



Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

February 2009



Report Control

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

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

Client: Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

Job Number: E09615-132

File Origin: N:\Projects\E6501-E7000\E006915-132\reports\Site Allocations\V4 FINAL REPORT\Site Allocation - Preferred Options Report FINAL V4 - 040209.doc

Document Checking:

Primary Author:	<i>Heather Davids</i>	Initialled:	HD
-----------------	-----------------------	-------------	----

Contributors:	<i>Pauline</i>	Initialled:	SP
---------------	----------------	-------------	----

Review By:	<i>[Signature]</i>	Initialled:	FM
------------	--------------------	-------------	----

Issue	Date	Status	Checked for Issue
1	19 th January 2009	In Progress Draft	
2	31 st January 2009	In Progress Draft	
3	2 nd February 2009	Draft	
4	4 th February 2009	Final	

Paul F. Burgess



Contents

0.0	NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY	1
0.1	Introduction.....	1
0.2	Development of the Sustainability Appraisal Framework	1
0.3	Development and Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document	2
1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.0	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL PROCESS	5
2.1	Requirements for Sustainability Appraisal.....	5
2.2	Sustainability Appraisal Regulations and Guidance.....	5
2.3	Sustainability Appraisal Process.....	6
2.4	Sustainability Appraisal Stages	6
2.4.1	Stage A.....	8
2.4.2	Stages B and C.....	15
2.5	Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive Compliance.....	15
3.0	BACKGROUND.....	17
3.1	Study Area.....	17
3.2	Hinckley and Bosworth Local Development Framework	17
3.3	Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.....	18
3.3.1	Development of the Development Plan Document.....	18
3.3.2	Contents of the Preferred Options Report	19
4.0	BASELINE AND KEY ISSUES.....	20
4.1	Introduction.....	20
4.2	Socio-Economic Baseline.....	21
4.2.1	Local Economy and Employment.....	22
4.2.2	Population.....	23
4.2.3	Deprivation.....	24
4.2.4	Crime.....	24
4.2.5	Health.....	25
4.2.6	Education.....	25
4.2.7	Housing	26
4.2.8	Traffic and Transport.....	28
4.2.9	Tourism, Leisure and Recreation.....	30
4.2.10	Key Sustainability Issues	31
4.3	Environmental Baseline.....	32
4.3.1	Introduction	32
4.3.2	Water Environment.....	33
4.3.3	Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	35
4.3.4	Landscape and Visual Amenity.....	38
4.3.5	Geology	43
4.3.6	Waste Management	45
4.3.7	Cultural Heritage and Archaeology	46
4.3.8	Noise	48
4.3.9	Air Quality	49



4.3.10	Climate Change	49
4.3.11	Key Sustainability Issues	50
4.4	Summary of Key Sustainability Issues.....	51
5.0	DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS	62
5.1	Introduction.....	62
5.2	Site Allocations Development Plan Document Issues and Options.....	62
5.3	Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Issues and Options	66
5.4	Outcomes of the Options Development and Appraisal.....	67
5.5	Additional Options Appraisal.....	67
6.0	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE PREFERRED OPTIONS	68
6.1	Introduction.....	68
6.2	Appraisal Methodology.....	68
6.2.1	Assessment of Effects	69
6.2.2	Limitations	70
6.3	Likely Effects of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options	71
6.3.1	Site Allocations	71
6.3.2	Non-Settlement Specific Site Allocations	86
6.3.3	Generic Development Control Policies	90
6.4	Cumulative Effects.....	94
6.5	Recommendations.....	95
7.0	IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING	96
7.1	Next Steps.....	96
7.2	Links to the Planning Process.....	97
7.3	Proposals for Monitoring	97

Sustainability Appraisal Report

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies
Development Plan Document Preferred Options Report



FIGURES

Figure 1 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough

TABLES

Table 2.1	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives
Table 2.2	Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive Compliance
Table 4.1	Hinckley and Bosworth Landscape Character Areas
Table 4.2	Key Sustainability Issues
Table 6.1	Determining Magnitude of Effects
Table 6.2	Significance of Effects
Table 6.3	Site Not Included in the Settlement Specific Appraisal Tables
Table 7.1	Next Steps in the Sustainability Appraisal

APPENDICES

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

ABBREVIATIONS

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

Sustainability Appraisal Report



Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies
Development Plan Document Preferred Options Report

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



0.0 NON-TECHNICALSUMMARY

0.1 Introduction

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC), as the Local Planning Authority for Hinckley and Bosworth, is developing a Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (DPD). The DPD will comprise site specific proposals (which will include sites to deliver housing and other major development needs such as employment, recreation, open space and community uses) and Development Control Policies that will apply across the Borough and will be used in determining planning applications. The DPD will form part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) being developed by the HBBC to replace the existing Local Plan (Adopted 2001).

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

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

0.2 DevelopmentoftheSustainabilityAppraisalFramework

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

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

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



As the HBBC LDF documents are being prepared over a number of years the above activities were repeated in May 2007 to ensure that the scope of the SA remains up-to-date.

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

HBBC initially proposed that the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD would comprise two separate documents; The Site Allocations DPD and the Generic Development Control DPD. In 2007, Issues and Options Papers were produced for each of these proposed DPDs. Both Issues and Options Papers (HBBC, 2007) were subject to SA using the SA objectives developed in Stage A. The SA process for each DPD was presented in separate Options Appraisal Explanatory Notes (WYG, 2007). All four reports were issued for consultation in 2007.

Following consultation on the reports, HBBC produced the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2009); a combined document detailing HBBC's preferred approach to future development in the Borough. The Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2009) has also been subject to SA using the SA objectives developed in Stage A.

The SA of the Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2009) identified a number of likely social, environmental and economic effects associated with implementation of the DPD.

Potential beneficial effects of the DPD include:

- Provision of housing that is supported by appropriate and accessible services / facilities.
- Provision of employment opportunities.
- Protection and enhancement of the natural environment. For example by preserving green corridors and wedges.
- Protection of the character of the Borough and the setting of historical features by ensuring that development is sensitively designed.
- Improvements in air quality and reductions in greenhouse gas emissions associated with transport through the encouragement of public transport, walking and cycling routes.
- Responsible use of resources such as water, materials and energy.
- Encouraging of the use of renewable energy.

Potential adverse effects of the DPD include:

- Effects associated with construction work, including loss of habitats / species, water, air and land pollution, increases in greenhouse gas emissions, use of previously undeveloped land, waste production, and impacts upon the character of the Borough.
- Air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from increased car travel.
- Increased energy and water consumption once new development is operational.



1.0 INTRODUCTION

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC), as the Local Planning Authority for Hinckley and Bosworth, is developing a Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (DPD). The DPD will comprise site specific proposals (which will include sites to deliver housing and other major development needs such as employment, recreation, open space and community uses) and Development Control Policies that will apply across the Borough and will be used in determining planning applications. The DPD will form part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) being developed by the Council to replace the existing Local Plan (Adopted 2001).

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

WYG has been appointed by HBBC to undertake a combined SA and SEA of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD. This combined approach is simply referred to as SA throughout this SA Report. Further details relating to the development of the DPD can be found in Chapter 3.

This report has the following format:

Non-Technical Summary

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

Chapter 1 Introduction

Chapter 2 Sustainability Appraisal Process

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

Chapter 3 Background

Details the background to the DPD.



Chapter 4 Baseline and Key Issues

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

Chapter 5 Development and Sustainability Appraisal of the Development Plan Document Issues and Options

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

Chapter 6 Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Options

Presents the predicted social, economic and environmental effects of the DPD Preferred Options.

Chapter 7 Implementation and Monitoring

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

Report Conditions are set out in Appendix A.



2.0 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL PROCESS

2.1 Requirements for Sustainability Appraisal

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

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

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

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

2.2 Sustainability Appraisal Regulations and Guidance

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

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



2.3 SustainabilityAppraisalProcess

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

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

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

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

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

2.4 SustainabilityAppraisalStages

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



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

- A1: Identifying other relevant plans, programmes and sustainability objectives.
- A2: Collating baseline information and identifying any gaps in the current data.
- A3: Identifying baseline conditions and key sustainability issues on the basis of the baseline data collated.
- A4: Developing SA objectives.
- A5: Consulting on the scope of the SA.

STAGE B Developing and refining options and assessing effects

- B1: Testing the DPD objectives against the SA objectives (WYG is unable to undertake a compatibility test as the DPD does not propose any specific objectives).
- B2: Developing and appraising the DPD options.
- B3: Predicting the likely effects of the draft DPD.
- B4: Evaluating the likely effects of the draft DPD.
- B5: Developing measures to mitigate adverse effects and maximise beneficial effects.
- B6: Developing measures to monitor the significant effects of the DPD.

STAGE C Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report

- C1: Preparing the SA report.

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

- D1: Public consultation on the draft DPD and the associated SA Report.
- D2: Appraising any significant changes to the DPD as a result of the SA and the public consultation.
- D3: Providing information on how the SA and consultation responses have been accounted for in preparing the DPD.

STAGE E Monitoring implementation of the plan

- E1: Monitoring significant effects of the DPD once adopted.
- E2: Responding to any adverse effects arising from the DPD following adoption.



