




FIGURES



|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reproduced from the Office of National Statistics with the permission of Her Majesty’s  Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright  White Young Green License No: C02W0007330 | | | | |
|  | WYG Environment Planning  Transport Arndale Court Headingley Leeds  LS6 2UJ  Tel: 0113 278 7111  Fax: 0113 275 0623  E-mail: [enviro.leeds@wyg.com](mailto:enviro.leeds@wyg.com) | | | |
| CLIENT: Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council | | | |
| PROJECT: Sustainability Appraisal of the Hinckley and Bosworth Site  Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD | | | |
| TITLE: Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | | | |
| DATE: January 2009 | | | PROJECT No: E6915-132  FIG No:  1 |
| DRAWN: HD | CHECKED: FMD | APPROVED: PFB |

APPENDIX A

REPORT CONDITIONS



APPENDIX A REPORT CONDITIONS

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

SITE ALLOCATIONS AND GENERIC DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT

This report is produced solely for the benefit of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and no liability is accepted for any reliance placed on it by any other party unless specifically agreed in writing otherwise.

This report is prepared for the proposed uses stated in the report and should not be used in a different context without reference to WYG. In time improved practices, fresh information or amended legislation may necessitate a re-assessment. Opinions and information provided in this report are on the basis of WYG using due skill and care in the preparation of the report.

This report refers, within the limitations stated, to the environment of the site in the context of the surrounding area at the time of the inspections. Environmental conditions can vary and no warranty is given as to the possibility of changes in the environment of the site and surrounding area at differing times.

This report is limited to those aspects reported on, within the scope and limits agreed with the client under our appointment. It is necessarily restricted and no liability is accepted for any other aspect. It is based on the information sources indicated in the report. Some of the opinions are based on unconfirmed data and information and are presented as the best obtained within the scope for this report.

Reliance has been placed on the documents and information supplied to WYG by others but no independent verification of these has been made and no warranty is given on them. No liability is accepted or warranty given in relation to the performance, reliability, standing etc of any products, services, organisations or companies referred to in this report.

Whilst skill and care have been used, no investigative method can eliminate the possibility of obtaining partially imprecise, incomplete or not fully representative information. Any monitoring or survey work undertaken as part of the commission will have been subject to limitations, including for example timescale, seasonal and weather related conditions.

Although care is taken to select monitoring and survey periods that are typical of the environmental conditions being measured, within the overall reporting programme constraints, measured conditions may not be fully representative of the actual conditions. Any predictive or modelling work, undertaken as part of the commission will be subject to limitations including the representativeness of data used by the model and the assumptions inherent within the approach

Development Plan Document



Preferred Options Report

used. Actual environmental conditions are typically more complex and variable than the investigative, predictive and modelling approaches indicate in practice, and the output of such approaches cannot be relied upon as a comprehensive or accurate indicator of future conditions.

The potential influence of our assessment and report on other aspects of any development or future planning requires evaluation by other involved parties.

The performance of environmental protection measures and of buildings and other structures in relation to acoustics, vibration, noise mitigation and other environmental issues is influenced to a large extent by the degree to which the relevant environmental considerations are incorporated into the final design and specifications and the quality of workmanship and compliance with the specifications on site during construction. WYG accept no liability for issues with performance arising from such factors.

August 2008

WYG Environment Planning Transport Ltd.

Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies

Development Plan Document

Preferred Options Report

APPENDIX B

PLANS AND PROGRAMMES REVIEW

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plan or Programme of  Relevance | Main Aims and Objectives | Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document | Implications for the  Sustainability Appraisal |
| Leicestershire Local Area Agreement (2006) | | | |
| Sets out a number of key priorities for improvement in Leicestershire in relation to health, older people, children and young people, safety, the environment and economic development and enterprise, with a focus upon maximising partnership activity across the county. | Older People:  • Improved quality of life, independence and well being of older people.  • Improving the quality of support for older people living at home.  • Providing a wide range of housing options and  increasing safety at home.  • Maximising income and improving use of income for older people.  • To reduce smoking prevalence amongst adults and children.  Healthier Communities:  • To achieve an improvement in people’s health.  • To increase participation in sport and active recreation.  • To improve mental health and well-being.  • To improve access to health services, including sexual health.  Children and Young People:  • Improved life chances and better opportunities for vulnerable young people.  • Improve educational progress and outcomes for  all children.  • Improve physical and mental health of young people.  Safer Communities:  • To reduce overall crime particularly violent crime, domestic violence and hate crime.  • To reduce the level of offending by prolific offenders.  • To build respect in communities and reduce the level of anti-social behaviour.  • To reduce vulnerability and assist people to feel  safe within priority neighbourhoods.  Stronger Communities:  • Building community cohesion and inclusion and increasing local participation in governance.  Cleaner and Greener Communities: | Relationships:  • Opportunities to make development accessible to everyone, including the disabled and the elderly.  • Opportunities to provide decent, affordable  housing that meets current housing needs.  • Opportunities through location, layout and design of development to reduce crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour.  • Opportunities to situate development in  locations with good access to key services and facilities.  • Opportunities for community involvement in the  SPD and SA decision making process.  • Opportunities to contribute towards improving the health and well-being of people through improvements in housing stock, and ensuring good access to health, leisure and recreation facilities.  • Opportunities for the provision of recreation  facilities as part of housing development (e.g. children’s play areas, football pitches), to encourage greater participation in sports and active recreation.  • Opportunities for the provision of appropriate recycling and composting facilities, which could encourage more sustainable waste management practices.  • Opportunities for sustainable design and construction, including the re-use and recycling of materials, which could reduce energy and resource use.  • Opportunities to protect and enhance green  infrastructure, and to ensure green space is of a high quality and accessible to all.  • Opportunities to make sure development can adapt to, and mitigate the effects of climate change. | The SA should include objectives which address the objectives and targets of the Local Area Agreement. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plan or Programme of  Relevance | Main Aims and Objectives | Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document | Implications for the  Sustainability Appraisal |
| Leicestershire Local Area Agreement (2006) | | | |
|  | • Improving waste management in Leicestershire: increasing levels of diversion from landfill, including recycling and composting.  • Improved cleanliness and attractiveness of towns  and cities.  • Increased quality and uses of green spaces.  • To increase cycling, walking and the level of outdoor activity.  • To increase awareness of and responses to climate change.  • Improve biodiversity and nature habitats.  Economic Development and Enterprise:  • Increase the number of businesses starting up within the County of Leicestershire.  • To increase the vitality and viability of town centres.  • Increasing skills and the number of people in employment.  • Working towards improving the provision of  employment land and premises across the county.  • Increasing the number of businesses starting up and expanding in the county.  • Increase the contribution of tourism to the  economy. | Conflicts:  • Potential challenge to ensure that development has no adverse impact upon social exclusion, community cohesion, and anti-social behaviour.  • Potential conflict between development and the  protection and enhancement of green space.  • Potential challenge to discourage use of the private car.  How could the aims be addressed in the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document?  • Ensure development is accessible to everyone,  Including the disabled and the elderly.  • Ensure the provision of decent, affordable housing that meets current housing needs.  • Ensure the potential for crime, the fear of crime  and antisocial behavior is reduced / prevented through location, layout and design of development.  • Consider the role of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document in improving the health and well-being of people, for example through improvements in housing stock, and by ensuring good access to health, leisure and recreation facilities.  • Adopt Secured by Design Principles for new  housing development.  • Ensure that the local community and other interested parties are given adequate opportunity to participate in, and contribute towards, the decision making process.  • Ensure the provision of appropriate recycling and composting facilities within new development.  • Promote high quality sustainable design and  construction, including the re-use and recycling |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plan or Programme of  Relevance | Main Aims and Objectives | Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document | Implications for the  Sustainability Appraisal |
| Leicestershire Local Area Agreement (2006) | | | |
|  |  | of materials where possible.  • Ensure the provision of greenspace within development which can be used as recreation / play space.  • Ensure development can adapt to, and mitigate the effects of climate change.  • Ensure development is situated in locations  with good access to key services and facilities.  • Ensure the provision of recreation facilities as part of housing development (e.g. children’s play areas, football pitches), to encourage greater participation in sports and active recreation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plan or Programme of  Relevance | Main Aims and Objectives | Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document | Implications for the  Sustainability Appraisal |
| Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Strategy 2005 - 2008 | | | |
| Details the key issues facing housing  in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough and where housing provision should be in the future. | Strategic objective:  • Secure decent, well-managed and affordable housing across the Borough.  Key objectives:  • A better balance in the local housing market to tackle homelessness and cater for projected population increases.  • Improved condition of the existing housing stock  in all sectors.  • Enhanced support for those with specific needs.  Priorities:  • To make more affordable housing available, both by increasing the number of dwellings let each year by the Council and housing associations and through a programme of new building by  housing associations.  • To enable more housing for people who can afford to pay more than an affordable rent but cannot afford open market rent or purchase. This is called “intermediate” housing. However this  will only be supported where it can be made to  work for the purchaser/renter. That means that prices must still be closer to affordable levels than to market prices.  • To ensure that provision is made to deal with the predicted shortfall in housing for owner occupation.  • To work with others, both within and outside the  Borough.  • To determine the long term ownership and management of Council housing stock.  • To update information on housing conditions.  • To pursue further energy efficiency improvements in all housing. | Relationships:  • Opportunities to provide decent, well managed affordable housing across the Borough which meets local needs.  • Opportunities to address the predicted  shortfall in housing for owner occupiers.  • Opportunities to incorporate energy efficiency technologies in all housing.  • Opportunities to address both current and future housing needs, including the needs of the disabled, the young and the elderly.  • Opportunities for the provision of affordable housing for key workers.  • Opportunities to make best use of previously developed land prior to development of greenfield land.  • Opportunities to provide affordable housing of  a recognised decent standard.  • Opportunities to help people to afford their heating by ensuring high quality heating systems and high standards of insulation.  • Opportunities to incorporate Secured by  Design elements into new housing to reduce the fear of crime and the potential for crime.  Conflicts:  • Potential challenge to ensure that housing remains affordable.  How could the aims be addressed in the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document?  • Secure the provision of decent, well managed affordable housing that meets local needs.  • Ensure that affordable housing provision  caters for the predicted shortfall in housing for | The SA should include objectives and requirements which address the key objectives and priorities of the Housing Strategy. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plan or Programme of  Relevance | Main Aims and Objectives | Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document | Implications for the  Sustainability Appraisal |
| Hinckley and Bosworth Housing Strategy 2005 - 2008  Internet Link: <http://www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/ppimageupload/holding/Image46202.PDF> | | | |
|  | • To ensure that support services for specific groups are targeted according to present and projected future needs and not according to past needs.  • Aim to adapt homes wherever possible which will enable someone to remain in their own home.  • Ensure new homes are suitable for the disabled  from the outset, without the need for further adaptation.  • To support young people, offenders, mentally disordered offenders, older people with support needs and people with learning disabilities. | owner occupation.  • Ensure housing incorporates renewable energy and energy efficient technologies where appropriate.  • Ensure that housing meets both current and future needs, including the needs of the disabled, the young and the elderly.  • Ensure that new housing is built on previously developed land prior to the development of greenfield land.  • Ensure the installation of high quality heating  systems and insulation to help people afford their heating.  • Ensure new housing incorporates Secured by  Design principles to reduce the fear of crime and the potential for crime.  • Ensure that all new housing meets the UK Government’s decent homes standards.  • Ensure the provision of the correct mix of  property types and sizes.  • Ensure the provision of housing which meets the requirements of people at all income levels.  • Ensure affordable housing provision meets the  housing needs of those who are homeless, vulnerable or have special housing requirements. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plan or Programme of  Relevance | Main Aims and Objectives | Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document | Implications for the  Sustainability Appraisal |
| Hinckley and Bosworth Community Plan 2007-2012  Internet Link: <http://www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/ppimageupload/Image50012.PDF> | | | |
| Details the issues and concerns facing communities within Hinckley and Bosworth and sets out priorities and actions plans to improve the quality of life of people in the Borough. | Priorities:  • Strengthening communities – through support for community activity, volunteering and learning.  • Increasing the positive role of and opportunities  for, young people and older people in their communities.  • Improving the provision and use of community and cultural facilities.  • Reducing crime, anti-social behaviour and fear of  crime and improving confidence in the Police and criminal justice system.  • Revitalising town and village centres.  • Developing the role of selected ‘growth sectors’  through tailored programmes of support.  • Improving physical access to services and reducing congestion.  • Improving electronic access to services.  • Preventing ill health by increasing participation in healthier lifestyles and through support for individuals – targeting communities with poorest health.  • Improving sexual health and reducing teenage  pregnancy.  • Achieving a cleaner Borough, targeting: litter, dog fouling, fly tipping and graffiti.  • Protecting and enhancing wildlife, heritage and rural and urban character.  • Reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.  • Reducing waste going to landfill.  • Secure decent, well-managed and affordable housing across the Borough – increasing its availability to meet expected needs. | Relationships:  • Opportunities for the provision of housing that meets the needs of the young and the elderly.  • Opportunities to situate development in  locations with good access to community, recreation and cultural facilities.  • Opportunities to incorporate Secured by  Design elements into new housing to reduce the fear of crime and the potential for crime.  • Opportunities to contribute towards the  regeneration of town and village centres through the redevelopment of previously developed land sites for housing development.  • Opportunities for the provision of accessible  greenspace as part of housing development, which can be used for social / recreation purposes.  • Opportunities to situate development in  locations with good access to key services /  facilities.  • Opportunities to situate development in locations with good access to the public transport network, which may help to reduce reliance upon the private car and thereby reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with car use.  • Opportunities for the provision of dedicated  recycling and composting bins within new housing, to encourage people to sort and recycle their waste.  • Opportunities to secure decent, well-managed  and affordable housing across the Borough which meets local needs.  • Potential conflict between development and  the protection and enhancement of wildlife, heritage and rural and urban character. | The SA should include objectives and requirements which address the key priorities and issues identified in the Community Plan. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plan or Programme of  Relevance | Main Aims and Objectives | Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document | Implications for the  Sustainability Appraisal |
|  |  | • Potential conflict between reducing greenhouse gas emissions and development.  • Potential conflict between reducing the amount of waste going to landfill and development.  How could the aims be addressed in the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document?  • Ensure the provision of housing that meets the  needs of the young and the elderly.  • Ensure development is situated in locations with good access to key services and recreation / cultural facilities.  • Ensure that Secured by Design Principles are  incorporated into new housing to help reduce the fear of crime and the potential for crime.  • Ensure the provision of accessible greenspace as part of housing development, which can be used for social / recreation purposes.  • Ensure development has no impact upon wildlife, heritage and rural / urban character.  • Ensure development is situated in locations with good access to the public transport network, to help to reduce reliance upon the private car. |  |

