Groby
- Higham on the Hill
- Hinckley Town Centre
- Hollycroft Park
- Market Bosworth
- Markfield
- Newbold Verdon
- Orton on the Hill
- Osbaston
- Ratby
- Shackerstone
- Shenton
- Sibson
- Stoke Golding
- Sutton Cheney
- Twycross
- Witherley

HBBC considers Conservation Areas to have special architectural or historic interest which it is desirable to preserve and enhance. Under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Conservation Area Consent is generally required before a building or other structure can be demolished. Development will not be permitted in, or where it would impact on, the Conservation Area unless:

- The external design and appearance of new buildings and extensions to existing structures will be of a high standard and will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area;
- Its location on the site relates well to its surroundings;
- The materials are sympathetic in colour and texture to those of nearby buildings and second hand materials are used where appropriate; and
- Existing landscape and built features of value are retained and original materials and elements reused wherever possible.



Archaeological Sites

There are a number of archaeological sites of interest in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough which form an important part of its heritage.

Leicestershire County Council holds the Historic Environment Record (HER) for Leicestershire and Rutland. This database contains all known archaeological sites in Leicestershire and Rutland as well as other historic features such as Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and Battlefields. There are 1022 records held on the HER for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough. Sites of archaeological interest in the Borough range from Roman Camps at Ratby and Witherley to Castle Mottes at Groby and Hinckley.

The Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan (Policy BE13) requires that any application for planning permission for a site of 0.4 hectares or more in area, where development would affect a site registered in the Leicestershire and Rutland HER, or the setting of such a site, should be accompanied by an initial assessment of whether the site is known or likely to contain archaeological records.

It should be noted that there is potential within Hinckley and Bosworth for archaeological sites to exist that are currently unknown and so are not specifically designated.

Registered Battlefields

English Heritage keeps a register of Historic Battlefields which are of historic importance. Its purpose is to offer them protection and promote a better understanding of their significance.

One of the 26 Historic Battlefields in England is located within Hinckley and Bosworth Borough; Bosworth Battlefield on Ambion Hill. The Battle of Bosworth took place in 1485 with the death of Richard III marking the end of the medieval period.

4.3.8 Noise

There is no baseline data currently available relating to noise within Hinckley and Bosworth Borough. The major sources of noise within the Borough are considered to be principally associated with the busy road corridors such as the A5 and the A47. Noise issues may be associated with Mallory Park Racetrack and Bagworth Gun Club.

There is also noise issues associated with aircraft movements to and from the East Midlands Airport, particularly noise impacts associated with night time flights. East Midlands Airport has designated Airport Exclusion Zones in the Borough, which restrict development in the vicinity of



flight paths to reduce the potential for noise issues associated with aircraft. The Airport is located in the north west of Leicestershire near to Castle Donington.

4.3.9 Air Quality

HBBC is responsible for the review and assessment of air quality in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough. In 2000 HBBC published the findings of their initial assessment for air quality in the Borough. The results showed that the annual mean objectives for nitrogen dioxide would not be met in two locations. Consequently two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) were declared in 2001:

- Trinity Lane AQMA in Hinckley; and
- Groby Road AQMA in Ratby.

In 2004, monitoring was undertaken on these two AQMAs. The results of this assessment indicated that, in the case of both AQMAs, the objectives for nitrogen dioxide will be met in 2005 without any further work by HBBC. As a result, both AQMAs were revoked.

HBBC produced an Air Quality Review and Assessment Progress Report in 2005. Given the conclusions of the 2003 and 2004 studies, and the fact that the previous year had seen no developments which would have affected levels of the objective pollutants, no monitoring or modelling was carried out other than for nitrogen dioxide and PM10. The results of this study concluded that no further work was required at the time.

4.3.10 Climate Change

Climate change is one of the greatest global environmental threats. It is likely that it will have a significant impact on Hinckley and Bosworth, particularly through increased rainfall intensity in winter resulting in an increase in the number and severity of flooding events. In addition, climate change may result in warmer summers, increased water demands and will place stress on public water supply, industry and agriculture.

In 2000, the East Midlands Sustainable Development Round Table published a report entitled 'The Potential Impacts of Climate Change in the East Midlands'. This report states that more work needs to be done in the areas of energy efficiency and renewable energy and that tough targets should be set for reducing emissions of gases that cause climate change.

Environmental Action for a Better Leicestershire produced a Climate Change Strategy for Leicestershire in 2005. The Strategy presents a summary of the evidence for climate change and discusses the potential impacts in Leicestershire.

According to the Climate Change Strategy climate change in Leicestershire could include the following adverse effects:



- A risk of less water being available for domestic, industrial and agricultural purposes;
- A risk of more extensive and frequent flooding;
- A risk of increased temperatures, with a greater number of 'hot periods';
- A decrease in summer soil moisture content;
- An increase in overall weather variability between years;
- A decrease in cloud cover of up to 15% in summer;
- A reduction in summer relative humidity;
- An increase of up to 10% in winter daily wind speed; and
- A 60-90% decrease in snowfall.

Estimates of emissions in Leicestershire that are contributing to climate change are presented: 43% are from road transport, 35% from commercial and domestic combustion processes and 18% from industrial combustion processes.

In 2000 HBBC signed the Nottingham Declaration. This is a voluntary pledge for local authorities, which shows their public commitment to tackling climate change. HBBC has set a series of targets to meet its commitment to the Nottingham Declaration, which are:

- To reduce emissions of carbon dioxide by 10% below 2000 levels by 2010; and
- To reduce emissions of carbon dioxide by 25% below 2000 levels by 2025.

4.3.11 Key Sustainability Issues

The key sustainability issues relating to the environment are:

- **The need to protect surface waters and groundwater.**
- **The need to prevent increases in surface water run-off and flood risk.**
- **Scarcity of water resources in the East Midlands region.**
- **The need to protect and improve nature conservation sites, in particular SSSI, within the Borough.**
- **The need to protect and enhance habitats and species, in particular those listed within the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland BAP.**
- **The potential for protected species in the Borough including otter, water vole, barn owl and bats.**
- **The need to protect and enhance the National Forest, in particular the Ancient Woodland.**
- **The need to protect the natural and historic landscape character of the Borough.**
- **The presence of contaminated land within the Borough.**
- **The need to reduce waste produced and increase the proportion of waste recycled and composted.**



- **The need to protect historic, cultural and archaeological sites and their settings.**
- **Noise pollution associated with the road corridors in the Borough.**
- **The need to maintain and improve air quality in the Borough.**
- **The need to manage the impacts of climate change particularly through reducing greenhouse gas emissions.**

4.4 Summary of Key Sustainability Issues

The SEA Directive requires an analysis of "...any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan..." (Annex 1d of the SEA Directive). Key sustainability issues that affect Hinckley and Bosworth Borough were identified through an analysis of the baseline conditions and through the review of plans and programmes. These key issues are summarised in Table 4.2 below. Table 4.2 also shows whether the issue is social, economic, environmental or cross cutting (covers more than one category). It identifies the implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD and the potential degree of influence that the DPD will have on the issue.