2.4.1 StageA

WYG undertook Stage A (scoping) for the overall HBBC LDF process in 2005, and produced a Scoping Report detailing the outcomes, including the SA framework to be used in appraising LDF documents.

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

Consultation(StageA5)

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

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



- Leicestershire Rural Transport Partnership
- First Buses
- Leicestershire Rural Partnership

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

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

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

Details of questionnaire consultation responses are provided in the SA Scoping Report.

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

The following consultees attended:

- Environment Agency
- Highways Agency
- University of Leicester
- Transport 2000
- Leicestershire Constabulary
- Leicestershire County Council: Planning
- Leicestershire County Council: Education
- Leicestershire County Council: Historic and Natural Environment
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council: Environment
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council: Environmental Health
- Hinckley and Bosworth Council: Energy Conservation
- Hinckley and Bosworth Council: Housing
- Oadby and Wigston Borough Council: Environmental Health



- Oadby and Wigston Borough Council: Community Development
- Oadby and Wigston Borough Council: Development Control
- Blaby District Council: Housing
- Blaby District Council: Community Development

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

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

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

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

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

Details of the outcomes of the consultation forum are provided in the SA Scoping Report.

As the Hinckley and Bosworth LDF documents are being prepared over a period of time it has been necessary to ensure that the SA framework is kept up-to-date. In May 2007 stages A1 to A4 were reviewed and updated to account for the passing of time. A letter detailing the updating process was distributed to the various consultees listed above in order to gain further feedback and suggestions. Consultees' comments received following the May 2007 consultation are provided in full in Appendix D.



LinkstoRelevantPlansandProgrammes(StageA1)

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

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

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

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

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

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

BaselineandKeySustainabilityIssues(StagesA2andA3)

Baseline data was collated and reviewed in order to establish the baseline conditions and to help identify key sustainability issues as part of the SA of the Hinckley and Bosworth LDF in 2005. The baseline conditions provide the basis against which significant effects of the DPD can be predicted. To ensure that the SA framework for the HBBC LDF remains relevant this information has been



updated. Chapter 4.0 of this SA Report summarises the current baseline and key sustainability issues for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives (Stage A4)

Once the key sustainability issues had been identified a set of SA objectives were developed. These objectives provide a basis against which to appraise Hinckley and Bosworth LDF documents, and cover social, environmental and economic issues.

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

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

Table 2.1 Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

SPD SA Objectives	Economic	Social	Environmental
1. To ensure the provision of decent and affordable housing that meets local needs and links into the provision of services.			
2. To improve health and reduce health inequalities by promoting healthy lifestyles, protecting health and providing access to health services.			
3. To provide better opportunities for local people and tourists to access and understand local heritage.			
4. To improve access to and participation in cultural and leisure activities.			



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



SPD SA Objectives	Economic	Social	Environmental
16. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions to mitigate the rate of climate change.			
17. To involve people, through changes to lifestyle and at work, in preventing and minimising adverse local, regional and global environmental impacts.			
18. To improve access to education and training for children, young people and adult learners.			
19. To develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation whilst providing access to appropriate employment opportunities for the local population, particularly in rural areas.			
20. To help farmers diversify their agricultural activities or venture into new rural businesses. To help other rural businesses diversify their activities.			
21. To optimise the use of previously developed land, buildings and existing infrastructure.			
22. To promote and ensure high standards of sustainable design and construction.			
23. To minimise waste and to increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials.			
24. To improve access to services, particularly for the rural population, those without a car and for disabled, elderly and deprived people.			
25. To encourage and develop the use of public transport, cycling and walking as alternatives to the private car.			



2.4.2 StagesBandC

The processes and outcome of Stage B are detailed in Chapters 5.0 and 6.0. The outcome of Stage C1 is this SA Report.

2.5 StrategicEnvironmentalAssessmentDirectiveCompliance

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

Table 2.2 Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive Compliance

Requirement of SEA Directive	Where detailed in this SA Report
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan... ...and its relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.	Section 3.3 of the SA Report. Plans and programmes reviewed during development of the SA framework are provided in the separate Scoping Report. Additional plans and programmes reviewed are provided in Appendix B. A summary of the key points arising from this review is provided in Section 2.4.1.
b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan.	Chapter 4.0 of the SA Report.
c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.	Chapter 4.0 of the SA Report.
d) The environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including, in particular those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance.	Chapter 4.0 of the SA Report.
e) Any existing environmental protection objectives which are relevant to the plan... ...and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation.	Section 2.4.1 and Appendix B of the SA Report. Environmental objectives of relevance to the DPD are also provided in the separate Scoping Report.



Requirement of SEA Directive	Where detailed in this SA Report
f) The likely significant effects on the environment including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors.	Section 6.3 and Appendix E of the SA Report.
g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme.	Section 6.5 and Appendix E of the SA Report.
h) An outline for the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with... ...and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties encountered in compiling the required information.	Sections 5.4 and 6.22 of the SA Report.
i) A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10 of the SEA Directive.	Chapter 7.0 and Appendix F of the SA Report.
j) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings.	Chapter 0.0 of the SA Report.



3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 StudyArea

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

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

3.2 HinckleyandBosworthLocalDevelopmentFramework

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

3.3 Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document

3.3.1 Development of the Development Plan Document

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

HBBC initially proposed that the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD would comprise two separate documents; The Site Allocations DPD and the Generic Development Control DPD. In 2007, Issues and Options Papers were produced for each of these proposed DPDs. Both Issues and Options Papers (HBBC, 2007) were subject to SA using the SA objectives developed in Stage A. The SA process for each DPD was presented in separate Options Appraisal Explanatory Notes (WYG, 2007). All four reports were issued for consultation in 2007.

Following consultation on the reports, HBBC produced the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report (HBBC, 2009); a combined document detailing HBBC's preferred approach relating to future development in the Borough. The reasons for selection of the Preferred Options are provided within this document.



3.3.2 ContentsofthePreferredOptionsReport

The Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies Preferred Options Report comprises two parts:

- Part A: Context (Chapters 1 and 2) provides the background and sets the policy context for the DPD.
- Part B: Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies comprises Chapters 3, 4 and 5.

Chapter3:SiteAllocations

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

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

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

Chapter4:Non-SettlementSpecificSiteAllocations

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

Chapter5:GenericDevelopmentControlPolicies

The 20 Generic Development Control Policies apply across the Borough and should be read in conjunction with the other DPDs that will make up the LDF. The Generic Development Control Policies can be found in Appendix H.



4.0 BASELINEANDKEYISSUES

4.1 Introduction

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

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

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

Socio-Economic

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

Environmental

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



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

4.2 Socio-Economic Baseline

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

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



4.2.1 Local Economy and Employment

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

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

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

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

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

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

During the period 2004-2005, the employment rate for Hinckley and Bosworth was 79.7% respectively, compared to 76.1% in the East Midlands and 75.1% in England as a whole. However,



long term unemployment is higher than most other Districts / Boroughs. According to the Leicestershire Economic Baseline Study (2006), since 2000 employment in Hinckley and Bosworth has decreased by 3.7% (1,500 jobs). This was compared to an 8.8% increase in the county and a 3.2% increase nationally.

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

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

4.2.2 Population

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

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

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

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



4.2.3 Deprivation

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

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

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

4.2.4 Crime

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

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

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

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

A Crime Disorder and Drugs Audit was undertaken by Leicestershire County Council in 2005. According to the findings of the audit, domestic violence, racist incidents and criminal damage account for the highest volume of crime in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough (39% of all crime in the



Borough). Vehicle crime has also increased over the last 3 years but remains lower than it was in the late 1990s. Youth nuisance, burglary and drug abuse were also identified as being of concern.

4.2.5 Health

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

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

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

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

4.2.6 Education

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

In terms of adult education, in 2003-2004, the percentage of the working age population educated to at least National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) Level 3 in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough was



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

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

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

4.2.7 Housing

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

Local variations within the Borough are typified by five housing sub-markets: Central Hinckley; Outer Hinckley; Barwell / Earl Shilton; Rural North East; and Rural West. Rural West and Outer Hinckley are the most expensive areas and Barwell / Earl Shilton is the cheapest. Housing is more expensive in the rural areas, with a high demand for all types, sizes, locations and prices of property.

The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2008) was a study jointly commissioned by the following authorities: Leicester City Council, Blaby District Council, Charnwood Borough Council, Harborough District Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, Melton Borough Council, North West Leicestershire District Council and Oadby and Wigston Borough Council.

The study found that, in principle, almost two thirds of all new houses planned to be built in Leicester and Leicestershire over the next seven years would need to be forms of affordable housing to meet the needs of those who cannot afford open market costs, based on housing market conditions in 2007 / 2008. The study estimated the total need for additional affordable housing above current levels of supply at some 2,700 a year, at least 250 of which are required in rural areas, up to 2016.

According to the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2008), homelessness levels have fallen over recent years, mainly due to prevention policies and not to



improvement in the underlying housing causes. These policies may also have deterred and deflected some applications as homeless. The study states that within the whole Housing Market Assessment (HMA), homelessness has reduced by 55% since 2002 / 2003.