Sustainability Appraisal Report



Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies

Development Plan Document

Preferred Options Report

APPENDIX C

BASELINE INFORMATION

WYG Environment Planning Transport part of the WYG Group creative minds safe hands [www.wyg.com](http://www.wyg.com/)

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

Preferred Options Report

Appendix C - Baseline Data

KEY TO BASELINE DATA SPREADSHEETS

Not applicable

|  |
| --- |
| / |
| ? |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Data not currently available / data trend unknown / no target set

Indicator is significantly below (or above) national average and / or previous Borough figures: not a key sustainability issue

Indicator is slightly above/below national average and / or previous Borough figures: potential sustainability issue

Indicator is significantly above (or below) national average and / or previous Borough figures: key sustainability issue

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| ECONOMICS |
| Gross Value Added | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gross Value Added per head (£) | 2003 | ? | ? | 14,505 | 16,339 | Increase | ? | www.sustainable- development.gov.uk Regional Sustainable Development Indicators | x |  |  |
| 2002 | ? | ? | 14,034 | 15,646 |
| 2001 | ? | ? | 13,226 | 14,887 |
| Economic Activity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Economic Activity Rate  (working age population) | Jun 2004- May 2005 | 83.4 | 84.0 | 79.5 | 78.8 | Increase | Overall increase since 2002. The EAR has, however, decreased since  2004 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey | x |  |  |
| June 2003- May 2004 | 85.1 | 84.4 | 79.7 | 78.9 |
| Jun 2002- May 2003 | 82.7 | 84.9 | 79.9 | 79 |
| Economic Inactivity Rate (EIR)  (working age population) | Jun 2004- May 2005 | 16 | 16 | 20.5 | 21.2 | Decrease | Overall decrease since  2002. The EIR has, however, increased since  2004 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey | x |  |  |
| June 2003- May 2004 | 14.9 | 15.6 | 20.3 | 21.1 |
| Jun 2002- May 2003 | 17.3 | 15.1 | 20.1 | 21 |
| Survival of Businesses | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Businesses surviving 12 months  (%) | 2001 | ? | 92.3 | 92.1 | 92.2 | Increase | ? | [www.goem.gov.uk](http://www.goem.gov.uk/) | x |  |  |
| VAT Registration Rate | 2004 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | Increase | Decrease | [www.goem.gov.uk](http://www.goem.gov.uk/) | x |  |  |
| 2003 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| VAT De-registration Rate | 2004 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | Decrease | No change | [www.goem.gov.uk](http://www.goem.gov.uk/) | x |  |  |
| 2003 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 |
| Business Stock at end of 12 month period | 2005 | 3545 | 20865 | 125170 | 1819870 | Increase | Decrease | [www.goem.gov.uk](http://www.goem.gov.uk/) | x |  |  |
| 2003 | 3600 | 20600 | 124000 | 1810500 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| EMPLOYMENT |
| Employment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Rate  (working age population) | Jun 2004- May 2005 | 79.7 | 81.1 | 76.1 | 75.1 | Increase | Overall decrease since  2002 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey | x | x |  |
| June 2003- May 2004 | 82.7 | 81.5 | 76.1 | 75 |
| Jun 2002- May 2003 | 81.2 | 82.3 | 76.2 | 75 |
| Unemployment Rate  (working age population) | Jun 2004- May 2005 | ? | 3.5 | 4.3 | 4.7 | Decrease | ? | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey | x | x |  |
| June 2003- May 2004 | ? | 3.3 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Jun 2002- May 2003 | ? | 3 | 4.6 | 5.1 |
| Job Seekers Allowance Claimants (proportion of working age population) | 2007 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 2.5 | Decrease | Increase | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Claimant Count with Rates and Proportions | x | x |  |
| 2006 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 2.6 |
| 2005 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 2.3 |
| Employment Status | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Full Time Workers as % of all in employment aged 16+ | Jun 2004- May 2005 | 72.9 | 74.8 | 73.7 | 74.0 | / | Increase | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey | x | x |  |
| June 2003- May 2004 | 71.6 | 71.6 | 73.2 | 73.8 |
| Jun 2002- May 2003 | 71.3 | 73.9 | 73.3 | 74.0 |
| Part Time Workers as % of all in employment aged 16+ | Jun 2004- May 2005 | 27.1 | 25.2 | 26.3 | 25.9 | / | Decrease | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey | x | x |  |
| June 2003- May 2004 | 28.4 | 28.4 | 26.8 | 26.2 |
| Jun 2002- May 2003 | 28.7 | 26.1 | 26.6 | 25.9 |
| Self Employed as % of all in employment aged 16+ | Jun 2004- May 2005 | 10.5 | 11.4 | 12.3 | 12.9 | / | Decrease | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey | x | x |  |
| June 2003- May 2004 | 11.4 | 12 | 11.7 | 13.0 |
| Jun 2002- May 2003 | 12.5 | 12.3 | 11.1 | 12.3 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| EMPLOYMENT |
| Income | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average Gross Weekly Pay (mean) (£) - Full Time Workers | Jun 2004- May 2005 | 506.3 | 528.4 | 505.4 | 548 | Increase | Overall increase since 2002 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings | x | x |  |
| June 2003- May 2004 | 506.8 | 504.2 | 482.9 | 527.4 |
| Jun 2002- May 2003 | 489.2 | 488.5 | 458 | 509.6 |
| Average Gross Weekly Pay (mean) (£) - Part Time Workers | Jun 2004- May 2005 | 174.2 | 176.4 | 167.4 | 172.5 | Increase | Overall increase since 2002 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings | x | x |  |
| June 2003- May 2004 | 161.7 | 155.2 | 159.8 | 169.1 |
| Jun 2002- May 2003 | 162.9 | 154.2 | 151.9 | 162.9 |
| Industry of Employment - Leicestershire Economic Baseline Study (2006) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % people employed in agriculture and fishing | 2004 | ? | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.9\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |
| % people employed in energy and water | 2004 | ? | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.6\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |
| % people employed in manufacturing | 2004 | 26.1 | 19.0 | 17.4 | 11.9\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |
| % people employed in Construction | 2004 | 3.5 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.5\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |
| % people employed in distribution, hotels and restaurants | 2004 | 26.1 | 28.6 | 25.1 | 24.7\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |
| % people employed in transport and communications | 2004 | 5.9 | 8.1 | 5.7 | 5.9\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |
| % people employed in financial and business services | 2004 | 15.0 | 15.8 | 15.2 | 20\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |
| % people employed in public administration, education and health | 2004 | 14.0 | 18.2 | 25.5 | 26.4\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |
| % of people employed in other services | 2004 | 6.7 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 5.1\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| EMPLOYMENT |
| Knowledge Economy Employment - Leicestershire Economic Baseline Study (2006) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of people employed in consumer services | 2004 | 22.6 | 21.7 | 20.3 | 21.3\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |
| % people employed in high technology manufacturing | 2004 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.9\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |
| % people employed in knowledge based services | 2004 | 13.0 | 13.8 | 13.4 | 17.9\* | / | ? | Leicestershire Economic  Baseline Study (2006) | x | x |  |
| Industry of Employment - 2001 Census Data | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % People employed in Agriculture, Hunting and Forestry | 2001 | 1.49 | 1.59 | 1.88 | 1.45\* | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People employed in Fishing | 2001 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.02\* | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People employed in Mining & Quarrying | 2001 | 0.39 | 0.45 | 0.42 | 0.25\* | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People employed in Manufacture | 2001 | 23.60 | 21.17 | 19.91 | 14.83 | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People employed in Electricity, Gas and Water Supply | 2001 | 1.54 | 0.96 | 0.83 | 0.71 | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People employed in Construction | 2001 | 6.33 | 6.70 | 6.86 | 6.76 | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People employed in Wholesale and Retail trade, Repair of Motor Vehicles | 2001 | 18.80 | 18.14 | 18.21 | 16.85 | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People emplyed in Hotels and  Restaurants | 2001 | 3.93 | 4.06 | 4.51 | 4.73 | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People employed in Transport, Storage and Communication | 2001 | 6.87 | 6.41 | 6.25 | 7.09 | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People employed in Financial  Intermediation | 2001 | 3.46 | 3.54 | 3.07 | 4.80 | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People employed in Real Estate, Renting and Business Activities | 2001 | 10.13 | 10.65 | 10.41 | 13.21 | / | ? |  |  | x |  |
| % People employed in Public Administration & Defence and Social Security | 2001 | 3.82 | 4.40 | 4.95 | 5.66 | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People employed in Education | 2001 | 6.95 | 8.59 | 7.80 | 7.74 | / | ? |  | x | x |  |
| % People employed in Health and  Social Work | 2001 | 8.66 | 9.22 | 10.60 | 10.70 | / | ? |  | x | x |  |