Table 4.2 Key Sustainability Issues

Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to diversify the economic base to reduce reliance upon traditional manufacturing industries	✓	✓		<p>Policies should encourage employment development to help to attract new investment into the area, therefore encouraging diversification of the economic base and helping to reduce reliance upon traditional manufacturing industries.</p> <p>Sites allocated for housing and employment development should have good links to local transport networks and appropriate infrastructure.</p>	Minor



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
Poor growth in emerging key service / knowledge sectors	✓	✓		<p>Policies should encourage employment development to ensure the provision of employment space suitable for key service / knowledge sectors (where appropriate).</p> <p>Sites allocated for housing and employment development should have good links to local transport networks and appropriate infrastructure.</p>	Minor
High long term unemployment rate in comparison to other Borough's / District's	✓	✓		<p>Policies should encourage employment development to help to attract new investment into the area, therefore increasing the number of jobs available within the Borough.</p> <p>Sites allocated for housing should be situated in locations with good access to employment opportunities.</p> <p>Existing employment sites should be protected and enhanced where appropriate.</p>	Moderate
The need to maintain the Economic Activity Rate of the Borough	✓			<p>Existing employment sites should be protected and enhanced where appropriate.</p> <p>Policies should encourage employment development to help to attract new investment into the area, therefore potentially increasing the Economic Activity Rate of the Borough.</p> <p>Sites allocated for housing and employment development should have good links to local transport networks and appropriate infrastructure.</p>	Moderate



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
Below average gross weekly pay rates in the Borough in comparison to county and national averages	✓	✓		Policies should encourage employment development to help to attract new investment into the area, therefore helping to provide long term employment opportunities for local communities. Sites allocated for housing and employment development should have good links to local transport networks and appropriate infrastructure.	Minor
Rising population of the Borough	✓	✓	✓	Sites allocated for housing should take into account the potential effect of an increase in population on existing services (e.g. schools and healthcare services).	Moderate
Ageing population of the Borough	✓	✓		Sites allocated for housing should take into account the ageing population of the Borough, for example, by considering proximity to services / facilities.	Minor
Pockets of local deprivation within the Borough	✓	✓	✓	Sites allocated for development purposes should encourage the regeneration of deprived areas. Site allocated for housing should be situated in accessible locations, with good links to a frequent and reliable public transport network, jobs, key services and infrastructure. The DPD should allocate land for employment uses to help to attract new investment into the area, therefore helping to provide long term employment opportunities for local communities.	Moderate to Major



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to reduce crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour		✓		Policies should ensure that the design and layout of development incorporates measures to help reduce crime and the fear of crime (e.g. the improvement of poorly lit areas, the provision of facilities for young people and the encouragement of crime reduction in design).	Moderate
The need to tackle health issues in the Borough, in particular obesity, smoking and cancer	✓	✓	✓	<p>Poor health is often related to deprivation. Sites allocated for development purposes should encourage the regeneration of deprived areas.</p> <p>Site allocated for housing should be situated in accessible locations, with good links to a frequent and reliable public transport network, jobs, key services and infrastructure.</p> <p>The DPD should allocate land for employment uses to help to attract new investment into the area, therefore helping to provide long term employment opportunities for local communities.</p> <p>Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards, leisure and healthcare facilities as part of development where necessary.</p>	Moderate



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to improve education and skills attainment levels, in particular for adults	✓	✓		Sites allocated for housing should take into account the potential effect of an increase in population on existing education services. Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards, education / training facilities where necessary, in particular for adults.	Moderate
The need to improve the energy efficiency of housing		✓	✓	Policies should encourage the use of renewable energy, energy efficiency measures and low energy embodied materials within new developments.	Moderate-Major
Rising house prices in the Borough, in particular in rural areas	✓	✓		Policies should ensure the provision of an adequate number of affordable housing units within housing developments that meet local needs.	Moderate
Shortfall in affordable housing provision in the Borough	✓	✓		Policies should ensure the provision of an adequate number of affordable housing units within housing developments that meet local needs.	Moderate
Shortfall in amount of housing for owner occupation in the Borough	✓	✓		Policies should ensure the provision of an appropriate level of housing to meet the needs of owner occupiers, including first time buyers and single families.	Moderate



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to address specific housing needs, including housing for the disabled, the elderly, those with mental problems and those with learning disabilities	✓	✓		Policies should ensure the provision of a mix of housing within residential development that reflects local circumstances.	Moderate
High levels of homelessness in the Borough		✓		Policies should ensure the provision of temporary and permanent accommodation as required, which provides options for the homeless and those who may become homeless.	Moderate
Road traffic congestion and road safety issues	✓	✓	✓	Sites allocated for new development should ensure that development is situated in accessible locations, with good links to a frequent and reliable public transport network to reduce the need to travel by car. Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards pedestrian / cycle friendly infrastructure and facilities, including the provision of dedicated cycle storage and crossing points.	Moderate to Major



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
High levels of private car use	✓	✓	✓	Sites allocated for new development should ensure development is situated in accessible locations, with good links to a frequent and reliable public transport network, jobs, key services and infrastructure to reduce the need to travel by car. Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards pedestrian / cycle friendly infrastructure and facilities, including the provision of dedicated cycle storage and crossing points.	Moderate to Major
The need to improve public transport service provision in both urban and rural areas, in particular the frequency and reliability of public transport services	✓	✓	✓	Sites allocated for new development should ensure development is situated in accessible locations, with good links to a frequent and reliable public transport network. Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards additional bus stops and extensions to existing bus services where necessary.	Moderate to Major
The need to encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport as viable alternatives to the private car	✓	✓	✓	Sites allocated for new development should ensure development is situated in accessible locations, with good links to a frequent and reliable public transport network. Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards pedestrian / cycle friendly infrastructure and facilities, including the provision of dedicated cycle storage and crossing points, and towards additional bus stops and extensions to existing bus services where necessary.	Moderate