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

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

4.2.8 Traffic and Transport

Road Network

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

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

Private Car Use

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

The rural nature of Hinckley and Bosworth, and the relatively good access to major road routes, means that more people tend to use cars than other forms of transport. In 2001, 66% of working



residents drove a car or van to work in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, compared to 64.6% in Leicestershire, 60.4% in the East Midlands and 54.9% in England as a whole.

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

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

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

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

Public Transport

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

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

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



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

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

WalkingandCycling

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

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

4.2.9 Tourism,LeisureandRecreation

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

4.2.10 Key Sustainability Issues

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

- The need to diversify the economic base to reduce reliance upon traditional manufacturing industries.



- Poor growth in emerging key service / knowledge sectors.
- High long term unemployment rate in comparison to other Boroughs / Districts.
- The need to maintain the Economic Activity Rate of the Borough.
- Below average gross weekly pay rates in the Borough in comparison to county and national averages.
- Rising population of the Borough.
- Ageing population of the Borough.
- Pockets of local deprivation within the Borough.
- The need to reduce crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour.
- The need to tackle health issues in the Borough, in particular obesity, smoking and cancer.
- The need to improve education and skills attainment levels, in particular for adults.
- The need to improve the energy efficiency of housing.
- Rising house prices in the Borough, in particular in rural areas.
- Shortfall in affordable housing provision in the Borough.
- Shortfall in amount of housing for owner occupation in the Borough.
- The need to address specific housing needs, including housing for the disabled, the elderly, those with mental problems and those with learning disabilities.
- High levels of homelessness in the Borough.
- Road traffic congestion and road safety issues.
- High levels of private car use.
- The need to improve public transport service provision in both urban and rural areas, in particular the frequency and reliability of public transport services.
- The need to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport as viable alternatives to the private car.
- The need to improve the standard of parks and open spaces within the Borough.
- The need to increase provision of open space and equipped play space.

4.3 Environmental Baseline

4.3.1 Introduction

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

- Environment Agency website (www.environment-agency.gov.uk).
- The Sustainable Development Unit [UK Govt.]
- The Department for Communities and Local Government
- The Land Registry (www.landregistry.gov.uk).
- The National Land Use Database
- The Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (www.defra.gov.uk).



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

4.3.2 WaterEnvironment

SurfaceWater

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

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

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



Groundwater

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

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

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

FloodRisk

The Environment Agency online flood mapping service provides an indication of the likelihood of flooding in an area. Floodplain maps for the Hinckley and Bosworth indicate that a number of areas within the Borough have been designated as floodplain. These areas are primarily associated with the watercourses in the Borough, in particular the River Sence. The chance of flooding in these areas is generally considered to be 0.5% (equivalent to 1 in 200 years) or less.

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

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

WaterResourcesandFoulDrainage

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



availability of water as an influence on location, and should seek to incorporate water efficiency measures and sustainable drainage systems at the feasibility or planning stage.

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

4.3.3 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation

Statutory Sites

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

NonStatutorySites

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

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

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

There are two LNRs within Hinckley and Bosworth:

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

HabitatsandSpecies

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

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



Mammals:

- Bat species
- Dormouse
- Otter
- Water vole

Birds:

- Barn owl
- Nightingale
- Redstart
- Sand martin

Invertebrates:

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

Plants:

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

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

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



4.3.4 Landscape and Visual Amenity

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

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

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

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



Table 4.1 Hinckley and Bosworth Landscape Character Areas

Landscape Character Area	Key Characteristics
<p>A) Charnwood Fringe Character Area</p>	<p>Prominent landform, which includes the highest land in the Borough. Localised steep slopes around rocky outcrops and quarries.</p> <p>Diverse land uses which relate to the varied geology. Dominated by pasture and woodland with quarries, pools and outcrops.</p> <p>Woodland cover of varying age from mature ancient to new National Forest plantations.</p> <p>Medium to small sized field pattern interspersed with large areas of woodland cover.</p> <p>Large clustered villages with strong suburban influences.</p> <p>Distinctive local assets such as Groby Pool and Billa Barra Hill</p> <p>Good network of public footpaths.</p> <p>Distant wide views to the urban edges of Leicester and surrounding Charnwood Forest.</p> <p>Diverse range of habitats due to variable land use types.</p> <p>Strong, long established aesthetic appeal.</p>
<p>B) Forest Hills Character Area</p>	<p>Gently undulating landform with small plateaus on higher ground. Highest point centred around Bagworth.</p> <p>Predominantly rural landscape with arable and rough set-aside, influenced by industrial / urban features such as masts, poles and pylons.</p> <p>Fields enclosed by hedgerows with scattered trees.</p> <p>Industrial heritage of quarrying and mining resulting in areas of restored land and new woodland within the National Forest.</p> <p>Generally large scale field pattern with groups of smaller fields surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Linear settlements of former mining villages with sparsely scattered farms on slopes in between.</p> <p>Good public access and footpath network throughout, especially within National Forest area.</p> <p>Visually open due to immature plantations.</p> <p>Wide ranging views from higher ground.</p> <p>Thornton reservoir is an attractive focal point.</p>



Landscape Character Area	Key Characteristics
C) Market Bosworth Parkland Character Area	<p>Rolling landform with gentle slopes which rise and fall reaching a high point around the town of Market Bosworth.</p> <p>Land use dominated by parkland, pasture and scattered trees.</p> <p>Increased tree cover associated with settlements.</p> <p>Field boundaries are predominantly hawthorn hedges with some post and rail or estate fencing.</p> <p>Scattered agricultural buildings are visible in wider views. Market Bosworth is mostly hidden by vegetation.</p> <p>Occasional narrow gated lanes with avenue trees.</p> <p>Open access within the parkland and country park supported by a good network of public footpaths.</p> <p>Area is semi-enclosed by trees and hedgerows which therefore limit views.</p> <p>Significant historic features typical of country estates including estate fencing, avenue trees, grazed pasture and lanes.</p> <p>Bosworth Battlefield has strong heritage associations.</p> <p>Market Bosworth provides an important focus within the area.</p>
D) Desford Dales Character Area	<p>Gently rolling landform.</p> <p>Although predominately arable, clustered areas of industry and recreational facilities are locally prominent.</p> <p>Tree cover is limited with scattered trees and small linear woodland copses.</p> <p>Large to medium sized field pattern is defined by single species hawthorn hedges. Where hedgerows have been removed, open views across the landscape are possible.</p> <p>Clustered villages of varying size centre around crossroads. Desford is the largest settlement in the area.</p> <p>Good network of footpaths link settlements. Few major roads.</p> <p>Open views give an impression of a large scale landscape. Masts, poles, and pylons are often prominent.</p>
E) Stoke Golding Vales Character Area	<p>Predominately flat with only gentle undulations.</p> <p>Mix of arable and pasture with frequent individual trees.</p> <p>Medium scale rectilinear field pattern bounded by mixed hedgerows with scattered hedgerow trees and small copses.</p> <p>Settlement usually associated with local high points.</p> <p>Area criss-crossed by network of small lanes and public footpaths.</p> <p>The Ashby Canal features numerous attractive canal bridges.</p> <p>Stoke Golding is an attractive settlement clustered around its prominent church, close to the Ashby Canal.</p>



Landscape Character Area	Key Characteristics
	<p>Area is open and expansive with views occasionally limited by vegetation.</p> <p>This is generally a tranquil, rural character area despite the proximity of Hinckley and the A5.</p>
<p>F) Hinckley, Barwell and Burbage Fringe Character Area</p>	<p>Gently rolling landform with some areas of flat land such as Burbage Common.</p> <p>Medium sized rectilinear field pattern bounded by mixed hedgerows and few hedgerow trees. Agricultural land provides open areas of separating landscape between Barwell, Earl Shilton and Hinckley.</p> <p>Landscape heavily influenced by established settlements, often situated on higher ground, with masts and poles prominent.</p> <p>Mix of arable and pasture with isolated areas of woodland. Increasing industrial use around urban areas.</p> <p>Significant transport infrastructure subdivides area.</p> <p>Distinctive landscape features such as Burbage Common and Wood have local and national importance as ecological and recreational resources.</p> <p>Localised containment provided by woodland, but urban areas frequently visible on ridgelines.</p>
<p>G) Fen Lanes Character Area</p>	<p>Predominantly flat valley landscape with areas of gentle undulations. Predominantly arable with some occasional pasture.</p> <p>Small woodland clumps and willow trees associated with watercourses.</p> <p>Mixed field pattern of large to medium size with broken hedgerows. Hedgerow trees are either scattered or in clumps along roads and near watercourses.</p> <p>Small dispersed settlements clustered around cross-roads, with isolated farmsteads.</p> <p>A444 forms main route through area with small lanes leading off and many public footpaths.</p> <p>Open aspect but views are occasionally curtailed by copses, hedgerow vegetation and limited vantage points.</p> <p>Frequent streams and ditches.</p>



Landscape Character Area	Key Characteristics
H) Upper Mease Character Area	<p>Simple open landform of elevated rolling hills. Predominantly arable land use. Dispersed farm buildings visible within wide panoramic views. Mature trees largely associated with small clustered villages. Large fields bordered by mixed species hedgerows with scattered hedgerow trees. Ditches define field boundaries where hedgerows have been lost. A444 traverses an area of otherwise minor roads. Good network of public footpaths leading towards Twycross. Occasional woodland within surrounding landscape. Expansive and at times dramatic long ranging panoramic views are a notable characteristic feature, especially from the A444. Twycross Zoo is an important visitor attraction of international importance.</p>
I) Gopsall Parkland Character Area	<p>Distinctive parkland landscape with many mature specimen trees. Historic associations with Handel the composer adds to the sense of place. Medium field pattern bordered by a mix of hedgerows, barbed wire fencing and small sections of estate fencing. Large farms relating to former estate buildings i.e. Gopsall Hall Farm and Gopsall House Farm. Tranquil and remote pasture. Good network of public footpaths leading towards Twycross. Some woodland within surrounding landscape. Generally expansive open aspect. Relic follies add interest.</p>
J) Upper Sence Character Area	<p>Gentle undulating landform which rises generally to the east. Mix of arable and pasture with small copses and scattered trees within mixed hedgerows. Well treed appearance despite lack of actual woodland. Regular pattern of medium sized fields become smaller around settlements. Settlements predominantly small villages. Long distance footpaths pass through area. Some long distance views but mostly limited by trees.</p>

The landscape of Hinckley and Bosworth is gently rolling and predominantly rural in nature. It consists of enclosed farmlands, large cropped fields, intact hedgerow patterns and scattered



woodland and hedgerow trees. Several villages and hamlets, of mixed building styles, are scattered throughout the Borough. In the east lies the urban fringe of Leicester City Centre.