\* Data for Great Britain

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| POPULATION |
| Total Population | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Population | 2005 | 102,800 | 627,800 | 4,306,300 | 50,431,700 | / | Increase of 1300 since 2003 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/)  Mid-year population estimates |  | x |  |
| 2004 | 102,200 | 623,900 | 4,279,700 | 50,093,800 |
| 2003 | 101,500 | 619,200 | 4,252,300 | 49,855,700 |
| 2001 | 100,141 | 609,578 | 4,172,174 | 49,138,831 |  | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/) |  |  |  |
| Population Density | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Density  (persons per sq km) | 2001 | 3.37 | 2.93 | 2.67 | 3.77 | / | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (UV02) |  | x |  |
| Ethnic Group | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % White British | 2001 | 97.93 | 94.71 | 93.49 | 86.99 | / | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS06) |  | x |  |
| % Mixed | 2001 | 0.59 | 0.74 | 1.03 | 1.31 | / | ? |
| % Asian or Asian British | 2001 | 1.06 | 3.69 | 4.05 | 4.57 | / | ? |
| % Black or Black British | 2001 | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0.95 | 2.3 | / | ? |
| % Chinese or Other Ethnic Group | 2001 | 0.31 | 0.53 | 0.49 | 0.89 | / | ? |
| Age | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % People aged 0-4 | 2005 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 5.7 | / | No change | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/)  Mid-year population estimates |  | x |  |
| 2004 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 5.4 |
| 2003 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 6 |
| 2001 | 5.53 | 5.62 | 5.73 | 5.96 | / | / | [www.statisitics.gov.uk](http://www.statisitics.gov.uk/) |  | x |  |
| % People aged 5-14 | 2005 | 11.6 | 12.2 | 12.3 | 12.2 | / | Decrease of 0.3 since 2003 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/)  Mid-year population estimates |  | x |  |
| 2004 | 11.8 | 12.4 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| 2003 | 11.9 | 12.5 | 12.7 | 12.9 |
| 2001 | 12.32 | 12.72 | 13.05 | 12.92 | / | / | [www.statisitics.gov.uk](http://www.statisitics.gov.uk/) |  | x |  |
| % People aged 15-19 | 2005 | 6.1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.6 | / | Overall increase of 0.1 since  2003 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/)  Mid-year population estimates |  | x |  |
| 2004 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.5 |
| 2003 | 6 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| 2001 | 5.83 | 6.36 | 6.23 | 6.18 | / | / | [www.statisitics.gov.uk](http://www.statisitics.gov.uk/) |  | x |  |
| % People aged 20-44 | 2005 | 32.3 | 33.1 | 33.9 | 35.2 | / | Decrease of 0.3 since 2003 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/)  Mid-year population estimates |  | x |  |
| 2004 | 32.6 | 33.3 | 34 | 35.2 |
| 2003 | 32.6 | 33.5 | 34 | 35.3 |
| 2001 | 33.17 | 33.92 | 34.32 | 35.31 | / | / | [www.statisitics.gov.uk](http://www.statisitics.gov.uk/) |  | x |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| POPULATION |
| Age | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % People aged 45-64 | 2005 | 28.1 | 26.4 | 25.4 | 24.3 | / | Increase of 2.5 since 2003 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/)  Mid year population estimates |  | x |  |
| 2004 | 27.8 | 26.2 | 25 | 24.2 |
| 2003 | 25.6 | 26 | 24.9 | 23.7 |
| 2001 | 27.13 | 25.74 | 24.59 | 23.75 | / | / | [www.statisitics.gov.uk](http://www.statisitics.gov.uk/) |  | x |  |
| % People aged 65 and over | 2005 | 16.7 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 16 | / | Increase of 0.2 since 2003 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/)  Mid year population estimates |  | x |  |
| 2004 | 16.6 | 16.2 | 16.3 | 16 |
| 2003 | 16.5 | 16 | 16 | 15.9 |
| 2001 | 16.02 | 15.67 | 16.07 | 15.89 | / | / | [www.statisitics.gov.uk](http://www.statisitics.gov.uk/) |  | x |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| QUALITY OF LIFE |
| Social Poverty | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indices of Deprivation- Rank of  Average Score (Overall)  1 is the most deprived LA in England and 354 is the least deprived | 2004 | 278 out of 374 | / | / | / | Increase rank | ? | [http://www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/) |  | x | x |
| Indices of Deprivation- Rank of  Income  1 is the most deprived LA in Engalnd and 354 is the least deprived | 2004 | 261 out of 374 | / | / | / | Increase rank | ? | [http://www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/) |  | x | x |
| Indices of Deprivation- Rank of  Employment  1 is the most deprived LA in Engalnd and 354 is the least deprived | 2004 | 238 out of 374 | / | / | / | Increase rank | ? | [http://www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/) |  | x | x |
| % Households that experienced fuel poverty | 2003 | ? | ? | 6.4 | 7.2 | Decrease | ? | Regional Sustainable Development Indicators |  | x | x |
| 2001 | ? | ? | 11.3 | 11.5 |
| % Children in low income households- before housing costs | 2001/2-  2003/4 | ? | ? | 22 | 20 | Decrease | ? | Regional Sustainable Development Indicators |  | x | x |
| 1995/6-  1997/8 | ? | ? | 23 | 23 |
| % Children in low income households- after housing costs | 2001/2-  2003/4 | ? | ? | 27 | 29 | Decrease | ? | Regional Sustainable Development Indicators |  | x | x |
| 1995/6-  1997/8 | ? | ? | 29 | 32 |
| % of Adult Population on Income  Support | 2003 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 10 | Decrease | ? |  |  | x | x |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| CRIME |
| Overall crime rate  (Recorded crime BCS comparator) | 2005 | 43.5 | 42.7 | 63.3 | 62.7 | Decrease | Decrease of 1.0 since 2003 |  |  | x | x |
| 2004 | 44.4 | 44.2 | 65.9 | 64 |
| 2003 | 44.5 | 45.4 | 72.5 | 69.3 |
| Burglary rate  (offences per 1,000 households) | 2005 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 14.8 | 13.8 | Decrease | decrease of 0.3 since 2003. Increase of 0.2 since 2004 |  |  | x | x |
| 2004 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 17 | 17.7 |
| 2003 | 11.7 | 13 | 22.2 | 18.6 |
| Vehicle crime  (offences per 1,000 population) | 2005 | 11.4 | 8.7 | 13.4 | 17 | Decrease | decrease of 0.3 since 2003. Increase of 0.2 since 2004 |  |  | x | x |
| 2004 | 11.2 | 9.5 | 14.3 | 14 |
| 2003 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 18 | 13.5 |
| Robbery  (offences per 1,000 population) | 2005 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 1.9 | Decrease | Increase of 0.1 since 2004. No change since  2003 |  |  | x | x |
| 2004 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 1.8 |
| 2003 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 2 |
| Violence Against the Person  (offences per 1,000 population) | 2000-2001 | 7.2 | ? | 10.3 | 11.3 | Decrease | ? |  |  | x | x |
| Theft of a Motor Vehicle  (offences per 1,000 population) | 2000-2001 | 6.1 | ? | 5.1 | 6.4 | Decrease | ? |  |  | x | x |
| Racial Incidents  (offences per 1,000 population) | 2000-2001 | 6.9 | ? | ? | ? | Decrease | ? |  |  | x | x |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| HEALTH |
| Life Expectancy | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Life Expectancy Males | 2003 | 78.1 | ? | 76.5 | 76.55 | Increase | Increase of 0.2 years since  2002 | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/) | x | x |  |
| 2002 | 77.9 | ? | 76.3 | 76.24 |
| Life Expectancy Females | 2003 | 81.5 | ? | 80.7 | 80.91 | Increase | No change | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/) | x | x |  |
| 2002 | 81.5 | ? | 80.5 | 80.72 |
| Mortality | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mortality due to circulatory diseases (per 100000 population of those under 75) | 2004 | 75.4 | 76 | 91.4 | 90.5 | Decrease | Decrease of 8.8 since 2002 |  | x | x |  |
| 2003 | 82.7 | 84.1 | 99.2 | 96.7 |
| 2002 | 84.2 | 87.8 | 104.4 | 102.8 |
| Mortality due to cancer  (per 100000 population of those under 75) | 2004 | 107.2 | 109.2 | 117.6 | 119 | Decrease | Increase of 10.3 since 2002 |  | x | x |  |
| 2003 | 106.8 | 107.2 | 119.7 | 121.6 |
| 2002 | 96.9 | 101.3 | 121.2 | 124 |
| General Health | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % People who descibe their health as Good | 2001 | 69.41 | 70.44 | 67.58 | 68.76 | Increase | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS08) | x | x |  |
| % People who descibe their health as Fairly Good | 2001 | 22.73 | 22.21 | 23.27 | 22.21 | / | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS08) | x | x |  |
| % People who descibe their health as Not Good | 2001 | 7.85 | 7.36 | 9.14 | 9.03 | Decrease | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS08) | x | x |  |
| % people with a long term limiting illness | 2001 | 16.3 | 15.4 | 18.4 | 17.9 | Decrease | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (UV22) | x | x |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| EDUCATION |
| Education - Adult | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of working age population educated to at least NVQ Level 3 | 2003-2004 | 16.3 | 17.6 | 16.4 | 15.2 | Increase | Increase of 2.4 since 2001-  2002 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey |  | x |  |
| 2002-2003 | 13.4 | 16.2 | 15.5 | 14.9 |
| 2001-2002 | 13.9 | 14.9 | 15 | 14.2 |
| % of working age population educated to at least NVQ Level 2 | 2003-2004 | 18.1 | 16.6 | 15.4 | 15.6 | Increase | Increase of 4.1 since 2001-  2002 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey |  | x |  |
| 2002-2003 | 15 | 15 | 15.8 | 15.7 |
| 2001-2002 | 14 | 15.1 | 15.6 | 15.4 |
| % of working age population educated to at least NVQ Level 1 | 2003-2004 | 17.2 | 15.5 | 16.4 | 15.0 | Increase | Overall decrease since  2001-2002 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey |  | x |  |
| 2002-2003 | 20 | 17.3 | 16.5 | 15.2 |
| 2001-2002 | 18.2 | 17.1 | 16.6 | 15.7 |
| % of working age population with trade apprenticeships | 2003-2004 | 9.5 | 10.5 | 12.2 | 10.5 | Increase | Decrease of 3.2 since 2002-  2003 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey |  | x |  |
| 2002-2003 | 12.7 | 8.5 | 8.2 | 7.2 |
| 2001-2002 | ? | 8 | 8 | 7.5 |
| % of working age population with no qualifications | 2003-2004 | 10.1 | 10.5 | 12.2 | 10.5 | Decrease | Decrease of 6.4 since 2001-  2002 | [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/) Local Quartely Labour Force Survey |  | x |  |
| 2002-2003 | 13.6 | 11.6 | 13 | 11.0 |
| 2001-2002 | 16.5 | 12.2 | 14.1 | 11.8 |
| Education - Children | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of pupils achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A\* - C or equivalent | 2005 | 100 | 100 | 85.9 | 92.6 | Increase | No change -  100% achievement since 2003 |  | x | x |  |
| 2004 | 100 | 100 | 84.7 | 88.9 |
| 2003 | 100 | 100 | 83.4 | 86.8 |
| % of 11 year olds achieving Level 4 or above in KS2 Maths | 2005 | 92 | 85.9 | 79.8 | 79.3 | Increase | Increase of 7.4 since 2003 |  | x | x |  |
| 2004 | 88.5 | 85.9 | 78.9 | 77 |
| 2003 | 84.6 | 86.3 | 74 | 73.7 |
| % of 11 year olds achieving Level 4 or above in KS2 English | 2005 | 92 | 91.4 | 85.3 | 86.2 | Increase | Overall increase of 3.5 since  2003 |  | x | x |  |
| 2004 | 92.3 | 91.4 | 83.8 | 83.4 |
| 2003 | 88.5 | 89.3 | 79.8 | 79 |
| % of 14 yr olds achieving Level 5 or above in KS3 Maths | 2005 | 100 | 100 | 94.7 | 94.2 | Increase | No change -  100% achievement since 2003 |  | x | x |  |
| 2004 | 100 | 100 | 94.7 | 94.2 |
| 2003 | 100 | 100 | 89.8 | 91.3 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| EDUCATION |
| Education - Children | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of 14 yr olds achieving Level 5 or above in KS3 English | 2005 | 100 | 100 | 92 | 93.3 | Increase | No change -  100% achievement since 2003 |  | x | x |  |
| 2004 | 100 | 100 | 89 | 89.2 |
| 2003 | 100 | 100 | 81.1 | 85.9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| HOUSING |
| % households owner occupied  (owns outright) | 2001 | 34.3 | 33.8 | 30.8 | 29.2 | / | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS18) |  | x |  |
| % households owner occupied  (owns with a mortgage or loan) | 2001 | 82.29 | 80.65 | 71.63 | 68.07 | / | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS18) |  | x |  |
| % households renting from council/housing association/registered social landlord | 2001 | 10.6 | 11 | 17.5 | 19.3 | / |  | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS18) |  | x |  |
| % households renting from private landlord/letting agency | 2001 | 4.7 | 5.5 | 7.3 | 8.8 | / |  | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS18) |  | x |  |
| % of housing identified in the development plan which is classified as affordable housing | 2005-2006 | 20 | / | / | / | Increase to  40 by 2008-  2009 | No change | Hinckley and Bosworth  Corporate Performance Plan  2006-2011 (LIB078) |  | x |  |
| 2004-2005 | 20 | / | / | / |
| % Total dwelling stock classified as unfit | 2005 | 2.1 | ? | 3.7 | 4.4 | Decrease | Decrease of 0.1 since 2003 | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/) |  | x |  |
| 2004 | 2.2 | ? | 3.7 | 4.8 |
| 2003 | 2.2 | ? | 4.9 | 5.6 |
| % Total Local Authority dwellings classified as unfit | 2005 | 0 | ? | 1.7 | 3.8 | Maintain at  0% to 2008-  2009 | No change -  100%  achievement | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/) |  | x |  |
| 2004 | 0 | ? | 1.5 | 4.2 |
| 2003 | 0 | ? | 1.8 | 4.7 |
| % Total Owner Occupied and Private Rented dwellings classified as unfit | 2005 | 2.3 | ? | 4.8 | 4.9 | Decrease | Decrease of 0.2 since 2003 | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/) |  | x |  |
| 2004 | 2.4 | ? | 5.3 | 5.3 |
| 2003 | 2.5 | ? | 5.7 | 6 |
| Average house price (£) (Land Registry October to December period)  \* Data for England and Wales | 2006 | 171,367 | 186,669 | 163,225 | 207,573 | / | Increase of 1390 since 2004 | [www.landregistry.gov.uk](http://www.landregistry.gov.uk/) |  | x |  |
| 2005 | 170,195 | 178,210 | 155,547 | 191,327 |
| 2004 | 169,977 | 176,767 | 152,269 | 182,920 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT |
| Traffic | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Road Accident Casualty Rate: People killed or seriously injured (per 1,000 population) | 2005 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | Reduce | Decrease of 0.1 since 2004. No change overall | [www.fti.neighbourhood.gov.uk](http://www.fti.neighbourhood.gov.uk/) | x | x | x |
| 2004 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| 2003 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Road Accident Casualty Rate: Children killed or seriously injured (per 1,000 population) | 2005 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | Reduce | No change since  2003 | [www.fti.neighbourhood.gov.uk](http://www.fti.neighbourhood.gov.uk/) | x | x | x |
| 2004 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| 2003 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Private Car | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % Households with at least one car or van | 2001 | 83.26 | 83.19 | 75.75 | 73.16 | / | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS17) | x | x | x |
| % working residents using public transport to get to work\* | 2001 | 4.39 | 6.05 | 8.44 | 15.42 | Increase | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS15) | x | x | x |
| % working residents cycling or walking to work | 2001 | 12.2 | 12.2 | 13.8 | 12.8 | Increase | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS15) | x | x | x |
| % working residents driving a car or van to work | 2001 | 66 | 64.6 | 60.4 | 54.9 | Decrease | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/)  (KS15) | x | x | x |
| Public transport users in households with a car or van | 2001 | 83.9 | 81.9 | 70.6 | 69 | / | ? | [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/) | x | x | x |
| Public Transport | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of bus passenger journeys per annum | 2005-2006 | ? | 15,036,000 | ? | ? | Increase | ? | [www.bvpi.gov.uk](http://www.bvpi.gov.uk/)  (102) | x | x | x |
| Length of Cycle Network (km) | 2002 | ? | 21 | ? | ? | Increase | ? | [www.leics.gov.uk](http://www.leics.gov.uk/) | x | x | x |