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to improve the standard of parks and open spaces within the Borough		✓	✓	Existing parks and open space sites should be protected and enhanced where appropriate. Policies should encourage improvements in the standard of parks and open spaces within the Borough are improved. Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards open space as part of new developments.	Moderate
The need to increase provision of open space and equipped play space		✓	✓	Existing open space sites and equipped play space should be protected and enhanced where appropriate. Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards open space and equipped play space as part of new residential developments.	Moderate
The need to protect surface waters and groundwater			✓	Policies should ensure that best practice is adopted during construction to protect groundwater and surface water in accordance with the relevant Environment Agency Pollution Prevention Guidelines.	Moderate
The need to prevent increases in surface water run-off and flood risk			✓	Sites allocated for new development should prevent inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding and safeguard land that may be required for current and future flood risk management. Policies should ensure the appropriate management of surface water run-off from development to reduce flood risk.	Moderate



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
Scarcity of water resources in the East Midlands region	✓	✓	✓	Policies should ensure that new development incorporates water conservation measures to reduce water demand (e.g. rainwater and / or greywater recycling systems)	Minor
The need to protect and improve nature conservation sites, in particular SSSI, within the Borough	✓	✓	✓	Sites allocated for new development should consider statutory and non statutory nature conservation sites / areas Policies should promote opportunities for habitat creation and / or enhancement as part of development should be sought wherever possible.	Moderate
The need to protect and enhance habitats and species, in particular those listed within the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland BAP			✓	Sites allocated for new development should consider the existing ecological value of the sites. Policies should promote opportunities for habitat creation and / or enhancement as part of development should be sought wherever possible.	Moderate
The potential for protected species in the Borough including otter, water vole, barn owl and bats			✓	Sites allocated for new development should consider the potential for protected species to be found on the proposed sites. Policies should promote opportunities for habitat creation and / or enhancement as part of development should be sought wherever possible.	Moderate



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to protect and enhance the National Forest, in particular the Ancient Woodland	✓	✓	✓	Sites allocated for new development should consider the need to protect areas and setting of the National Forest. New development that would contribute towards the protection and enhancement of the Forest (e.g. creation of woodland areas or shelter belts within development) should be encouraged.	Moderate
The need to protect the natural and historic landscape character of the Borough	✓	✓	✓	Sites allocated for new development should consider the surrounding natural and historic landscape character, in particular those areas considered to be of high landscape importance (e.g. the National Forest, Bosworth Battlefield). Policies should encourage development that is sensitive to the natural and historic landscape character of the Borough.	Moderate
The presence of contaminated land within the Borough			✓	Sites that will require remediation of contaminated land should be considered when allocating sites for new development.	Moderate
The need to reduce waste produced and increase the proportion of waste recycled	✓	✓	✓	Policies should encourage the use of recycled / re-used materials for construction of new development. Accessible waste disposal and recycling bins should be provided within all new development to encourage responsible waste management practices.	Moderate



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to protect historical, cultural and archaeological sites and their settings	✓	✓	✓	Sites allocated for new development should consider the location of historical, cultural and archaeological assets and their settings. Policies should encourage development that is sensitive to historical, cultural and archaeological assets and their settings.	Moderate
Noise pollution associated with the road corridors in the Borough		✓	✓	Sites allocated for new development should consider the proximity of road corridors to limit the impact of noise pollution. Policies should encourage noise attenuation measures within development where necessary (e.g. double glazing, room locations, acoustic ventilation).	Moderate
The need to maintain and improve air quality in the Borough		✓	✓	Sites allocated for new development should have good access to a frequent and reliable public transport network, jobs, key services and infrastructure to reduce the need to travel by car. Policies should ensure that best practice is adopted to minimise dust and air pollution arising from construction activities. Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards pedestrian / cycle friendly infrastructure and facilities, including the provision of dedicated cycle storage and crossing points, and towards additional bus stops and extensions to existing bus services where necessary.	Moderate



5.0 DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS

5.1 Introduction

HBBC initially proposed that the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD would comprise two separate DPDs: The Site Allocations DPD and the Generic Development Control DPD. In 2007, an Issues and Options paper was produced for each DPD: The Site Allocations DPD Issues Paper (HBBC, 2007) and the Generic Development Control DPD Issues and Options (HBBC, 2007). Both documents were subject to SA using the SA framework developed in Stage A (see Section 2.4.1). Further details of this process are provided in the following sections.

5.2 Site Allocations Development Plan Document Issues and Options

The following issues are considered in the Site Allocations DPD Issues Paper (HBBC, 2007): Housing; Employment, Retail and Tourism; and Community Facilities. Chapter 3 of the Site Allocations DPD Issues Paper (HBBC, 2007) discusses the specific sites suggested for development.

The SA of the Site Allocations DPD Issues Paper (HBBC, 2007) focused on the specific sites that were suggested for development. The sites were appraised in groups based upon the proposed use (housing, employment, any use, mixed use, industrial and leisure) and location, as follows:

- Group A:** Brownfield sites within the existing development boundary of settlements
- Group B:** Greenfield sites within the existing development boundary of settlements
- Group C:** Sites adjoining urban areas
- Group D:** Sites in rural areas within or adjoining existing towns and villages
- Group E:** Sites situated elsewhere (sites situated outside of existing settlements)

5.3 Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Issues and Options

The Generic Development Control DPD Issues and Options (HBBC, 2007) document consists of a review of saved Local Plan policies regarding development control. Each policy is accompanied by some commentary and a question, or set of questions. The majority of the questions concern such matters as where policies should be located in the LDF, whether or not groups of policies should be combined or whether policies are already covered elsewhere by regional/national guidance.

The SA of the Generic Development Control Policies DPD Issues and Options (HBBC, 2007) involved appraisal of each of the saved Local Plan policies under review.



5.4 Outcomes of the Options Development and Appraisal

SA of both the Site Allocations DPD and the Generic Development Control DPD Issues and Options (HBBC, 2007) enabled their social, economic and environmental acceptability to be determined. The outcome of the SAs is detailed in Options Appraisal Explanatory Notes (WYG, 2007) for both documents.