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

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

An assessment of the urban character / townscape of the urban areas of Hinckley, Burbage, Earl Shilton, Barwell, Market Bosworth, Desford and Newbold Verdon has also been undertaken as part of the Hinckley and Bosworth Landscape Character Assessment. Details of this are available on the HBBC website (www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk).

Landscape Designations

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

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

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

4.3.5 Geology

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



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

Designated Sites

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

Contaminated Land

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

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

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

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

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

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



Potentially contaminative land uses in the Borough include:

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

4.3.6 Waste Management

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

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

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

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

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



4.3.7 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

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

Listed Buildings

Listed Buildings are buildings of special architectural or historic interest recognised by the Government as being worthy of protection under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Listed Buildings are classified as Grade I, II* or II. Buildings listed as Grade I or II* are considered to be of outstanding interest.

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

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

Scheduled Monuments

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

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

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



Conservation Areas

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

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

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

- The external design and appearance of new buildings and extensions to existing structures will be of a high standard and will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area;



- Its location on the site relates well to its surroundings;
- The materials are sympathetic in colour and texture to those of nearby buildings and second hand materials are used where appropriate; and
- Existing landscape and built features of value are retained and original materials and elements reused wherever possible.

Archaeological Sites

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

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

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

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

Registered Battlefields

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

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

4.3.8 Noise

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



There is also noise issues associated with aircraft movements to and from the East Midlands Airport, particularly noise impacts associated with night time flights. East Midlands Airport has designated Airport Exclusion Zones in the Borough, which restrict development in the vicinity of flight paths to reduce the potential for noise issues associated with aircraft. The Airport is located in the north west of Leicestershire near to Castle Donington.

4.3.9 AirQuality

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

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

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

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

4.3.10 ClimateChange

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

4.3.11 Key Sustainability Issues

The key sustainability issues relating to the environment are:

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



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

4.4 Summary of Key Sustainability Issues

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

Table 4.2 Key Sustainability Issues

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



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



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



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



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to improve the energy efficiency of housing				Policies should encourage the use of renewable energy, energy efficiency measures and low energy embodied materials within new developments.	Moderate-Major
Rising house prices in the Borough, in particular in rural areas				Policies should ensure the provision of an adequate number of affordable housing units within housing developments that meet local needs.	Moderate
Shortfall in affordable housing provision in the Borough				Policies should ensure the provision of an adequate number of affordable housing units within housing developments that meet local needs.	Moderate
Shortfall in amount of housing for owner occupation in the Borough				Policies should ensure the provision of an appropriate level of housing to meet the needs of owner occupiers, including first time buyers and single families.	Moderate
The need to address specific housing needs, including housing for the disabled, the elderly, those with mental problems and those with learning disabilities				Policies should ensure the provision of a mix of housing within residential development that reflects local circumstances.	Moderate
High levels of homelessness in the Borough				Policies should ensure the provision of temporary and permanent accommodation as required, which provides options for the homeless and those who may become homeless.	Moderate



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



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport as viable alternatives to the private car				Sites allocated for new development should ensure development is situated in accessible locations, with good links to a frequent and reliable public transport network. Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards pedestrian / cycle friendly infrastructure and facilities, including the provision of dedicated cycle storage and crossing points, and towards additional bus stops and extensions to existing bus services where necessary.	Moderate
The need to improve the standard of parks and open spaces within the Borough				Existing parks and open space sites should be protected and enhanced where appropriate. Policies should encourage improvements in the standard of parks and open spaces within the Borough are improved. Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards open space as part of new developments.	Moderate
The need to increase provision of open space and equipped play space				Existing open space sites and equipped play space should be protected and enhanced where appropriate. Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards open space and equipped play space as part of new residential developments.	Moderate



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to protect surface waters and groundwater				Policies should ensure that best practice is adopted during construction to protect groundwater and surface water in accordance with the relevant Environment Agency Pollution Prevention Guidelines.	Moderate
The need to prevent increases in surface water run-off and flood risk				Sites allocated for new development should prevent inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding and safeguard land that may be required for current and future flood risk management. Policies should ensure the appropriate management of surface water run-off from development to reduce flood risk.	Moderate
Scarcity of water resources in the East Midlands region				Policies should ensure that new development incorporates water conservation measures to reduce water demand (e.g. rainwater and / or greywater recycling systems)	Minor
The need to protect and improve nature conservation sites, in particular SSSI, within the Borough				Sites allocated for new development should consider statutory and non statutory nature conservation sites / areas Policies should promote opportunities for habitat creation and / or enhancement as part of development should be sought wherever possible.	Moderate



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to protect and enhance habitats and species, in particular those listed within the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland BAP				Sites allocated for new development should consider the existing ecological value of the sites. Policies should promote opportunities for habitat creation and / or enhancement as part of development should be sought wherever possible.	Moderate
The potential for protected species in the Borough including otter, water vole, barn owl and bats				Sites allocated for new development should consider the potential for protected species to be found on the proposed sites. Policies should promote opportunities for habitat creation and / or enhancement as part of development should be sought wherever possible.	Moderate
The need to protect and enhance the National Forest, in particular the Ancient Woodland				Sites allocated for new development should consider the need to protect areas and setting of the National Forest. New development that would contribute towards the protection and enhancement of the Forest (e.g. creation of woodland areas or shelter belts within development) should be encouraged.	Moderate
The need to protect the natural and historic landscape character of the Borough				Sites allocated for new development should consider the surrounding natural and historic landscape character, in particular those areas considered to be of high landscape importance (e.g. the National Forest, Bosworth Battlefield). Policies should encourage development that is sensitive to the natural and historic landscape character of the Borough.	Moderate



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The presence of contaminated land within the Borough				Sites that will require remediation of contaminated land should be considered when allocating sites for new development.	Moderate
The need to reduce waste produced and increase the proportion of waste recycled				Policies should encourage the use of recycled / re-used materials for construction of new development. Accessible waste disposal and recycling bins should be provided within all new development to encourage responsible waste management practices.	Moderate
The need to protect historical, cultural and archaeological sites and their settings				Sites allocated for new development should consider the location of historical, cultural and archaeological assets and their settings. Policies should encourage development that is sensitive to historical, cultural and archaeological assets and their settings.	Moderate
Noise pollution associated with the road corridors in the Borough				Sites allocated for new development should consider the proximity of road corridors to limit the impact of noise pollution. Policies should encourage noise attenuation measures within development where necessary (e.g. double glazing, room locations, acoustic ventilation).	Moderate



Issue	Eco	Soc	Env	Implications for the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD	Potential Influence
The need to maintain and improve air quality in the Borough				<p>Sites allocated for new development should have good access to a frequent and reliable public transport network, jobs, key services and infrastructure to reduce the need to travel by car.</p> <p>Policies should ensure that best practice is adopted to minimise dust and air pollution arising from construction activities.</p> <p>Policies should seek to secure the provision of, or financial contributions towards pedestrian / cycle friendly infrastructure and facilities, including the provision of dedicated cycle storage and crossing points, and towards additional bus stops and extensions to existing bus services where necessary.</p>	Moderate



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

5.1 Introduction

HBBC initially proposed that the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD would comprise two separate documents; The Site Allocations DPD and the Generic Development Control DPD. In 2007, an Issues and Options Paper was produced for each DPD and both documents were subject to SA using the SA framework developed in Stage A (see Section 2.4.1).

5.2 Site Allocations Development Plan Document Issues and Options

In October 2007 HBBC consulted on a Site Allocations DPD Issues and Options Paper. This document aimed to provide an opportunity to comment on the issues that were being considered in drafting the Site Allocations DPD. Key issues for consideration included the location of housing and employment sites in the Borough.

To aid the SA of the Issues and Options Paper a number of constraints plans were produced using GIS based on a search of the Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside database (www.magic.gov.uk) and GIS data provided by HBBC. The plans are presented in Appendix G of this report and have been used in the appraisal of the Preferred Options also.