\* This figure includes people using underground, metro, light rail, tram, bus, minibus, coach, train or taxi/minicab.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| TOURSIM AND RECREATION |
| Usage of Facilities | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of visits to libraries  (per 1,000 population) | 2001-2002 | ? | 4420 | ? | 6431 | Increase | ? | [www.bvpi.gov.uk](http://www.bvpi.gov.uk/)  (117) |  | x |  |
| Number of visits to/usage of museums  (per 1,000 population) | 2005-2006 | ? | 647 | ? | ? | Increase | ? | [www.bvpi.gov.uk](http://www.bvpi.gov.uk/)  (170a) |  | x |  |
| 2001-2002 | ? | 591 | ? | ? |
| Number of school pupil visits to museums and galleries | 2005-2006 | ? | 16746 | ? | ? | Increase | ? | [www.bvpi.gov.uk](http://www.bvpi.gov.uk/)  (170c) |  | x |  |
| Satisfaction with Cultural and Recreation Services | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of people very/fairly satisfied with sports and leisure facilities | 2006-2007 | ? | 53 | ? | 55.1 | Increase | ? | [www.bvpi.gov.uk](http://www.bvpi.gov.uk/)  (119a) |  | x |  |
| 2004-2005 | 47 | ? | ? | ? |
| % of people very/fairly satisfied with museums and galleries | 2006-2007 | ? | 71 | ? | 71.6 | Increase | ? | [www.bvpi.gov.uk](http://www.bvpi.gov.uk/)  (119b) |  | x |  |
| % of people very/fairly satisfied with theatres and concert halls | 2006-2007 | ? | 35 | ? | 43 | Increase | ? | [www.bvpi.gov.uk](http://www.bvpi.gov.uk/)  (119c) |  | x |  |
| % of people very/fairly satisfied with libraries | 2006-2007 | ? | 36 | ? | 44.7 | Increase | ? | [www.bvpi.gov.uk](http://www.bvpi.gov.uk/)  (119d) |  | x |  |
| 2004-2005 | 37 | ? | ? | ? |
| % of people very/fairly satisfied with parks and open spaces | 2006-2007 | ? | 70 | ? | 72.3 | Increase | ? | [www.bvpi.gov.uk](http://www.bvpi.gov.uk/)  (119e) |  | x |  |
| 2004-2005 | 71 | ? | ? | ? |
| Footpaths | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % total length of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use | 2005-2006 | ? | 77 | ? | 66.4 | Increase | ? | [www.bvpi.gov.uk](http://www.bvpi.gov.uk/)  (178) |  | x |  |
| 2001-2002 | ? | 79.4 | ? | ? |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| WATER |
| River Water Quality | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % Rivers graded as Good - Chemical GQA | 2004 | ? | ? | 55 | 62 | Increase | ? | Regional Sustainable Development Indicators |  |  | x |
| 2003 | ? | ? | 54 | 62 |
| 2002 | ? | ? | 59 | 65 |
| % Rivers graded as Good / Fair - Chemical GQA | 2003 | ? | ? | 97 | 94 | / | ? | Regional Sustainable Development Indicators |  |  | x |
| 2001 | ? | 98.4 | ? | ? |
| % Rivers graded as Good - Biological GQA | 2004 | ? | ? | 61 | 70 | Increase | ? | Regional Sustainable Development Indicators |  |  | x |
| 2003 | ? | ? | 59 | 69 |
| 2002 | ? | ? | 57 | 68 |
| % Rivers graded as Good / Fair- Biological GQA | 2003 | ? | ? | 96 | 95.4 | / | ? | Regional Sustainable Development Indicators |  |  | x |
| 2001 | ? | 98.3 | ? | ? |
| Pollution | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Substantiated Pollution  Incidents (Water) | 2003 | ? | ? | 5037 | 29,626 | Decrease | ? | [www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/) |  |  | x |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| BIODIVERSITY |
| Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of SSSI | 2007 | 7 | 91 | 330 | 4000+ | 95% of SSSI land to be in favourable  or recovering condition by  2010 | ? | [www.naturalengland.org.uk](http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/) [www.magic.gov.uk](http://www.magic.gov.uk/) |  |  | x |
| Number of SSSI units | 2007 | 27 | 398 | 1,765 | 22,000 | ? |
| % of SSSI in Favourable Condition | 2007 | 33.3\* | 22.1 | 44.4 | 44.8 | ? |
| % of SSSI in Unfavourable but  Recovering Condition | 2007 | 7.4 | 48.5 | 25.6 | 30.7 | ? |
| % of SSSI in Unfavourable  Condition - No Change | 2007 | 48.1\* | 21.6 | 10.6 | 15.9 | ? |
| % of SSSI in Unfavourable and  Declining Condition | 2007 | 11.1\* | 7 | 19 | 8.5 | ? |
| % of SSSI Destroyed / Part  Destroyed | 2007 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.01 | 0.07 | ? |
| \* It should be noted that the SSSI condition data for the Borough refers to the condition of the SSSI units not the overall SSSI condition. This data is therefore not comparable with the data for the county, region and England as a whole. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Special Areas of Conservation | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Special Areas of  Conservation | 2007 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 237 | Increase | ? | [www.magic.gov.uk](http://www.magic.gov.uk/) |  |  | x |
| Special Protection Areas | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Special Protection Areas | 2007 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 83 | Increase | ? | [www.magic.gov.uk](http://www.magic.gov.uk/) |  |  | x |
| Local Nature Reserves | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Local Nature Reserves | 2007 | 2 | ? | ? | ? | Increase | ? | [www.natureonthemap.org.uk](http://www.natureonthemap.org.uk/) |  |  | x |
| Regional Farmland Bird Species Indices | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of species | 2003 | ? | ? | 91 | ? | Increase | Decrease of 1.0 since 2002 | www.sustainable- development.gov.uk Regional Sustainable Development Indicators |  |  | x |
| 2002 | ? | ? | 92 | ? |
| 2001 | ? | ? | 91 | ? |
| Number of species with populations increasing | 1994-2002 | ? | ? | ? | 8/19 | ? | ? |
| Number of species with populations showing little change | 1994-2002 | ? | ? | ? | 4/19 | ? | ? |
| Number of species with populations declining | 1994-2002 | ? | ? | ? | 7/19 | ? | ? |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| BIODIVERSITY |
| Regional Woodland Bird Species Indices | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of species | 2003 | ? | ? | 114 | ? | Increase | Decrease of 1.0 since 2002 | Regional Sustainable Development Indicators |  |  | x |
| 2002 | ? | ? | 111 | ? |
| 2001 | ? | ? | 114 | ? |
| Number of species with populations increasing | 1994-2002 | ? | ? | ? | 15/33 | ? | ? |
| Number of species with populations showing little change | 1994-2002 | ? | ? | ? | 7/33 | ? | ? |
| Number of species with populations declining | 1994-2002 | ? | ? | ? | 11/33 | ? | ? |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| WASTE |
| Waste disposal and recycling | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average household waste collected per head (kg) | 2005-2006 | 416.9 | 545.1 | ? | ? | Decrease | Increase | (84a) | x | x | x |
| 2004-2005 | 405.6 | ? | ? | 444.5 |
| 2001-2002 | 382 | 530 | ? | ? |
| % household waste recycled | 2005-2006 | 17.6 | ? | ? | ? | Increase to  19% by  2008-2009 | Increase of 8.8 since 2001-2002 | (82a) | x | x | x |
| 2004-2005 | 15.7 | ? | ? | 15.2 |
| 2001-2002 | 8.8 | 11.8 | ? | ? |
| % household waste composted | 2005-2006 | 22.7 | ? | ? | ? | Increase to  27% by  2008-2009 | Increase of 20.8 since 2001-2002 | (82b) | x | x | x |
| 2004-2005 | 18.8 | ? | ? | 6.5 |
| 2001-2002 | 1.9 | 9.4 | ? | ? |
| % household waste landfilled | 2001-2002 | ? | 78.8 | ? | ? | Decrease | ? | (82d) | x | x | x |
| % residents served by kerbisde recycling (one recyclable) | 2005-2006 | 99.8 | ? | ? | ? | Increase to  100% by  2008-2009 | Increase of 4.8 since 2004-2005 | (91a) | x | x | x |
| 2004-2005 | 95 | ? | ? | 91.1 |
| % residents served by kerbisde recycling (two recyclables) | 2005-2006 | 99.8 | ? | ? | ? | Increase to  100% by  2008-2009 | ? | (91b) | x | x | x |
| % of residents satisfied with waste recycling facilities | 2004-2005 | 70 | ? | ? | ? | Increase | ? | (90b) | x | x | x |
| % of residents satisfied with household waste collection | 2004-2005 | 80 | ? | ? | ? | Increase | ? | (90a) | x | x | x |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| CULTURAL HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY | Eco | Soc | Env |
| Listed Buildings | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Listed Buildings | 2007 | 296 | ? | 29,552 | 372,791 | / | ? | Heritage Counts East Midlands  Report [www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/) | x | x | x |
| 2005 | 320 | ? | ? | ? |
| Number of Grade I Listed Buildings | 2007 | ? | ? | 973 | 9136 | / | ? | x | x | x |
| Number of Grade II\* Listed Buildings | 2007 | ? | ? | 1823 | 20,985 | / | ? | x | x | x |
| Buildings at Risk | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number of Buildings at Risk | 2006 | 2 | 16 | 134 | 1,786 | Decrease | ? | [www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/) | x | x | x |
| Number of Buildings at Risk- Very Bad condition | 2006 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 422 | Decrease | ? | [www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/) | x | x | x |
| Number of Buildings at Risk- Poor condition | 2006 | 0 | 3 | 53 | 927 | Decrease | ? | [www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/) | x | x | x |
| Number of Buildings at Risk- Fair condition | 2006 | 2 | 11 | 56 | 411 | Increase | ? | [www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/) | x | x | x |
| Number of Buildings at Risk- Good condition | 2006 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 26 | Increase | ? | [www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/) | x | x | x |
| Historic Parks and Gardens | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Historic Parks and Gardens | 2006 | 1 | ? | 132 | ? | / | ? | UK Database of Historic Parks and  Gardens | x | x | x |
| Historic Battlefields | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Registered Historic  Battlefields | 2007 | 1 | ? | 5 | 43 | / | ? | [www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/) | x | x | x |
| Scheduled Ancient Monuments | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Scheduled Ancient  Monuments | 2007 | 22 | ? | 1,512 | ? | / | Increase | Heritage Counts East Midlands  Report [www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/) [www.magic.gov.uk](http://www.magic.gov.uk/) | x | x | x |
| 2005 | 20 | ? | ? | ? |
| 2002 | ? | ? | 1503 | ? |
| Conservation Areas | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Conservation Areas | 2007 | 26 | ? | 1,006 | 9,374 | / | ? | [www.english-heritage.org.uk](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/) | x | x | x |
| 2005 | 21 | ? | ? | ? |