The appraisals were used by HBBC to inform the preparation of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008); however it should be noted that the SA of the options was a tool for informing decision making by HBBC. No priority was given to social / economic / environmental factors and as such the role of the SA was to highlight sustainability implications rather than recommending appropriate options for implementation.

The SEA Directive requires the '...reasons for selecting alternatives...' to be identified. The Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008) outlines the reasons why the Preferred Options were chosen and other options discounted.

5.5 Additional Options Appraisal

It should be noted that some further options have been appraised since the Options Appraisal Explanatory Notes (WYG, 2007) were prepared. Regarding the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites, the following two options were subject to a comparative appraisal:

- Include residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers within the proposed housing allocations.
- Allocate Gypsy and Traveller sites within 3 to 5 miles of urban areas or key rural centres.

Both options were appraised using the methodology detailed in the Options Appraisal Explanatory Notes (WYG, 2007); an Appraisal Table is presented within Appendix E of this report.

A further comparative appraisal was undertaken regarding the location of sports and leisure facilities.

TO BE INSERTED



6.0 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE PREFERRED OPTIONS

6.1 Introduction

The SA of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008) has been undertaken in relation to the SA framework developed during Stage A of the SA process (as detailed in Section 2.4.1).

For the purposes of the SA the baseline conditions are assumed to be the status quo for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough. Implementation of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options will result in either an improvement to or deterioration in this baseline. If the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options are not implemented (do nothing situation) then it must be assumed that there will be no change to the current baseline conditions. In reality this would not occur as natural and social processes would continue to operate.

As detailed in Section 5.3, Part B of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008) is divided into four parts: Site Allocations; Non-Settlement Specific Site Allocations; Overarching Generic Development Control Policies; and Generic Development Control Policies.

Appraisal tables have been produced for each of the settlements identified within the Site Allocations, for each of the Non-Specific Site Allocations, and for each of the 20 Generic Development Control Policies; however, it should be noted that some of the Site Allocations and the Generic Development Control Policies have not been appraised. Explanation as to why certain sites / policies have been scoped out of the appraisal is provided in Section XX.

Each appraisal table details the likely social, economic and environmental effects associated with implementing the plan. Recommendations have been made to reduce potential adverse effects and maximise beneficial effects. The predicted effects of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options are detailed in the Appraisal Tables in Appendix E. A summary of the appraisal is provided in Section 6.3.

6.2 Appraisal Methodology

The social, economic and environmental effects of the DPD have been predicted in relation to each of the SA objectives developed at Stage A (as detailed in Section 2.4.1).



The predicted effects have been qualified within the Appraisal Tables in terms of their nature, duration, magnitude and geographical scale.

Effects may be of the following nature:

- Adverse or beneficial.
- Direct or indirect.

Effects may be of the following duration:

- Temporary or permanent.
- Short or long term.

Effects may be of the following geographical scale:

- Immediate.
- Local.
- District.
- Regional.
- National.
- International.

Effects have also been qualified in terms of their likelihood and the magnitude of changes in the baseline conditions.

The magnitude of effects has been determined based upon the changes to the baseline conditions that are predicted to arise from the DPD taking into account the likelihood and scale of the change. Table 6.1 details the methodology for determining the magnitude of effects.

Table 6.1 Determining Magnitude of Effects

Magnitude of Effect	Description
Major	Effect resulting in a considerable change in baseline conditions with undesirable / desirable consequences on the receiving environment
Minor	Effect resulting in a discernible change in baseline conditions with undesirable / desirable consequences that can be tolerated
No effect	No discernible change in baseline conditions



6.2.1 Assessment of Effects

Following the prediction of effects, as detailed above, an assessment of the significance of these effects has been undertaken. The factors described above (magnitude, geographical scale, duration and nature) have been considered in order to determine significance. As advised in the ODPM guidance (2005i) significance has been determined based on the individual merits of each case, as effects which are significant in one situation may not necessarily be significant in another.

Where effects have been identified to be potentially beneficial or potentially adverse this means that there is a degree of uncertainty associated with the effects. This may be because the effects will depend upon implementation of the option or there may be limited information available at the strategic level to confirm their significance.

The Appraisal Tables show how significant adverse effects represent a move away from a SA objective and significant beneficial effects represent a move towards a SA objective. Table 6.2 provides a key to the significance of effects as shown within the Appraisal Tables.

Table 6.2 Significance of Effects

Significance of Effects	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects
Major beneficial	Major beneficial
Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial
Potentially beneficial	Potentially beneficial
Potentially adverse	Potentially adverse
Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Major adverse	Major adverse
Potentially beneficial or adverse	
No significant effect	

6.2.2 Limitations

The ODPM guidance (2005i) advises that any uncertainties and/or limitations encountered in the SA should be documented. Future SA and monitoring of LDF documents should take into account these limitations/uncertainties.



TO BE INSERTED

6.3 Likely Effects of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options

6.3.1 Site Allocations

Scoped Out

The following site allocations are deemed to have no significant effects as they are all existing sites (i.e. they are currently in use) and were allocated under Local Plan. They have therefore been scoped out from the assessment.

Hinckley	Earl Shilton	Barwell	Burbage	Desford	Groby	Ratby
HIN29 to HIN38 HIN42 HIN45 to HIN83 HIN87 to HIN98	EAR05 to EAR08 EAR10 EAR11 EAR13 to EAR17 EAR19 to EAR24	BARW07 to BARW25 BARW27 BARW28	BUR02 to BUR15 BUR17 to BUR21 BUR23 to BUR25 to BUR29 BUR35	DES03 to DES09 DES11 DES14 to DES17	GRO03 GRO04 GRO07 to GRO10 GRO13 to GRO20 GRO22 GRO24 to GRO26	RAT03 RAT05 to RAT11 RAT13 RAT15 RAT18

Markfield	Bagworth	Thornton	Barlestone	Market Bosworth	Newbold Verdon	Stoke Golding
MARK07 MARK09 to MARK12 MARK14 to MARK19 MARK21 to MARK23	BAG03 BAG04 BAG06 to BAG09 BAG12 to BAG15	THO01 to THO07 THO09 to THO11	BARL03 to BARL09 BARL12 to BARL15 BARL17	MKBO03 MKBO05 to MKBO12 MKBO15 MKBO16 MKBO19 to MKBO24	NEW02 to NEW08 NEW11 NEW12 NEW16	STG03 to STG08 STG11

Congerstone	Higham on the Hill	Stanton under Bardon	Sheepy Magna	Nailstone	Twycross	All allocations proposed for Witherley,
CON03 to CON05	HIG03 to HIG08	STA02 to STA08	SHE04 to SHE06	NAI03 to NAI05	TWY02 to	



		STA10		NAI07 to NAI09 NAI11		and the Rural Hamlets.
--	--	-------	--	----------------------------	--	---------------------------------------

The following sites are alternative options considered for gypsy and traveller sites. These are all considered under one alternative options matrix.