In excess of 400 sites were considered in the SA. Due to the large number of sites they were grouped for the appraisal. The groups/options considered are presented below.

Specific Sites Proposed for Development:

Chapter 3 of the Issues and Options Paper discussed the specific sites suggested for development. As part of the review of the allocations in the Local Plan landowners and developers submitted suggested sites for development. These sites were viewed as suitable for allocation to meet development needs in the Borough.

The sites proposed by landowners and developers were appraised in groups based upon the proposed use of the site (housing, employment, any use, mixed use, industrial and leisure) and their location, as follows:

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



In addition, a specific site was identified by landowners / developers for the specific use of boarding kennels. An appraisal of this option was undertaken.

Landowners / developers also proposed that certain sites be retained as open space. Two options in relation to these sites were appraised:

- Option A: Retain certain sites as open space
- Option B: Allow development of certain sites

One Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) was proposed for development by landowners / developers on land adjacent to the urban area of Ratby. It was proposed that the SUE comprise housing, employment, open space and community uses. An appraisal of this option was undertaken.

Potential Housing Sites:

Chapter 4 of the Issues and Options Paper discussed the allocation of sites for housing development. Potential housing development sites for the Borough were identified in the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Urban Housing Potential Study (2006).

The sites identified in the Urban Housing Potential Study were appraised in groups based upon their location as follows:

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

Potential Employment Sites:

Chapter 5 of the Issues and Options Paper discussed the allocation of sites for employment development.

The Hinckley and Bosworth Employment Land and Premises Study (2004) suggested that a number of existing employment sites in the Local Plan should be reclassified. The existing employment sites are classified into three types:

- Category A: Actively retain for employment
- Category B: Consider for other activities or alternative uses
- Category C: Consider for alternative uses but there are environmental problems



The employment sites proposed for reclassification were appraised in groups based upon their location as follows:

- Employment sites situated within existing settlements
- Employment sites adjoining existing settlements
- Employment sites in rural areas within or adjoining existing towns and villages
- Employment sites situated elsewhere (sites situated outside of existing settlements)

For each group of employment sites three options were considered:

- Option A: Classify employment sites as Category A
- Option B: Classify employment sites as Category B
- Option C: Classify employment sites as Category C

A number of sites were also proposed for potential employment use (e.g. for the expansion of neighbouring uses). These employment land portfolio sites were appraised in groups based upon their location as follows:

- Employment sites situated within existing settlements
- Employment sites adjoining existing settlements
- Employment sites in rural areas within or adjoining existing towns and villages

The Employment Land and Premises Study proposed a number of potential employment sites in addition to the existing employment allocations, which were appraised:

- Development of a 25 hectare strategic employment site located along the A5 corridor
- The allocation of 10 hectares in the A5 corridor for Small and Medium Sized Enterprises
- The allocation of approximately 2 hectares in Earl Shilton if existing town centre employment land can not be regenerated effectively
- The set aside of approximately 2.5 hectares for small businesses close to Hinckley

In addition, the Issues and Option Paper discussed whether Jericho Farm would be a suitable site for the expansion of Logix Park near Hinckley. Two options related to this suggestion were appraised:

- Option A: Use of Jericho Farm for the expansion of Logix Park near Hinckley
- Option B: Do not use Jericho Farm for the expansion of Logix Park



Community Facilities:

Chapter 6 of the Issues and Options Paper discussed the provision of community services and facilities in the Borough.

The regeneration of the former Nailstone Colliery site is a key priority for HBBC. The Issues and Options Paper proposed three options for the development of the site which were appraised:

- Option A: Development of waste management uses, comprising of the recycling of a range of wastes, the composting of municipal wastes, waste recovery and landfill for non-inert wastes
- Option B: Development of employment uses
- Option C: Development of recreational uses

Natural and Historic Assets:

Chapter 7 of the Issues and Options Paper discussed the protection and enhancement of natural and historic assets in the Borough. Consideration was given to open space / amenity areas, green wedges / areas of separation, wildlife sites and corridors and forests / woodland.

A number of open space / amenity areas exist throughout the Borough, which are used for leisure / recreation. The Issues and Options Paper questioned whether the existing open space / amenity allocations should be protected from development. Two options related to this suggestion were appraised:

- Option A: Protect open space / amenity areas from development
- Option B: Allow development of open space / amenity areas

Green wedges and areas of separation exist in the Borough. The intention for these spaces is to protect open countryside and prevent the merger of separate settlements. As part of the Site Allocations DPD Issues and Options HBBS reviewed the green wedge boundaries.

Two options in relation to green wedges were appraised:

- Option A: Maintain the existing green wedge designations
- Option B: Keep the green wedges in their locations but review their boundaries

The Issues and Options Paper also questioned whether areas of separation should be dealt with through more generic policies relating to the open countryside. Two options in relation to areas of separation were appraised:



- Option A: Maintain areas of separation
- Option B: Remove areas of separation and control the land through more generic open countryside policies

In addition, HBBC identified two potential sites in the Borough for the development of recreational uses, these being Thornton Reservoir and the Gopsall Park Estate. Two options for each of these sites were appraised:

- Option A: Allocate Thornton Reservoir for recreational use
- Option B: Maintain Thornton Reservoir in its current state

- Option A: Reuse of the Gopsall Park Estate to enable restoration of the parkland, which could potentially include recreational, tourism and leisure uses
- Option B: Maintain Gopsall Park Estate in its current state

Potential Sites for Any Use:

In addition to those sites identified in the Issues and Options Paper, HBBC identified a number of sites in the Borough that could potentially be developed for any use.

The sites identified for any use development were appraised in groups based upon their location as follows:

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

5.3 Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Issues and Options

The Generic Development Control DPD Issues and Options Paper consisted of a review of saved Local Plan policies regarding development control to determine which could be carried forward into the emerging LDF. Each policy was accompanied by some commentary and a question, or set of questions. The majority of the questions concerned such matters as where policies should be located in the LDF, whether or not groups of policies should be combined or whether policies are already covered elsewhere by regional/national guidance.

The SA involved appraisal of each of the saved Local Plan policies under review to determine in which the principles of sustainability were best embodied.



5.4 Outcomes of the Options Development and Appraisal

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

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

The SEA Directive requires the ‘...reasons for selecting alternatives...’ to be identified. The Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report outlines the reasons why the Preferred Options were chosen and other options discounted.

5.5 Additional Options Appraisal

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

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

Both options were appraised using the methodology detailed in the Options Appraisal Explanatory Notes. The Preferred Option is to allocate Gypsy and Traveller sites within 3 to 5 miles of urban areas or key rural centres; an Appraisal Table is presented within Appendix E of this report.



6.0 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE PREFERRED OPTIONS

6.1 Introduction

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

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

As detailed in Section 5.3, Part B of the Preferred Options Report is divided into three parts; Site Allocations, Non-Settlement Specific Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies.

Appraisal tables have been produced for each of the settlements identified within the Site Allocations, for each of the Non-Specific Site Allocations, and for each of the 20 Generic Development Control Policies; however, it should be noted that some of the Site Allocations and the Generic Development Control Policies have not been appraised. Explanation as to why certain sites / policies have been scoped out of the appraisal is provided in Section 6.3.

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

6.2 Appraisal Methodology

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

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

Effects may be of the following nature:

- Adverse or beneficial.



- Direct or indirect.

Effects may be of the following duration:

- Temporary or permanent.
- Short or long term.

Effects may be of the following geographical scale:

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

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

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

Table 6.1 Determining Magnitude of Effects

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

6.2.1 Assessment of Effects

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



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

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

Table 6.2 Significance of Effects

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

6.2.2 Limitations

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

In undertaking this SA the following uncertainties and / or limitations were encountered:

- At this level it is unknown whether or not development will actually come forward in the sites proposed. Therefore, where necessary, a worst case scenario has been assumed.
- No field surveys have been undertaken and as such assumptions have been made about the current use of the sites allocated.



- The SA has been based on a combination of quantitative information from a number of sources (e.g. National Statistics and Nomis) and qualitative assessment using considered judgement. Given the strategic nature of the plan the robustness of the SA is not considered to be compromised by the use of a qualitative approach. Detailed quantitative information relating to the effects of the plan is likely only to be available at a later stage (e.g. once planning applications are submitted).
- In the preparation of the constraints maps there were no data available on archaeological features.

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

6.3.1 Site Allocations

The following Site Allocations are existing sites (i.e. they are currently in use) and were allocated under the existing Local Plan. It is therefore considered that allocating these sites will have no significant effects upon the existing (baseline) situation. These sites have not therefore been included in the settlement specific appraisal tables.