\* Approximate figures

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Date | Hinckley and Bosworth Borough | Leicestershire | East Midlands | England | Target | Local Trends | Data Sources | Relationship | | |
| Eco | Soc | Env |
| AIR AND CLIMATE |
| Carbon Dioxide Emissions | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total carbon dioxide emissions  (Carbon equivalent, tonnes) | 2003 | ? | ? | 11 | 123.4 | Decrease | ? | www.sustainable- development.gov.uk Regional Sustainable Development Indicators | x | x | x |
| Total carbon dioxide emissions per head (carbon equivalent) | 2003 | ? | ? | 2,660 | 2,470 | Decrease | ? | www.sustainable- development.gov.uk Regional Sustainable Development Indicators | x | x | x |
| Energy Efficiency | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Installed capacity of sites generating electricity from renewable energy resources (MW) | 2005 | ? | ? | 90\* | 3,225\* | Increase | ? | <http://www.restats.org.uk/> | x |  | x |
| Generation of electricity from renewable sources (GWh) | 2005 | ? | ? | 650\* | 8900\* | Increase | ? | <http://www.restats.org.uk/> | x |  | x |
| Energy efficiency of housing stock  (average SAP rating) | 2005-2006 | 72.2 | ? | ? | ? | Increase to  75% by  2008-2009 | Increase of 14.2 since 2001-2002 | [www.bvpi.gov.uk](http://www.bvpi.gov.uk/)  (63) |  | x | x |
| 2004-2005 | 71 | ? | ? | ? |
| 2003-2004 | 68 | ? | ? | 59.9 |
| 2001-2002 | 58 | ? | ? | ? |
| Air Quality | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Air Quality Management  Areas | 2006 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | Decrease | ? | [www.airquality.co.uk](http://www.airquality.co.uk/) | x | x | x |