- EAR18
- BUR34
- NEW12
- STG10
- STG13
- STA09

Site THO08, which is a proposed green corridor at Thornton has been appraised as part of general (non settlement specific) matrix for 'Green Corridors'.

Generic Effects – All Sites

Housing, Employment and Mixed Use:

Housing allocations will contribute towards meeting the need for housing in the Borough. Employment allocations will provide employment opportunities for people living in the Borough and further afield and may provide training opportunities. Mixed use developments may provide opportunities for people to live and work in the same area, thus reducing the need to travel. In addition, mixed use developments can encourage activity throughout the day, which increases natural surveillance and can help to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour.

Development of housing, employment and mixed use sites may increase energy and water consumption and waste production, however there are opportunities to adopt sustainable design and construction techniques.

Construction may also have a number of effects upon of environment, including water pollution, air pollution, increased surface water run-off etc.

New Green Corridors and Open Space:

Formal allocation of additional sites as open space and green corridors will help to ensure their retention and protection from development. Open space and green corridors provide recreation, cultural and leisure opportunities, benefits in terms of health and well-being. They often also



provide a biodiversity resource and green corridors in particular are beneficial in terms of habitat and species networks.

Open space and green corridors can also contribute significantly towards the character of an area and therefore formal allocation of these will help to protect character. There may also be opportunities encourage ownership of open space to improve community cohesion and reduce the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour. However, poorly maintained open space can contribute towards the fear of crime (e.g. overhanging vegetation on pathways and poor lighting).

New Allotments:

Allotments can provide a recreational resource, encouraging leisure activities associated with cultivating on allotment land and have health and wellbeing benefits. Allotments contribute to urban green space, thus having a beneficial effect upon character. Allocating land as an allotment may help to protect some of the ecological value of the site and maintain a green corridor for wildlife. There may also be opportunities to enhance ecological value in creating / managing the allotments.

Allotments may also encourage people to grow their own food, thus reducing their environmental footprint.

Settlement Specific Effects

Hinckley:

Given the size of Hinckley it has been split into three sub-areas- South West, South East and North. Sites which have already been allocated as part of the Hinckley Town Centre AAP have already been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and have not therefore been re-appraised. However it is important to note that they are likely to have a number of cumulative effects together with the sites allocated within the Site Allocations DPD, including increased traffic, pressure on existing services and increased energy and water consumption.

South West Hinckley

The following residential development allocations are identified for South West Hinckley:

- HIN01
- HIN02
- HIN03
- HIN04



Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Preferred Options Report

- HIN05
- HIN06
- HIN22

These sites have relatively good access to services in Hinckley and also good access to employment at the nearby industrial estates. HIN02, HIN03, HIN05, HIN06 are greenfield, therefore will not enable use of previously developed land or buildings. However, there may be some opportunities for use of existing infrastructure as the sites are on the edge of the existing settlement. Allocation of brownfield sites for housing, particularly Site HIN04 for 64 dwellings will enable use of previously developed land. Site HIN03 is within a local wildlife site, and development of this site is likely to have an adverse effect upon this resource. Sites HIN04, HIN05 and HIN22 are also adjacent / near to the same local wildlife site and development of housing on these sites could have a cumulative effect upon this. Site HIN03 is adjacent to a Conservation Area.

Site HIN39 is proposed for new allotments. This will help to meet the demand for allotment plots in Hinckley.

Site HIN84 is proposed for a Gypsy and Traveller Transit site. Please note that this site is one of two options for a transit site, the other being in Groby (please see the appraisal table for Groby).

South East Hinckley

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- HIN07
- HIN08
- HIN09
- HIN13
- HIN15
- HIN19
- HIN26
- HIN27

These sites are all brownfield and within the built up area of Hinckley and therefore allocation of these sites will encourage use of previously developed land. Sites HIN07, HIN08, HIN09 and HIN15 may be contaminated given their previous use. Redevelopment of these sites for housing may result in migration of contamination; however it may also enable remediation. Site HIN07 is adjacent to a Conservation Area.



Site HIN41 is a brownfield site, to be allocated for mixed use development, including 47 homes. The site is partly within Hinckley Conservation Area, and therefore the new development will need to be designed sensitively so as not to affect the character of this.

Sites HIN43 and HIN44 are areas of open space within the built up area which are to be allocated formally as open space. This will help to protect these resources and maintain the character of the local area.

North Hinckley

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- HIN20
- HIN21
- HIN23
- HIN24
- HIN25

These sites are all within the built up area of Hinckley. All the housing sites are brownfield, with the exception of Site HIN21, which is an area of open space. Allocation of this site may therefore have an adverse effect on leisure provision and the character of Hinckley.

Site HIN40 is a greenfield site on the edge of Hinckley, proposed to be allocated as a new allotment site. Creating allotments on the site may have an effect on the rural landscape, however, allocation would protect the site from 'hard' development and there may be opportunities to enhance the character of the landscape in creating and managing the allotment.

Site HIN41 is a brownfield site, to be allocated for mixed use development. This site may be contaminated given its previous use, and redevelopment may result in migration of contamination, however it may also enable remediation.

Site HIN85 is a greenfield site, outside of the built up area of Hinckley. Development of the site for a community facility may therefore have an adverse effect upon the rural landscape. The site is to be allocated for a community facility, which may help to improve access to community facilities. However, given the location outside of the built up area of Hinckley, this may encourage car use and limit access for those without a car.

Earl Shilton:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised.



Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Preferred Options Report

- EAR01
- EAR02
- EAR03
- EAR04

The allocations are for 10 dwellings in total, each site is very small scale so there are likely to be few significant effects. Future residents will have good access to services in Earl Shilton and public transport. All sites classed as previously developed land. There was previously a parish level wildlife site encompassing site EAR01, however the majority of this has since been lost to housing development. Site EAR03 is near to the site of the castle owned by Simon de Montfort which is designated as a Scheduled Monument, and development here could have an effect upon its setting.