Table 6.3 Sites Not Included in the Settlement Specific Appraisal Tables

<u>Hinckley</u> HIN29 to HIN37 HIN43 to HIN82 HIN87 to HIN99	<u>Barlestone</u> BARL03 to BARL09 BARL12 to BARL14 BARL17	<u>Witherley</u> All Allocations	<u>Orton on the Hill</u> All Allocations
<u>Earl Shilton</u> EAR05 to EAR13 EAR15 to EAR17 EAR19 to EAR23 EAR25 to EAR27	<u>Market Bosworth</u> MKBOS03 MKBOS05 to MKBOS12 MKBOS15 to MKBOS16 MKBOS19 to MKBOS20 MKBOS22 to MKBOS24	<u>Barton in the Beans</u> All Allocations	<u>Peckleton</u> All Allocations
<u>Barwell</u> BARW07 to BARW25 BARW27 to BARW29	<u>Newbold Verdon</u> NEW02 to NEW08 NEW16	<u>Botcheston</u> All Allocations	<u>Ratcliffe Culey</u> All Allocations
<u>Burbage</u> BUR02 to BUR15 BUR18 to BUR23 BUR26 to BUR29 BUR35	<u>Stoke Golding</u> STG03 to STG08 STG11 to STG12	<u>Bradgate Hill</u> All Allocations	<u>Shackerstone</u> All Allocations
<u>Desford</u> DES03 to DES11 DES15 to DES17	<u>Congerstone</u> CON03 to CON05	<u>Cadeby</u> CAD01	<u>Sibson</u> All Allocations
<u>Groby</u> GRO03 to GRO04 GRO07 to GRO20 GRO24 to GRO26	<u>Higham on the Hill</u> HIG03 to HIG09	<u>Carlton</u> CAR01 to CAR04	<u>Stapleton</u> All Allocations
<u>Ratby</u>	<u>Nailstone</u>	<u>Dadlington</u>	<u>Sutton Cheney</u>



RAT03 RAT05 to RAT11 RAT13 RAT18	NAI03 to NAI04 NAI07 to NAI08 NAI11	All Allocations	All Allocations
<u>Markfield</u> MARK07 MARK09 to MARK12 MARK14 to MARK16 MARK18 to MARK19 MARK21 to MARK23	<u>Sheepy Magna</u> SHE04 SHE06	<u>Fenny Drayton</u> All Allocations	<u>Odstone</u> All Allocations
<u>Bagworth</u> BAG03 BAG05 to BAG08 BAG10 to BAG11 BAG13 to BAG15	<u>StantonunderBardon</u> STA02 to STA07 STA10	<u>KirbyMallory</u> All Allocations	
<u>Thornton</u> THO01 to THO07 THO09 THO11	<u>Twycross</u> TWY03	<u>NortonJuxtaTwycross</u> NOR02 to NOR04	

The following allocations are for settlement boundaries which have been amended from the Local Plan to incorporate the new housing / employment / community / mixed use allocations:

- HIN83
- BUR25
- DES14
- GRO22
- RAT15
- MARK17
- BAG12
- BARL15
- MKBOS21
- NEW11
- STG08
- NAI09
- SHE05
- STA08
- TWY04

It is not considered that the extension of these settlement boundaries will have any significant effects over and above those identified for the associated new housing / employment / community / mixed use allocations.

Site CAD02 is an existing Gypsy and Traveller site with personal planning permission for one pitch. It is proposed as part of the Site Allocations DPD to extend the planning permission to all the



pitches on the site. Site HIG11 is an existing Gypsy and Traveller site (comprising 5 pitches) which is proposed to be formalised. These allocations are not therefore considered to have any significant effects upon the SA objectives, and have not therefore been include in the settlement specific appraisal tables.

The following sites are alternative options considered for Gypsy and Traveller sites. These are all considered under one alternative options appraisal table (see Section 5.5):

- HIN86 ALT
- EAR18 ALT
- EAR24 ALT
- BUR34 ALT
- DES18 ALT
- GRO23 ALT
- GRO27 ALT
- RAT19 ALT
- MARK24 ALT
- BAG16 ALT
- BARL19 ALT
- MKBOS25 ALT
- NEW17a ALT
- NEW17b ALT
- STG10 ALT
- STG13 ALT
- STG14 ALT
- STA09 ALT

Site THO08 is a proposed green corridor at Thornton. This allocation has been appraised as part of general (non settlement specific) appraisal table for 'Green Corridors'.

GenericEffects--AllSites

Housing,EmploymentandMixedUse:

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



Development of housing, employment and mixed use sites may increase energy and water consumption and waste production, however there are opportunities to adopt sustainable design and construction techniques. Construction of new developments may also have a number of effects upon the environment, including water pollution, air pollution, increased surface water run-off etc.

NewGreenCorridorsandOpenSpace:

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

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

NewAllotments:

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

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

SettlementSpecificEffects

Hinckley:

Given the size of Hinckley it has been split into three sub-areas; South West, South East and North. Sites which have already been allocated as part of the Hinckley Town Centre AAP have already been subject to SA and have not therefore been re-appraised. However, it is important to note that development of the AAP allocations is likely to have a number of cumulative effects together with development of sites allocated within the Site Allocations DPD (see Section 6.4).



South West Hinckley

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

- HIN01
- HIN02
- HIN03
- HIN04
- HIN05
- HIN06
- HIN22

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

Site HIN39 is proposed for new allotments. This will help to meet the demand for allotment plots in Hinckley. Formal allocation of Site HIN100 as open space and recreation will help to ensure that it is retained and protected from development. This will enable increased leisure and recreation activities and contribute towards protection of the character of Hinckley, particularly given it forms part of a Conservation Area. In addition, it may help to protect biodiversity both within the site (particularly given the water body within the site) and near the site (given the adjacent local wildlife site).

Site HIN84 is proposed for a Gypsy and Traveller Transit site. The site is greenfield and therefore its allocation may affect character of rural-urban fringe of Hinckley.

South East Hinckley

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- HIN07
- HIN08
- HIN09
- HIN13
- HIN15



- HIN19
- HIN26
- HIN27

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

Sites HIN38 and HIN42 are existing brownfield employment sites, to be allocated for mixed use development. Site HIN42 is partly within Hinckley Conservation Area and therefore any new development will need to be designed sensitively so as not to affect the character of this.

North Hinckley

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- HIN20
- HIN21
- HIN23
- HIN24
- HIN25

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

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

Site HIN41 is an existing brownfield employment site, to be allocated for mixed use development, including 47 homes. This site may be contaminated given its previous use, and redevelopment may result in migration of contamination, however it may also enable remediation.

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



Formal allocation of open space at HIN101 will help to ensure that it is retained and protected from development. This site is designated as a local wildlife site therefore its protection is likely to have a beneficial effect upon biodiversity. This will also contribute towards protection of the character of Hinckley.

Earl Shilton:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised.

- EAR01
- EAR02
- EAR03
- EAR04

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

Allocation of Site EAR14 as a District Centre (formerly a Local Centre) may help to enhance the services provided within Earl Shilton. This may encourage people to walk to services rather than use their car to travel further afield.

Barwell:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

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

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



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

Burbage:

Site BUR01 is allocated for a mixed use development, including 236 homes and 14 hectares of employment. Given the scale of the development, it may affect capacity of health care and education facilities. There are two wildlife sites within the site, plus one on the west boundary which could be adversely affected by development.

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

Formal allocation of Sites BUR16 and BUR17 as Local Centres will help to protect and maintain services within the local area and may also help to protect the vitality and diversity of Burbage.

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

Desford:

There are two allocations for residential development. DES01 is a large greenfield site, adjacent to the current settlement boundary and will accommodate 82 dwellings. DES02 is a small brownfield site, formerly a public house. Both sites will have good access to the existing services in Desford, but may also affect capacity given the size of Site DES01. Development of Site DES02 may also affect the character of the adjacent Desford Conservation Area.

It is proposed to allocate a new area of open space at Site DES12 which will provide a recreational resource for new residents at the housing allocation DES01 as well as for existing residents.

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



Groby:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- GRO01
- GRO02
- GRO21

These will provide 110 houses in total. Future residents of these sites will have good access to services within Groby and access to a regular bus service (every 15-30 minutes) into Leicester. However, the capacity of services within Groby may be affected, particularly by development of 82 dwellings at Site GRO21. All three housing sites are greenfield. Sites GRO02 and GRO21 are near to local wildlife sites and development could therefore have an effect upon this. Site GRO21 is near the M1 motorway, therefore there may be air quality issues for future residents.

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

- GRO05 - extension to existing allotments
- GRO06 - open space and allotment- greenfield, next to new housing development

Site GRO28 is proposed to be allocated for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. The site is greenfield, however there are no designations which would be affected by this. Future residents would be able to access services in Groby; however the site is approximately 1km from the centre of the village.

Ratby:

Allocation of Sites RAT01 and RAT02 for residential development will help to ensure future residents have good access to services in Ratby. The sites will provide a total of 76 homes. Site RAT01 is predominantly brownfield, while RAT02 is greenfield. Site RAT02 includes some significant tree cover and development could lead to removal of this. Site RAT02 is also adjacent to the M1 motorway and may therefore be exposed to air pollutants and noise, with potential for impacts upon health.

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



Allocation of Site RAT14 as a Community Facility may enable provision of new community / leisure activities with associated beneficial effects upon health and well-being. However, it may also affect the existing sports ground currently on the site depending upon the specific proposals.

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

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

It is proposed to allocate Site RAT20 as an extension to the Gypsy and Traveller site. The site is greenfield, however there are no designations which would be affected by this. Future residents would be able to access services in Ratby, however the site is approximately 1km from the centre of the village.