\* Approximate values

**Sustainability Appraisal Report**



**Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies**

**Development Plan Document**

**Preferred Options Report**

**APPENDIX D**

SCOPING CONSULTATION RESPONSES

WYG Environment Planning Transport part of the WYG Group creative minds safe hands [www.wyg.com](http://www.wyg.com/)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| Government Office for the  East Midlands (GOEM) | • The requirement for Sustainability Appraisal (SA) relates to Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) and, as your report indicates, it is an iterative process that is intended to identify the likely significant environmental effects of the plan and the extent to which implementation of the plan will achieve sustainability objectives, and inform the preparation of the plans. It also encompasses the requirements of the European Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive. | Noted. |
| • Section 19 (5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 specifies that SA should be carried out for the proposals in each document. However, your Scoping Report relates to the local development framework (LDF), which is the  ‘folder’ of documents. The Scoping Report should relate to the individual  documents and not the overall approach to the LDF. It should identify in sufficient detail the scope of the key sustainability issues for each individual Local Development Document (LDD). Whilst it is possible to combine sustainability appraisal work for a number of LDDs, the combined report must enable you to separate out the early work on scoping the individual LDDs, to  inform the preparation of each LDD and the sustainability appraisal reports. This is particularly important where plans are to be prepared to different timetables, as is the case with the LDDs in your Local Development Scheme (LDS). | Section 2.3 of the report refers to the DPDs that the scoping report will inform. It is accepted that this should be made more explicit in Section 1.0 of the report.  Proposed Change  Scoping Report relates to the Core Strategy, Housing DPD, Employment DPD and Hinckley Area Action Plan. |
| • The GOEM have considered the content of the Scoping Report against the guidance in Annex 7 of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) consultation paper on SA of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) and LDFs (September 2004). The Scoping Report does not cover plan objectives for each LDD (it is noted that these have yet to be prepared); the broad options for consideration in each LDD; or the structure and level of detail of the sustainability appraisal reports. In the absence of the appendices, you should also ensure that the indicators and targets relate to the scope of each individual LDD and to matters that the LDD is likely to have an effect upon. | It is not possible for the Scoping Report to cover plan objectives for the individual DPDs as these have not yet been prepared. The  report aims to provide a broad scope of issues  to be addressed in future DPDs and SPDs. Broad options for consideration have been identified in the report and these will be refined as DPDs are progressed. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
|  | • In relation to more detailed matters, Section 2.3 lists the LDDs but is misleading as not all of these will be adopted by 2007, according to the local development scheme. In Table 7.1 there also seems to be some confusion between the different formal stages of consultation on DPDs. Stage D1 of the SA process should be undertaken at the Regulation 28 submission stage for a DPD. | The document states which DPDs are to be produced during the first three years (those identified in the LDS) and those that may follow. It is accepted that further scoping work may be required when these documents are produced. |
| • The Scoping Report includes a considerable amount of baseline information that will assist in moving forward with the plan preparation programme. For further guidance GOEM would refer to the ODPM (September 2004) consultation draft on SA and the April 2005 interim advice note, available on. | Noted. |
| Leicestershire Constabulary Police Architectural Liaison Officer | • National Level (para 4.1) - It would be relevant to review “Safer Places – The Planning System and Crime Prevention (ODPM 2004)” and include under this heading. This would emphasise the Council’s commitment to reducing crime and disorder through the planning system. | Disagree. The SA Scoping Report can only consider a limited number of plans and programmes. Whilst ‘The planning system and crime prevention’ will provide useful guidance in preparing future DPDs, it is not a priority for review as part of the SA Scoping Report. |
| • Analysis (para 4.1). It should be noted that crime reduction through design (Buildings and the Built Environment) can also apply to the design of open spaces particularly those associated with amenity, leisure and recreation facilities. | Agree. The SA objective “Improving community safety, reducing anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime” relates to all forms of development and open spaces, not just buildings. |
| • Key Sustainability Issues (5.3.7). As the provision of improved facilities is not the only way to tackle anti-social behaviour, the Police Architectural Liaison Officer would suggest that the bullet point be expanded to read ”The need to tackle  anti-social behaviour including the provision of improved facilities for young  people”. | Disagree. The SA objective “Improving community safety, reducing anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime” addresses this issue. |
|  | • Further base line data regarding Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) habitats and species and legally protected species is available from the Leicestershire Environmental Records Centre. | Noted. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| English Nature | • Under section 5.8.5 Key Sustainability Issues, the following two issues should be added:  • The need to protect and enhance habitats and flora and fauna populations that have developed on the brownfield sites.  • The compensation for biodiversity and geodiversity features lost to  development where loss is completely unavoidable, should reflect the fact that higher levels of recreation are needed compared to the amount of lost features. | The SA Scoping Report refers to key sustainability issues identified in collecting the baseline data. Whilst the two suggestions were not considered key following this research it is acknowledged that they are important through references in the sustainability objectives. |
| • English Nature is concerned with some of the targets and indicators that have been put forward in Appendix G: Objectives, Targets and indicators. The suggested indicator ‘Area of statutory and non-statutory designated sites of ecological importance in favorable condition’ for the specific objective “to protect and enhance the natural environment (species and habitats) whilst contributing to the achievement of BAP habitats” is considered to be a bit of an odd target with regard to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) condition as this target is more defendant upon the actions of the management of the SSSI rather than the LDF. | Noted. Account will be taken of the suggested indicators when monitoring this objective. Due to the large number of suggested indicators, however, it is not intended to include them all in the SA Scoping Report. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| English Nature | • English Nature suggests the following indicators that could be added:  • The number of developments that enhance wildlife habitats found on brown field sites.  • The number of mineral extraction site restoration plans which promote biodiversity gain/contribute towards biodiversity action plan targets.  • The area (ha) of newly created accessible urban green space.  • The area (ha) of existing urban greenspace for which management is implemented to enhance wildlife.  • The number of protected species populations identified. Number of mitigation projects necessary. Degree of alteration for protected species habitats.  • The number of LBAP species and habitats.  • The number of opportunities for habitat enhancement.  • The number of habitats enhancement projects taken forward.  • The number of geological interest features enhanced/ protected.  • The number of historic landscape enhancement/protection projects implemented. | Noted. Account will be taken of the suggested indicators when monitoring this objective. Due to the large number of suggested indicators, however, it is not intended to include them all in the SA Scoping Report. |
| • With regard to Appendix H: Compatibility Index, English Nature encourages planners and developers to maximise the opportunities for biodiversity in the planning and design of sustainable communities. If this is done at a very early stage then the environment should not only be protected, but also enhanced.  • English Nature recommends that provision should be made of at least two  hectares of accessible natural greenspace per 1000 population according to a system of tiers into which sites of different sizes fit:  • No person should live more than 300 metres from their nearest area of  natural greenspace;  • There should be at least one accessible 20ha site within 2km from home;  • There should be one accessible 100 ha site within 5km; and  • There should be one accessible 500 ha site within 10km.  • This data is taken from “Providing accessible natural greenspace in towns and cities – A Practical guide to assessing the resources and implementing local standards for provisions” published by English Nature. | Noted.  This will be achieved through policies in the various DPDs. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| The Countryside Agency | • In general the Countryside Agency considers that the Scoping Report is very comprehensive in the range of issues that it covers and is logical in its approach. Furthermore the interests that the Countryside Agency is concerned with are, for the most part, dealt with in sufficient details. The Countryside Agency does, however, have a number of the comments on the following aspects for the report: | Noted. |
| • In chapter 5, Social, Economic and Environmental Baseline, Section 5.4 deals with Tourism and Recreation and lists the reference to Countryside Agency references, either to the Agency’s website of to the specific documents relating to countryside recreation or tourism. In particular the Countryside Agency draw attention to “The Countryside in and Around Tours”, a joint vision between the Agency and Groundwork which provides a vision for connecting town and country, and “Planning Sustainable Communities”. This document is a green infrastructure guide, developed on behalf of the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Environment and Quality of Life Sub Group, specifically for Milton Keynes and the South Midlands but would be of relevance to the East Midlands region as a whole. In addition there were a number of other documents of the different aspects involved in countryside recreation on the Countryside Agency website [www.countryside.gov.uk.](http://www.countryside.gov.uk/) | Disagree. The SA Scoping Report can only consider a limited number of plans and programmes. Whilst these documents will provide useful guidance in preparing future DPDs, they are not a priority for review as part of the SA Scoping Report. |