Allocation of Sites EAR09 and EAR12 as Open Space will help to protect character of Earl Shilton.

Barwell:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- BARW01
- BARW02
- BARW03
- BARW04
- BARW05
- BARW06

Future residents of these sites will have good access to services in Barwell and public transport. Site BARW01 is for 37 dwellings so may have some effects in terms of capacity of health and educational services and increased traffic. The other housing sites are very small scale and all are classed as previously developed land. Site BARW01 may be contaminated and require remediation.

Allocation of Site BARW26 as an extension of the existing Show Person's Accommodation site will provide good access to services in Barwell. However, this extension may affect character of rural-urban fringe of Barwell. The site is greenfield.

Burbage:

Site BUR01 is allocated for a mixed use development, including 295 homes and 14 hectares of employment. Given the scale of the development, it may affect capacity of health care and education. There are two wildlife sites within site, plus one on west boundary which could be affected.



Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Preferred Options Report

Sites BUR30, BUR31, BUR32 and BUR33 are to be allocated for residential development. The sites are small scale and brownfield, and will provide 16 homes in total. They all have good access to services and public transport provision within Burbage.

Formal allocation of Site BUR16 as a Local Centre will help to protect and maintain services within the local area and may also help to protect the vitality and diversity of Burbage.

Formal allocation of Site BUR24 as a green corridor will help to ensure that this resource is retained and protected from development. This will help to protect the character of Burbage and also potentially enable informal leisure activities, with beneficial effects upon health and well being. Green corridors can support a range of habitats and species, therefore protection of this could also have a beneficial effect upon biodiversity.

Desford:

There are two allocations for residential development: DES01 and DES02. DES01 is a large greenfield site, adjacent to the current settlement boundary and will accommodate 100 dwellings. DES02 is a small brownfield site, formerly a public house. Both sites will have good access to the existing services in Desford, but may also affect capacity given the size of Site DES01. Site DES02 is adjacent to Desford Conservation Area.

Allocation of existing areas of open space and allotment (DES09 and DES10) will help to protect the character of Desford. It is also proposed to allocate a new area of open space at Site DES12 which will provide a recreational resource for new residents at the housing allocation DES01 as well as for existing residents.

Site DES13 is allocated for development of a railway station (this is the site of a currently disused station). It is near to a local wildlife site, therefore should development occur may have an effect upon this.

Groby:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- GRO01
- GRO02
- GRO21

These will provide 110 houses in total. Future residents of these sites will have good access to services within Groby, and access to a regular bus service (every 15-30 mins) into Leicester. However the capacity of services within Groby may be affected, particularly by development of 82



dwellings at Site GRO21. All three housing sites are greenfield. Site GRO02 is adjacent to a local wildlife site and near the M1 motorway, therefore may be air quality issues associated with this.

The following allocations for allotments / open space have been appraised:

- GRO05 - extension to existing allotments
- GRO06 - open space and allotment- greenfield, next to new housing development.
- GR012- open space- already open space but not allocated.

Site GRO23 is within a local wildlife site and allocation for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation may therefore have an adverse effect upon this. It is also next to M1 motorway, therefore there may be air quality issues associated with this.

Ratby:

Allocation of Site RAT01 for residential development and Site RAT02 for residential and Gypsy and Traveller provision will help to ensure future residents have good access to services in Ratby. The sites will provide a total of 79 homes. Site RAT01 is predominantly brownfield, while RAT02 is greenfield. Site RAT02 includes some significant tree cover and development could lead to removal of this.

Site RAT04 is an existing employment site which is to be allocated for mixed use, i.e. employment plus any other use (including residential). Site RAT12 is a brownfield site, which is proposed to be allocated for a new employment site. Allocation of both these sites will make good use of previously developed land and existing infrastructure.

Site RAT14 is a sports ground to be allocated as a community facility. This will help to ensure that it is retained and potentially enable new leisure activities.

Allocation of greenfield Sites RAT16 and RAT17 as new allotments will help to meet the demand for allotment plots in Ratby. Site RAT16 is near to a local wildlife site.

Sites RAT01, RAT04, RAT12 and RAT14 include small areas within the floodplain. Development of these sites could, therefore, increase the risk of flooding. Sites RAT01, RAT12 and RAT14 are near to Ratby Conservation Area, therefore development of these sites could affect the character of this.

Markfield

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- MARK01



- MARK02
- MARK03
- MARK04
- MARK05
- MARK06

Site MARK01 is a farm site, proposed to be allocated for 44 dwellings. It is adjacent to a local wildlife site and development may therefore affect this. The site is close to services available in Markfield but may affect the capacity of health care and education services within the village. Site MARK02 is also a greenfield site, proposed for 15 dwellings. This site is further away from the village centre and less accessible in terms of services. The other housing sites are relatively small scale (max 9 dwellings) and brownfield, therefore fewer effects are anticipated.

Development of employment at Site MARK08 is likely to have an adverse effect upon the local wildlife site designated within this site. Allocation of this site for employment is likely to increase employment opportunities both in the village and for the borough as a whole.

Allocation of Site MARK13 as a new allotment will help to meet the demand for allotment plots in Markfield. Site MARK20 is 2.5 km from the centre of Markfield, therefore allocation of this site for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation may limit access to village services.

Bagworth:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- BAG01
- BAG02

Service provision in Bagworth is limited as there is no primary school or GP surgery. BAG01 is allocated for 55 dwellings, therefore development of this would significantly increase the population of the village and could affect capacity of services further afield. BAG01 is brownfield (former railway sidings) but does include trees. BAG02 is greenfield, and also includes trees. As the sites are within the National Forest, they are particularly sensitive and trees should be protected wherever possible.

Allocation of BAG04 for a railway station will enable improvements to public transport provision in Bagworth (and thus improved access to services), should the National Forest line be reopened.

Allocation of BAG11 as an Area of Special Character will help to protect this site from development and maintain the character of the rural landscape.