Markfield:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- MARK01
- MARK02
- MARK03
- MARK04
- MARK05
- MARK06

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

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

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



Bagworth:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- BAG01
- BAG02

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

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

Allocation of Site BAG09 as a Local Centre may encourage more service provision within the village and improve the diversity of services. It may therefore encourage people to walk when accessing services rather than drive.

Thornton:

Site THO10 is to be allocated as a new Gypsy and Traveller site. The site is greenfield, however there are no designations which would be affected by this. Future residents would be able to access services in Thornton; however the site is approximately 2km from the centre of the village.

Barlestone:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- BARL01
- BARL02
- BARL18

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



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

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

MarketBosworth:

Allocation of sites MKBOS01 and MKBOS02 for 60 and 40 houses respectively will enable good access for future residents to services within Market Bosworth. However, public transport provision is limited which may limit accessibility for those without a car. Both residential sites are greenfield and on the edge of the town. Development at these sites could have adverse effects upon the local wildlife sites adjacent to the railway line, particularly Site MKBOS02 which is actually within a local wildlife site. Site MKBOS02 is also within a biodiversity improvement area.

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

Sites MKBOS13 and MKBOS14 are currently greenfield sites to be allocated for open space. This will help to protect the character of Market Bosworth. Site MKBOS13 forms part of a local wildlife site and biodiversity improvement area and allocation of this as open space may therefore help to protect the natural environment.

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

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



NewboldVerdon:

There are currently two alternatives being considered for a large (98 dwellings) residential development in Newbold Verdon, these being NEW01a and NEW01b. Both sites are greenfield and on the edge of the village, therefore could affect the character of the village and the surrounding rural landscape. Site NEW01b is adjacent to two local wildlife sites which could be adversely affected by the development. However, this site would also provide excellent access to recreation opportunities at the adjacent area of open space.

Four other brownfield sites (NEW09, NEW13, NEW14 and NEW15) are also proposed to be allocated for residential development. These are all small scale (between 1 and 5 dwellings) and within or on the edge of the built up area.

Allocation of the residential sites may encourage walking and public transport use given the proximity to services within Newbold Verdon and to the local bus route with half hourly services into Leicester.

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

Site NEW12 is to be allocated as a new Gypsy and Traveller site. This site is rural and greenfield and allocation may therefore have an effect upon the rural landscape. There are no wildlife or archaeological sites designated on or adjacent to this site. The site is outside the village which may affect access to services.

StokeGolding:

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

Allocation of Site STG01 for residential development (59 dwellings) will enable good access for future residents to services in Stoke Golding. The site is on the edge of the village and may therefore affect the character of the rural landscape as well as that of Stoke Golding. The eastern edge of the site is designated as a local wildlife site; it is therefore likely that development would have an adverse effect upon this.

Site STG02a / STG02b is previously developed land (former convent) on the edge of the village. There are two possible options for this site, these being residential development, specifically elderly person's accommodation (STG02a), or niche employment (STG02b). While this is a brownfield site



and allocation for development would encourage the use of previously developed land, the site does include a number of 'green' features, including significant numbers of trees and allotments.

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

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

Site STG15 is to be allocated as an extension to the existing Gypsy and Traveller site. This site is rural and greenfield and allocation may therefore have an effect upon the rural landscape. There are no wildlife or archaeological sites designated on or adjacent to this site. The site is outside the village which may affect access to services.

Congerstone:

CON01 is a residential allocation for 9 dwellings. Given the limited services and public transport provision in Congerstone, future residents will have limited access to services by means other than the private car. The site is greenfield, but there are no designations.

CON02 is small section of a larger existing Local Plan allocation. Since the adoption of the Local Plan the Employment Land and Premises Study (2004) recommended that the site could be developed as mixed-use. Planning permission was granted for a residential and employment development. CON02 represents the employment section of the planning permission which has now been constructed. Formal allocation will help to ensure that the employment provision on site is maintained.

HighamonthetheHill:

The following allocations for residential development have been appraised:

- HIG01
- HIG02
- HIG10

The allocations are for 40 dwellings in total. Both HIG01 and HIG10 are greenfield sites on the edge of the village. HIG02 is next to a wildlife site, therefore development could affect this. HIG02 is



partly greenfield and partly brownfield. Part of HIG02 falls within Higham on the Hill Conservation Area, therefore development of this could have an effect upon the character of this. Allocation of these sites will ensure good access for people living at these sites to services within Higham on the Hill. However, public transport provision is limited with the bus service only every hour which may limit accessibility for those without a car.

Nailstone:

Sites NAI01, NAI02 and NAI10 are to be allocated for residential development. Sites NAI01 and NAI02 are greenfield sites on the edge of the settlement. Site NAI10 is a small scale brownfield site. Nailstone has limited service provision. However, new housing development within the village may make service provision within the village more viable, thus could improve services for those living within the village.

While the village is served by a regular bus service (every 20 minutes), given the distance from major service centres and the lack of services within the village it is considered that most future residents and employees are likely to make use of the private car, instead of walking, cycling and public transport use.

Allocation of Site NAI06 for employment will make use of the existing colliery site. Part of the site is designated as a local wildlife site, and development is likely to adversely affect this. The site also includes some woodland cover and development could lead to removal of this. As the sites are within the National Forest, they are particularly sensitive and trees should be protected wherever possible. Allocation of Site NAI05 as a country park may help to mitigate some of these effects and support the National Forest. In addition, it may help to maintain existing, and encourage additional, recreational activities associated with this area, with beneficial effects upon health and well-being.

SheepyMagna:

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

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

StantonunderBardon:

Site STA01 is proposed to be allocated for residential development of 30 homes. Services and public transport provision in Stanton under Bardon are limited; therefore future residents will need



to travel further afield to access services and are likely to rely on the private car, particularly given the very limited bus service to the village.

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

Twycross:

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

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

Site TWY02 is an existing employment site, which is to be allocated for mixed use development. The site is adjacent to a local wildlife site, which could be affected should further development take place.

Carlton:

Sites CAR05 and CAR06 are currently greenfield areas on the edge of Carlton. Allocation of these as new areas of open space will provide additional green resources in the village and potentially enable informal leisure activities with associated beneficial effects upon health and well-being. In addition, allocation as open space will protect these from development, thus helping to maintain the character of Carlton and the surrounding rural landscape.

NortonJuxtaTwycross:

Site NOR01 is an existing brownfield employment site, which is to be allocated for mixed use development. This may result in redevelopment of the site. Norton has limited services and public transport provision which will limit accessibility for future residents / users of the site without a car. However, should development occur this may make service provision within the village more viable, thus could improve services for those living within the village.

6.3.2 Non-SettlementSpecificSiteAllocations

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



- Green / wildlife corridors.
- Green wedges.
- Renewable energy.
- Tourism.
- Sporting facilities.

These allocations vary in nature and, as such, so has the approach to their appraisal. The Appraisal Tables are presented in Appendix E.

Green/WildlifeCorridors(NSP01-NSP12)

The green / wildlife corridor sites are linear green spaces that define community boundaries and which join up larger natural areas. They provide connections between natural areas for wildlife, and in some cases, people.

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

- Multifunctional green / wildlife corridors without watercourses (NSP01, NSP02, NSP03, NSP05, NSP06, NSP07, and NSP09).
- Multifunctional green / wildlife corridors with watercourses (NSP11 and NSP12).
- Green / wildlife corridors with watercourses (NSP04 and NSP08).
- Green / wildlife corridors linking features / assets to long distance paths (NSP10).

Safeguarding green / wildlife corridors, whether or not they incorporate a watercourse or access for people, should afford protection to the natural environment and conserve both the character of towns and villages and the rural landscape of the Borough.

In addition, those corridors that are designated as 'multifunctional' (i.e. providing connections for wildlife and people) should also result in beneficial impacts relating to their recreational potential, for example, the promotion of healthy lifestyles through participation in leisure activities. Encouraging continued use of the corridors may also help to reduce anti-social behaviour and / or the fear of crime by encouraging social interaction, and in some cases, may help to promote local heritage to local people and tourists by preserving access to heritage assets (for example NSP01 is a disused railway line).



Those corridors that are focused around a watercourse (for example, Sketchley Brook and the River Sence) may result in additional beneficial impacts by helping to prevent development that may adversely affect water quality and which may result in the loss of floodplain.

The corridors that are proposed to link features / assets to long distance paths comprise small areas of land and so are not anticipated to contribute significantly to conserving the rural landscape of the Borough; however these may help provide better opportunities for local people and tourists to access and understand local heritage assets, although an adverse impact of these may be the loss of habitat during the creation of the links themselves.

GreenWedges(NSP13andNSP14)

Green wedges are areas separating conurbations designed to maintain open space between settlements. There are two green wedges discussed within the DPD:

- Hinckley/Burbage/Barwell/Earl Shilton Green Wedge (NSP13)
- Groby/Ratby Green Wedge (NSP14)

Although these green wedges are allocated in the Local Plan their character has been altered slightly within the DPD. They have therefore been incorporated into the SA.

Safeguarding these green wedges will have beneficial impacts relating to the recreational benefits of the areas, for example, the promotion of healthy lifestyles through participation in leisure activities. The allocations will also help to protect the natural environment and help conserve both the character of towns and villages and the rural landscape of the Borough, as well as protecting the quality of any water features from the adverse impacts associated with construction of new development and ensuring that no areas of flood plain are lost.