| • In chapter 5, Section 5.9 Landscape and Visual Amenity, the topic of landscape character is well covered. The Countryside Agency would, however, suggest that where the topic of open space within urban areas is discussed that the concept  of “Green Infrastructure” is mentioned. Green Infrastructure is network of multi- functional greenspace that contributes to the high quality natural and built environment required for existing and new sustainable communities in the  future. The key sustainability issues should therefore be “to protect and enhance  existing areas of urban open space and link together to establish a green infrastructure”. | Disagree. The suggested key sustainability issue is an objective rather than an issue. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| The Countryside Agency | • The specific SA objectives for Hinckley and Bosworth set out in Section 6.3 include many of the particular interests of the Countryside Agency, including conservation and enhancement of the rural landscape, diversification of agriculture, promotion of sustainable design and construction and improving access to services in rural areas. There is, however, no mention of countryside recreation and would suggest that this is mentioned in conjunction with the objective regarding the conservation of the rural landscape. | Disagree. This is adequately covered under the objective of to improve access to and participation in cultural and leisure activities and does not fit easily alongside the suggested objective. |
| Environment Agency | • Although water is included in the Analysis (p16), reference to Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 25 has not been included in the plans and programmes review. Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 23 has also not been included in the review, which is relevant to general environment impact of the analysis. | Disagree. The SA Scoping Report can only consider a limited number of plans and programmes. Whilst these documents will provide useful guidance in preparing future DPDs, they are not a priority for review as part of the SA Scoping Report. |
| • Section 5.6.6: the reduction of land which is contaminated should be included as a key sustainability issue. | Disagree. Contaminated sites are not necessarily a key issue in the three council’s administrative areas. |
| • Section 5.7.1: the Environment Agency website has been used as a source of baseline data. The Council should have also received a CD of baseline data sets. If not, please contact Dr Sue Hornby (021 711 5849) for additional information. Further data sets may also be available. | Noted. |
| • Section 5.7.5: flooding has been identified, which may be attributed to the rate  at which run-off reaches the receiving watercourse. An increase in hard surfaced area as a result of new development will have the potential to increase flood  risk. Surface water may require attenuation, either as part of a comprehensive strategy for a major development or on a site-by-site basis, assuming that underlying ground conditions will make the use of soakaways unsuitable. | Noted. This has been included in the SA. |
| • Flooding is not solely restricted to the floodplain and the Key Sustainability Issues listed in Table 5.2 should include the management of surface water. The Implications of Sustainability Issue ‘Future flooding risk associated with climate change’ could be expanded to ‘Future development in the floodplain and increased surface water run-off could increase flood risk to properties.’ The LDF should restrict development in the floodplain and ensure the sustainable management of surface water. | Agree. Key sustainability issues will be amended to include management of surface water. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| University of Leicester | • There is an apparent conflict in Paragraph 5.12.2 which indicates that there are four Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) which require particular attention. I would draw your attention to the Central Leicestershire Provisional Local Transport Plan (LTP) published in July which states that there is no longer justification for any AQMAs in the Borough. | Disagree. There are 4 AQMAs in place in the Borough which are regularly monitored. They will be reviewed during 2006. |
| Leicestershire County Council | • From an Educational perspective the only comment Leicestershire County Council would wish to make is the importance of District Councils and Boroughs supporting schools in their areas in achieving Eco Schools status. Generally speaking in Leicestershire Eco Schools are a particular strength and according to the Eco Schools website 48% of Eco Schools in the East Midlands are in Leicestershire. There are, however, significant variations between District and Boroughs,  • The key sustainability issues (Implications for the LDF) and SA objectives should  reflect the Strategic objectives of Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure  Plan. | Noted. This has been included in the baseline. |
| • It should be noted that the Leicestershire Provisional LTP 2006-2011 has now been submitted and has been published. There are now two overlapping provisional LTPs covering Oadby and Wigston. The Borough Council is required to have regard to the LTPs when producing its LDF.  • Reference should also be made to Leicestershire County Council’s “Highways,  Transportation and Development” (HTD) documents, which have been prepared with sustainability in mind. | Agree. It is considered that this is the case.  Disagree. The SA scoping report can only consider a limited number of plans and programmes. Whilst these documents will provide useful guidance in preparing future DPDs, it is not a priority for review as part of the SA Scoping Report. |
| • Para 2.1 It is not strictly accurate to say that Hinckley and Bosworth is bounded by M1 and M69. | Noted. |
| • Para 4.1 County Level bullet 5: Leicestershire County Council suggests that the reference to the Walking and Cycling Strategy should not be made as this has largely been taken over by the Provisional Local Transport Plan 2006-2011. | Agree. Delete reference to this strategy. |
| • Para 4.2 Access and Transport third bullet should include bridleways since these are also used by walkers and cyclists | Agree. The bullet point will be amended. |
| • 6th bullet – do this mean travel plans? | Agree. The bullet point will be amended. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| Leicestershire County Council | • Para 4.2 Air and Climate, bullet 4. The air quality impacts of traffic generated by new development may be covered to an extent by the preceding bullets. However, it would be useful to have clarity as to whether or not the 4th bullet includes the air quality impacts of newly generated traffic, since this is only one which specifically discourages development that would adversely affect pollution areas. | Disagree. It is felt that the current wording sufficiently explains the issue, in a clear and concise manner. |
| • Para 5.4.4 Encouraging tourism can generate traffic. Is this a key sustainability issue? | Agree.  Proposed Change  Reference made to this in Sustainability Report. |
| • Para 5.5.2. It is not strictly accurate to say that Hinckley and Bosworth is bounded by the M1 and M69. | Noted. |
| • The Secretaries of State are minded to confirm the CPO and Side Order for the Earl Shilton Bypass subject to success in bidding for funding. The bypass already has planning permission. | Agree.  Proposed Change  Reference made to this in Sustainability  Report. |
| • Access from M69 motorway junction is mentioned as an issue, but without saying which junction. The south facing slip roads were originally omitted from junction 2 because they would draw traffic through Sapcote and Stoney Stanton unless bypasses were built. | Agree.  Proposed Change  Text amended to clarify which junction of the  M69 is the main issue. |
| • 5.5.4: there is no reference to Park and Ride. There is an existing facility (LERTS) serving A47 near Braunstone Crossroads. The County and City Councils are looking to provide a further new park and ride facility, though possibly in the vicinity of Junction 21. | These park and ride facilities are located outside Hinckley and Bosworth, but affect travel patterns for people living within the borough.  Proposed Change  Reference made to this in the Sustainability  Report. |
| • 4.2 (bullet point 6): uncertain whether this refers to travel plans. | Noted. Needs clarification.  Proposed Change  Amend bullet point 6 to read travel plan. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| Leicestershire County Council | • 5.5.3: Although transport links may be excellent at off-peak times, congestion at peak times may be an issue on some routes. | Agree.  Proposed Change  Amend 5.5.6 to identify congestion on major routes at Peak times as a key sustainability issue. |
| Sport England | • Section 4 Links to Relevant Plans and Programmes Reference should be made to  Change 4 Sport, the regional plan for sport in the East Midlands. It can be found on the Sport England website at [www.sportengland.org.](http://www.sportengland.org/) | Disagree. The SA Scoping Report can only consider a limited number of plans and programmes. Whilst these documents will provide useful guidance in preparing future DPDs, they are not a priority for review as part of the SA Scoping Report. |
| • Another key issue is the need to maintain and enhance access to existing and new sports facilities. A proposed CPA target is the % of population within 20 minutes travel time (urban areas by walk; rural areas by car) of a range of three different sports facility (playing fields/ swimming pools/sports hall/ golf courses/ health and fitness/ synthetic turf pitches) of which one has achieved a quality assured standard. | Disagree. The suggested key sustainability issue is an indicator rather than an issue. SA Objective 2 set out in Appendix F addresses this issue. |
| • Active Places Power is a website designed to help organisations involved with sports facility investment and strategy. The website is free to use and provides a planning tool for sports, leisure and fitness facilities | Noted. |
| English Heritage | • Generally, while the report covers the baseline, sustainability issues and objectives, it is not explicit in the report how the appraisal of the Development Plan Documents will actually be undertaken (paragraph 3.5). As well as looking at the mitigation of impacts, the appraisal process should look at the opportunities for enhancement. English Heritage recommends that the Conservation Officer should be involved in the appraisal process. | Amend report state that: The report aims to provide a broad scope of issues to be addressed in future DPDs and SPDs. Broad options for consideration have been identified in the report and these will be refined as DPDs are progressed. Scoping Report relates to the Core Strategy, Housing DPD and Employment DPD.  Comment relates to a later stage in the SA  process. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| English Heritage | • Paragraph 4.1 Regional Level. The Regional Environment Strategy should be added to the list. Also, ‘Viewpoints on the Historic Environment’ provides an overview of the region’s historic environment. English Heritage also publishes an annual ‘Heritage Counts’ document, which looks at different aspects of the state of the historic environment, including data. An East Midlands ‘Heritage Counts' is published as well as a national version. | Disagree. The SA Scoping Report can only consider a limited number of plans and programmes. Whilst these documents will provide useful guidance in preparing future DPDs, they are not a priority for review as part of the SA Scoping Report. |
| • Page 14 Buildings and the Built Environment. There is no reference here to conserving or enhancing townscape and the quality of the public realm or local distinctiveness, although I note that objective 8 in Appendix G relates to local distinctiveness. | The SA Scoping Report refers to key sustainability issues identified in collecting the baseline data. Whilst the two suggestions were not considered key following this research it is acknowledged that they are important through references in the sustainability objectives. |