Barlestone:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- BARL01
- BARL02
- BARL18

These allocations will provide 41 dwellings in total. Service provision is generally good in Barlestone, however there is no GP surgery in the village (the nearest is 1.4 miles away). Site BARL01 is infill of the existing settlement but includes significant planting and development may affect the diversity of Barlestone. BARL02 is greenfield, on the edge of the settlement and development may therefore affect the rural landscape. Site BARL18 is very small scale (1 dwelling) and brownfield therefore not anticipated to have any significant effects.

Allocation of Site BARL10 for employment will provide job opportunities for local people. The site is greenfield and on the edge of the settlement, therefore may have an effect upon the rural landscape. However, there are no designations on the site. Site BARL11 is adjacent to BARL10 and may have similar effects however given the nature of the allocation (i.e. cemetery) any effects are likely to be less significant.

Site BARL16 is to be allocated as an extension to an existing Gypsy and Traveller site. This site is rural and greenfield and allocation may therefore have an effect upon the rural landscape. There are no wildlife or archaeological sites designated on or adjacent to this site.

Market Bosworth:

Allocation of sites MKBOS01 and MKBOS02 for 60 and 40 houses respectively will enable good access for future residents to services within Market Bosworth. Both sites are greenfield and on the edge of the town. Development at these sites could have adverse effects upon the local wildlife sites adjacent to the railway line, particularly Site MKBOS02 which is actually within a local wildlife site. Site MKBO02 is also within a biodiversity improvement area.

Allocation of the existing but disused railway station (Site MKBOS04) will help to protect and enable the renovation of this historic and tourist resource. This site is within a local wildlife site, therefore should the allocation lead to further development, this could have an effect upon this site.

Sites MKBOS13 and MKBOS14 are currently greenfield sites to be allocated for open space. This will help to protect the character of Market Bosworth. Site MKBOS13 forms part of a local wildlife site



and biodiversity improvement area and allocation of this as open space may therefore help to protect the natural environment.

Site MKBOS17 is to be allocated for an extension to the existing industrial estate. The site is greenfield and on the edge of the town. The site is also near to a local wildlife site, therefore development could affect this.

Site MKBOS18 is a greenfield site to be designated as a car park. Given the level of proposed development around the railway line, there is potential for cumulative effects upon environmental resources in this area, which includes local wildlife sites and a designated biodiversity improvement area.

Newbold Verdon:

There currently are two alternatives being considered for a large (110 dwellings) residential development, including Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in Newbold Verdon: NEW01a and NEW01b. Both sites are greenfield and on the edge of the village, therefore could affect the character of the village and the surrounding rural landscape. Site NEW01b is adjacent to two local wildlife sites which could be adversely affected by the development. However this site would also provide excellent access to recreation opportunities at the adjacent area of open space.

Four much smaller brownfield sites are also proposed to be allocated for residential development these are all small scale (between 1 and 5 dwellings) and within or on the edge of the built up area.

Site NEW10 is a brownfield site proposed to be allocated for a new car park for the nearby church. The site is within the Newbold Verdon Conservation Area and near to the Moated Site Scheduled Monument and therefore could have an effect upon the character of these resources.

Stoke Golding:

Stoke Golding is on the edge of Bosworth Battlefield and therefore any development in the village could affect this historic and tourist resource.

Allocation of Site STG01 for residential development (60 dwellings), including Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, will enable good access for future residents to services in Stoke Golding. The site is on the edge of the village and may therefore affect the character of the rural landscape as well as that of Stoke Golding. The eastern edge of the site is designated as a local wildlife site; therefore it is likely that development would have an adverse effect upon this.



Site STG02a / STG02b is previously developed land (former convent) on the edge of the village. There are two possible options for this site- residential development, specifically elderly person's accommodation (STG02a) or niche employment (STG02b). While this is a brownfield site and allocation for development would encourage the use of previously developed land, the site does include a number of 'green' features, including significant numbers of trees and allotments.

If Site STG02a is allocated for elderly person's accommodation, this would contribute towards meeting needs. If Site STG02b is allocated as an employment site, this is likely to increase employment opportunities both in Stoke Golding and for the borough as a whole. Allocating the site for niche employment uses will also contribute towards the aim to develop a culture of innovation in the borough.

Designation of Site STG12 as a Local Centre will help to maintain and protect the shopping area and thus help to ensure services are retained within the village and potentially enable development of further services. It may also encourage people to walk to access services rather than drive.

Congerstone:

CON01 is a residential allocation for 10 dwellings. Given the limited services and public transport provision in Congerstone, future residents will have limited access to services by means other than the private car. The site is greenfield, but there are no designations.

CON02 is an employment land allocation- the site was allocated in the Local Plan but has yet to be developed and has therefore been appraised. The site is brownfield, within Congerstone Conservation Area.

Higham on the Hill:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- HIG01
- HIG02
- HIG10 (STILL TO BE APPRAISED)

The allocations are for 40 dwellings in total. HIG01 is a greenfield site, next to a wildlife site. HIG02 is part greenfield part brownfield. It is also partly in the Conservation Area.



Stanton under Bardon:

Site STA01 is proposed to be allocated for residential development of 30 homes. Services and public transport provision in Stanton under Bardon are limited, therefore future residents will need to travel further afield to access services, and are likely to rely on the private car, particularly given the very limited bus service to the village.

The site is predominately greenfield and on the edge of the village, therefore may affect the character of the village and the rural landscape. There are no environmental designations within or adjacent to the site.

Sheepy Magna:

Sites SHE01 and SHE02 are proposed to be allocated for residential development, to provide 20 dwellings in total. Both sites are greenfield. Service and public transport provision is limited in Sheepy Magna, therefore residents are likely to rely on private car.

An additional area of open space is to be designated at SHE03. The site is next to a local wildlife site, therefore protection of this as open space may help to protect biodiversity at this site. It is also provide a recreational resource for local residents.

Nailstone:

Sites NAI01, NAI02 and NAI10 are to be allocated for residential development. Sites NAI01 and NAI02 are greenfield sites on the edge of the settlement. Site NAI10 is a small scale brownfield site.

Allocation of Site NAI06 for employment will make use of the existing colliery site. Part of the site is designated as a local wildlife site, and development is likely to adversely affect this. The site also includes some woodland cover and development could lead to removal of this. As the sites are within the National Forest, they are particularly sensitive and trees should be protected wherever possible.

Twycross:

Site TWY01 is proposed to be allocated for residential development of 20 homes. Services and public transport provision in Twycross are limited, therefore future residents will need to travel further afield to access services, and are likely to rely on the private car, particularly given the very limited bus service to the village.