| • Page 16 The Historic Environment. With reference to the 4th bullet point on the re-use of buildings, PPG15 makes it clear that in the case of changes of use of listed buildings… ‘The aim should be to identify the optimum viable use that is  compatible with the fabric, interior and setting of the historic building. This may not be the most profitable use if this would entail more destructive alterations than other viable uses.’  • This section should also refer to the issue of ‘setting’. This could be added to the second bullet point. | Agree. Amend to include word ‘optimum’ instead of ‘suitable’. Add last sentence of suggestion to clarify what optimum use means.  Disagree. The current wording would cover the issue of ‘setting’. |
| • Page 28, 5.9.2 Landscape Character Leicestershire County Council is to undertake a Historic Landscape Characterisation of the County, which will provide a time depth to landscape character assessments in the County. The County Council should in any case advise you on the location of areas of historic landscape, which can inform the process of landscape change, such as in the National Forest. | Noted. |
| • Page 29, 5.10.5: There should be reference to ‘setting’, i.e. ‘The need to preserve and enhance sites of archaeological and cultural heritage interest and their setting’. | Agreed.  Proposed Change  Amend 1st bullet point to include reference to the setting of sites of archaeological and  cultural heritage. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| English Heritage | • Appendix G objectives, targets and indicators: Objective 9 – This should address  ‘the character, appearance and setting of archaeological sites…’  • There is a need to distinguish between the registers of Buildings at Risk (BAR) (the national register for Grade I and II\* buildings is published annually by English Heritage) and the number of listed buildings that might be at risk, either directly and indirectly (e.g impact on setting) as a result of development proposals or policies in the DPD. The SEA should address the latter, unless the policy or proposal specifically provides for the conservation of BAR on the register. Similarly, while a pilot East Midlands Scheduled Monuments at Risk Survey has been undertaken by English Heritage, the indicator should measure the number of SAMs that might be affected by the DPD. | Noted. The report aims to provide the broad scope of the issues to be addressed in future DPDs and SPDs. The suggested indicator applies to individual DPDs and this will be taken into account as appropriate for each individual DPD. |
| • You may be aware of the new Best Value Performance Indicator relating to  Conservation Area Appraisals, which could be used as an indicator here. | Noted. The suggested indicator will be born in mind as a local indicator for our monitoring report. |
| • English Heritage has just published new guidance on Conservation Area  Appraisals that can be viewed on [www.helm.org.uk](http://www.helm.org.uk/) | Noted. |
| National Forest | • Section 4: This section should include reference to the National Forest Strategy, particularly as PPS7 states that local planning authorities should have regard to the National Forest when developing LDDs. At a local level the National Forest BAP also covers the area of the Borough in the National Forest. | Disagree. The SA Scoping Report can only consider a limited number of plans and programmes. Whilst these documents will provide useful guidance in preparing future DPDs, it is not a priority for review as part of the SA Scoping Report. These documents were used in determining the baseline. |
| • Biodiversity and Nature Conservation: NFC supports the references to the National Forest. Bullet points five and six may, however, be better placed in the Buildings and Built Environment Section, as they relate to woodland planting and landscaping associated with new development. | Noted. |
| • Leisure, Recreation, Community and Tourism: The part that the National Forest is playing in relation to all these activities should be included, in particular, the creation of new woodlands with public access close to where people live. (See specialist chapters in the National Strategy 2004 – 14). | Agreed.  Proposed Change  Reference to this in the Sustainability Report. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| National Forest | • Section 5.2.3 – Rural Economy: The reference to agricultural diversification should be broadened to refer to rural diversification; and include reference to the opportunities for woodland, conservation and leisure related diversification (as well as tourism) in The National Forest. | Agree.  Proposed Change  Sustainability Report to include reference to broader definition of rural diversification to take into account woodland related diversification. |
| • Section 5.3.4 – Health: Promoting healthy walking initiatives should be included, particularly in The National Forest where many new woodlands provide new recreational access for local people and visitors. | Disagree. Healthy walking initiatives comes within the banner of increasing physical activity. The purpose of the section is to provide a broad overview of issues, and the suggestion is considered too specific for this section. |
| • Section 5.4.3/4 – Leisure and Recreation: The NFC supports the references to The National Forest. The potential for tourism and recreation is significant, but it should also be noted that an increasing number of new woodlands with public access are available now | Agree.  Proposed Change  Sustainability Report to include increasing number of new woodlands with public access being available. |
| • Section 5.5.6 – Traffic and Transport: Another key sustainability issue is the poor availability of public transport to rural recreation attractions. | Agree.  Proposed Change  Sustainability Report includes amended key issue referencing public transport to rural visitor attractions. |
| • Section 5.6.3 - Geological Environment: The NFC supports the references to The  National Forest in relation to derelict land reclamation. The reference to after use for Nailstone Colliery should refer to Forest-related uses (this includes potential for woodland, conservation, recreation and sports). | Agree.  Proposed Change  Sustainability Report includes amend ed paragraph to include the word ‘related’ so that woodland, conservation, recreation and sports can be included. |
| • Section 5.8.1 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation: Reference should also be made to the National Forest BAP. | Disagree. The SA Scoping Report can only consider a limited number of plans and programmes. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| National Forest | • Section 5.8.3 - Biodiversity and Nature Conservation: The reference to the National Forest should include “creation of woodland and other wildlife habitats; and the word designation” should be deleted (to avoid any confusion – as the Forest area is not statutorily designated). | Agree.  Proposed Change  Sustainability Report to include “creation of woodland and other wildlife habitats; and the word ‘designation’ should be deleted. |
| • Section 5.9 - Landscape and Visual Amenity: The NFC supports the references to The National Forest and the Forest Strategy in relation to landscape and visual amenity. | Noted. |
| • Section 5.12 - Air and Climate: The relatively small, but significant role of The National Forest in helping to improve local air quality should be mentioned – in relation to tree planting ‘soaking up’ Carbon Dioxide and particulates in the atmosphere. | Agree. Amend report to include references to role of National Forest in terms of air quality and climate change. |
| • Table 5.2 – Key Sustainability Issues: “The need to maintain and enhance the setting of the The National Forest” – the NFC see the potential influence of the LDF as ‘major’ in relation to this. | Disagree. The National Forest covers a relatively small portion of the borough and the so this affects the potential influence of the LDF. A moderate influence is considered appropriate. |
| • The NFC think that the LDF has a ‘major’ influence in maintaining the rural economy and opportunities for diversification” – by establishing a supportive policy framework. | The maintenance of the rural economy and opportunities for diversification is likely to be affected by other policies and sources of funding beyond the remit of the LDF. A moderate influence is considered appropriate. |
| • Table 6.1 - SA Objectives: “Improving access to and participation in cultural and leisure activities” – this will also have an economic impact, as more people visit paid attractions. | Noted. It is acknowledged that for many objectives there would be social, environmental and economic dimensions. In this instance the social and economic dimensions are not apparent enough to warrant inclusion in the table. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| National Forest | • Table 6.1 - SA Objectives: “Conserve and enhance woodland cover, particularly in The National Forest” – the social and economic boxes should be ticked, as new woodlands are creating new recreation opportunities for local people and visitors and woodland management and creation are both adding to the development of the wood land economy in the area. | Noted. It is acknowledged that for many objectives there would be social, environmental and economic dimensions. In this instance the social and economic dimensions are not apparent enough to warrant inclusion in the table. |
| • Table 6.1 – SA Objectives: “Protecting and improving the natural environment…”  – also has social dimensions (improving quality of life) and economic (through local employment creation). | Noted. It is acknowledged that for many objectives there would be social, environmental and economic dimensions. In this instance the social and economic dimensions are not apparent enough to warrant inclusion in the table |
| • Figure 4 should include new woodlands with public access in the National Forest. | Noted. |
| • Figure 11 should include the boundary of the National Forest. | Noted. |
| • Appendix D - Plans and Programmes: PPS7 – As the National Forest is  specifically mentioned in PPS7 this review should highlight this as relevant to the  LDF. | Disagree. This is referred to within the report. |
| • National Forest BAP and National Forest Strategy – the NFC is pleased to see these documents included. In terms of the relationship of the Forest Strategy to the LDF this should highlight the opportunities to improve sustainable transport and to enhance biodiversity. | Noted. |
| • Appendix 9 – Targets and Indicators: The indicator of number of Black Poplar trees would be better expressed as planting sites. Numbers of trees are not likely to be large, but it more important that they are planted in appropriate locations. | Agree.  Proposed Change  Targets and Indicators amended with this in mind. |
| • A useful indicator would be to measure the number of successful new farm diversification schemes. | Agree.  Proposed Change  Targets and Indicators amended with this in mind. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Consultee | Comments | Response to Proposed Change |
| GVA Grimley (on behalf of  Jelson Homes) | • GVA Grimley has viewed the above document and is supportive of the general approach to the SA set out within the document. GVA Grimley would like to take this opportunity to register continued interest in the LDF and request that they continue to be notified of any further consultations with regard to the above. | Noted. |