The site is greenfield, on the edge of the settlement, therefore development may affect the character of this small village and the surrounding rural landscape. There are no environmental designations within or adjacent to the site.

6.3.2 Non-Settlement Specific Site Allocations

The DPD contains number of allocations that are not associated with any specific settlements within the Borough, these are categorised as follows:

- Green infrastructure.
- Green wedges.
- Renewable energy.
- Tourism.
- Sporting facilities.

These allocations vary in nature and as such so has the approach to their appraisal.

Green Infrastructure

The green infrastructure sites comprise a network of green spaces, landscape and natural elements that intersperse and connect cities, towns and villages to each other and the surrounding rural areas. These provide for the economy, wildlife, local people and communities alike.

It should be noted that the sites allocated are already in existence, i.e. their allocation is not for development but to afford them protection and conserve them in their current state. It is considered that their allocation will preserve the status quo; however as they have not been previously allocated the sites have been grouped according to their nature and appraised 'in principle' rather than in terms of the potential for site specific impacts. The groups appraised are as follows:

- Multifunctional corridors without watercourses.
- Multifunctional corridors with watercourses.
- Wildlife corridors with watercourses.
- Green/wildlife corridors linking features/assets to long distance paths.

The Appraisal Tables are presented within Appendix E.

SUMMARY TO BE INSERTED

Green Wedges



Green wedges are areas separating conurbations designed to maintain open space between settlements. The green wedges discussed within the DPD were previously allocated in the Local Plan and as such it is considered that the status quo will not be altered. The green wedges have not been appraised further as part of this SA.

Wind Power

Three sites have been allocated for wind power developments. It has been determined that one of these sites can support between one and two turbines, another can support two and the third can support four. In addition, all three sites are in close proximity to one another, each site being within 2km of another. As such, all three sites were appraised as a group to enable consideration of their cumulative impact.

The Appraisal Tables are presented within Appendix E.

SUMMARY TO BE INSERTED

Charnwood Forest

The RSS for the East Midlands includes provision for the creation of a Charnwood Forest Regional Park. The DPD has been utilised to determine where the boundary of the park should be within the Borough.

The Appraisal Tables are presented within Appendix E.

SUMMARY TO BE INSERTED

Sporting Facilities

This involves the provision of a new leisure centre for the Borough, the current facility being located within Hinckley. There are a number of issues for consideration here, including whether or not new facilities should be located within Hinckley and if so where? These issues have been dealt with through a comparative options appraisal, see section 5.5.

6.3.3 Generic Development Control Policies

Each of the generic development control policies was appraised using the methodology presented in section 6.2., the Appraisal Tables are presented in Appendix E.

SUMMARY TO BE INSERTED



6.4 Recommendations

In undertaking the SA of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008), a series of recommendations were developed to order to maximise beneficial effects and minimise adverse effects of any impacts. The following hierarchy was used when determining recommendations for adverse impacts:

- Prevent impacts as far as possible by designing out or using preventative measures during the construction process.
- Reduce impacts as far as possible by using preventative measures to minimise effects.
- Offset impacts to compensate for unavoidable effects that cannot be further reduced.

Recommendations can be incorporated at three stages of the development:

- During preparation of the DPD in order to design out or reduce adverse impacts, and to maximise beneficial impacts.
- During construction in order to minimise adverse impacts / maximise beneficial impacts arising during the construction process.
- Following development in order to minimise impacts / maximise beneficial impacts arising during the post implementation phase.

It should be noted that there is potential for many of the recommendations identified at the Preferred Options stage to be implemented through existing or subsequent DPDs and subsequent SPDs.

Recommendations are presented in Appendix E in relation to each of the SA objectives.



7.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

7.1 Next Steps

The Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2008) and this SA Report will be consulted on for a period of 6 weeks. HBBC will then consider the responses to the public participation and produce their final Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD. Any significant changes made during this stage will need to be subject to further SA prior to adoption.

The next steps of the SA and associated steps of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD are detailed in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1 Next Steps in the Sustainability Appraisal

ODPM Stage		SA Steps	Links to the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Process
Stage D Consulting on the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD and the SA Report	D1	Consultation on the Preferred Options SA Report.	Undertaken at the same time as consultation on the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report
	D2	Appraise any significant changes to the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD following consultation.	Undertaken in conjunction with finalisation of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD prior to adoption.
	D3	Produce a consultation statement to accompany the adopted Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD to show how responses to consultation have been taken into account. This must state how the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD was changed as a result of the SA	Undertaken in conjunction with finalisation of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD prior to adoption.



ODPM Stage		SA Steps	Links to the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Process
		process and responses to consultation.	
Stage E Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	E1 & E2	Undertake monitoring of significant effects arising from the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD and respond to adverse effects.	Undertaken after the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD has been adopted.

7.2 Links to the Planning Process

Once adopted, the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD will be taken into account as a material consideration in determining planning applications in the Borough. In due course the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD will be incorporated into the LDF being developed by HBBC.

7.3 Proposals for Monitoring

Once adopted, implementation of the Site Allocations must be monitored to ensure that unforeseen adverse effects are identified and acted upon. Monitoring should:

- Take an objective and target led approach.
- Determine whether the SA process has accurately predicted effects.
- Determine whether the DPD is contributing to achievement of the SA objectives.
- Determine whether mitigation measures are performing as desired.
- Identify adverse effects and determine whether remedial action is required.

The extent of development considered within the DPD was previously determined by the Core Strategy. A list of general monitoring targets and indicators was developed for the Core Strategy and these have been presented in Appendix F. The indicators should be used as guidance only; however due to the closely linked natures of the DPD and the Core Strategy it is considered that it will be possible to link the monitoring. It will be necessary for HBBC to build upon/refine these targets and indicators. In developing monitoring it may be possible to utilise indicators being used



elsewhere within the Council, such as in the monitoring of the Local Transport Plan or other documents under the LDF.

It is not necessary to monitor everything, or conduct monitoring indefinitely. It should be noted that although monitoring features of the baseline may indicate the effects of the DPD, those features may also be open to effects beyond its influence. As such, indicators should be clearly linked to the SA process and in addition should enable the setting of targets that are within the scope of that which the DPD can achieve. This may involve focusing upon the significant effects predicted during the SA process; For the DPD these include the following:

SUMMARY TO BE INSERTED

IN PROGRESS DRAFT