WindPower(NSP15,NSP16andNSP17)

Three sites have been allocated for wind power developments: NSP15 (Congerstone), NSP16 (Twycross) and NSP17 (Barton in the Beans). It has been determined that NSP15 can support two turbines, NSP16 can support four turbines and NSP17 can support between one and two turbines. All three sites are in close proximity to one another, each site being within 2km of another. As such, all three sites were appraised as a group to enable consideration of their cumulative impact.

If development of the turbines goes ahead there are likely to be a number of beneficial and adverse impacts.

In relation to environmental objectives, the majority of impacts are likely to be adverse and associated with both construction and operation of the turbines. Such impacts include loss of



habitat and disturbance to wildlife, the potential for air, water and land pollution due to accidental spillages of oils / chemicals during construction, waste production due to excavations, greenhouse gas emissions from construction vehicles and machinery, the use of aggregate for foundations, the use of greenfield land and the potential for unknown archaeological features to be affected. There may be long term adverse impacts associated with bat / bird mortality (should the turbines be located on flight lines). There is also the potential for the turbines to have a visual impact on the character of local towns and villages and the rural landscape, as well as the setting of any historical features that lie within the turbines' Zone of Visual Influence.

However, once the turbines are operational, there will be significant beneficial impacts for objectives relating to reducing energy consumption, developing renewable resources and decreasing greenhouse gas emissions.

In relation to social and economic objectives, if informal recreation routes that currently exist on the sites are disrupted this may result in adverse impacts associated with the benefits that these routes provide (for example, a reduction in participation in leisure activities and the associated health benefits of these activities). However, it is likely that there will be some employment opportunities created during the construction period, although it is unknown to what extent, if any, opportunities will be available for the local population.

CharnwoodForestRegionalPark(NSP18)

The RSS for the East Midlands includes provision for the creation of a Charnwood Forest Regional Park. The DPD has been utilised to determine where the boundary of the park should be within the Borough. The creation of Charnwood Forest Regional Park has the potential to result in a number of beneficial impacts depending on the level of spatial planning and land management involved.

Environmentally, safeguarding existing biodiversity and the potential for creating new habitats will contribute positively to the natural environment and will help to conserve and enhance woodland cover in the park. In addition, safeguarding the character of settlements within the park boundary and ensuring that new development is in keeping with the setting of the park has the potential to help conserve the character of towns and villages, the rural landscape, and the setting of historical features.

In relation to social and economic objectives, the creation of the park may promote participation in recreational / leisure activities through the enhancement of green spaces and walking and cycling routes. This may result in associated health benefits and may also help to reduce anti-social behaviour and / or the fear of crime by encouraging social interaction. In addition, the local heritage of the area may be promoted to local people and tourists through the enhancement of cultural heritage features within the park should this occur.



The potential for the support of agricultural diversification and the restoration of minerals sites to leisure, tourism and rural economy uses may result in the provision of employment opportunities, particularly in rural areas, and may encourage farmers to venture into new businesses.

SportingFacilities(NSP19andNSP20)

This involves the provision of a new leisure centre for the Borough, the current facility being located within Hinckley Town Centre. The Preferred Option for the location of the new leisure centre (NSP19) is land to the north of Hinckley (adjoining Hinckley United Football Club off Leicester Road). As well as providing a new leisure centre, this location will include a sporting hub that will comprise football pitches etc.

Replacing the current leisure centre is likely to result in improved leisure facilities with greater capacity. This is anticipated to have beneficial impacts upon SA objectives relating to health, wellbeing and participation in leisure activities; however, the new location, although served by cycle and bus routes, is likely to be less accessible for those without a car compared to the current location within the Town Centre. This will also mean that there will be associated adverse impacts from increased car use (for example, upon air quality and greenhouse gases). There may be an increase in the number of people employed to run the facilities, beneficially impacting upon SA objective 19.

Construction of the replacement leisure centre will result in those adverse impacts associated with construction activities (such impacts include loss of habitat and disturbance to wildlife, the potential for air, water and land pollution due to accidental spillages of oils / chemicals during construction, waste production due to demolition / excavations, greenhouse gas emissions from construction vehicles and machinery, the use of aggregate for foundations, the use of greenfield land, the potential for unknown archaeological features to be affected, and the potential for the character of the landscape to be affected). However, construction will also result in some temporary employment opportunities.

It should be noted that an alternative site was considered for the relocation of the leisure centre; NSP20. This is incorporated within Site Allocation BUR01 (mixed used development). The effects resulting from the development of this site have been considered with the appraisal of the settlement specific Site Allocations.

6.3.3 GenericDevelopmentControlPolicies

Each of the 20 generic development control policies was appraised using the methodology presented in Section 6.2. The generic development control policies can be found in Appendix H. The Appraisal Tables are presented in Appendix E.



Should developer contributions result in ensuring provision / improvement of local healthcare facilities, this has the potential to improve health. Should contributions result in provision / enhancement of open space, this has the potential to increase participation in recreational activities (with associated health benefits), benefit biodiversity (should open space involve habitat creation) and encourage social interaction, potentially helping to reduce anti-social behaviour and / or the fear of crime. It may be that developer contributions result in ensuring provision / enhancement of education facilities; this has the potential to improve access to education services. If contributions result in the provision of cycle lanes or bus services, this may potentially encourage people to reduce use of the private car, beneficially impacting upon air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, and may also increase accessibility for those without access to a car.

PolicyDSC1:DevelopmentandDesign

Policy DSC1 (Development and Design) will predominantly impact upon environmental objectives. Ensuring that development respects the local distinctiveness of existing buildings and landscape settings should beneficially impact upon the character of towns and villages, the character of the rural landscape, and the setting of historical features. Ensuring that development maximises the opportunities for conservation of energy and resources through design, layout, orientation should help to reduce water consumption, energy use and waste production during both construction and operation.

In terms of social objectives, the policy should ensure that detrimental impacts upon the well-being of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings are limited by ensuring that development respects these receptors, for example, in matters of lighting, smell, and noise.

PoliciesEMP1:DevelopmentofEmploymentSitesandRES1:ResidentialDevelopment

Policies EMP1 and RES1 are to support the employment Site Allocations and the residential Site Allocations respectively, see Section 6.1 for further details. No further impacts are therefore anticipated beyond those identified for the specific sites allocated and tables have not been produced for these policies.

EnvironmentPolicies:ENV1,ENV2,ENV3,ENV4andENV5

The Environment Policies comprise the following:

- ENV1: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas.
- ENV2: Recreation and Green Space Provision in New Development.
- ENV3: Landscape Character Areas.
- ENV4: Former Railway Lines.
- ENV5: Development in the Countryside.



All five policies are anticipated to impact upon the natural environment, the character of the Borough and the setting of historical features. For policies ENV3, ENV4 and ENV5, these impacts are anticipated to be beneficial. Policy ENV3 should ensure that development respects the local context, and policies ENV4 and ENV5 should help preserve rural character and the wildlife within these areas. For policies ENV1 and ENV2, the impact may be beneficial or adverse; the outcome depends on the design and the location of any new recreational facilities constructed.

The policies relating to recreational areas (ENV1, ENV2 and ENV4) are anticipated to beneficially impact upon those objectives relating to recreation (and therefore health) by encouraging people to take part in recreational activities through either the enhancement or construction of recreational facilities and the maintenance of recreational routes. Those policies that relate to the provision of open space (ENV1 and ENV2) may also indirectly contribute to reducing crime by encouraging social interaction, and policy ENV4 may contribute to local people and tourists understanding local heritage by enabling people to make use of former railway line routes.

Policies ENV1 and ENV2 may involve the construction of new recreational facilities and will therefore result in those adverse impacts relating to construction activities

Policy ENV5 may contribute beneficially to objectives relating to air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and access by helping to focus development within settlement boundaries and therefore limiting the distances that people have to travel.

Community Policies: COM1, COM2, COM3, and COM4

The Community Policies comprise the following:

- COM1: Loss of Local Shops and Community Facilities outside of Hinckley Town Centre.
- COM2: Local Centres.
- COM3: Small Local Shops.
- COM4: Alternative Uses on Existing Educational and Community Sites.

Policy COM1 is anticipated to result in a number of beneficial impacts upon objectives relating to service provision, health, recreation, crime and employment by ensuring that certain facilities are not lost. Policy COM4 may beneficially impact upon objectives relating to education provision by potentially enhancing / constructing new educational facilities; however the policy may result in the replacement of recreational facilities with educational / community facilities that may adversely impact upon participation in recreational activities and therefore the health benefits associated with this. Policy COM4 may also result in construction of new facilities and the associated adverse impacts.



Policy COM2 is anticipated to beneficially impact upon objectives relating to health, crime, access to the services and the character of the Borough by ensuring that new retail development does not have any adverse effects in terms of noise, smell, litter or disturbance and also that there are no adverse impacts upon highway safety and the character of the locality. In addition, development must not result in under provision of off street parking.

Policy COM3 is not anticipated to impact upon any of the SA objectives with the exception of 'to conserve and enhance the character, diversity and local distinctiveness of towns and villages in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough'. The policy is expected to beneficially impact upon this objective by ensuring that new small local shops do not undermine the vitality of existing local centres.

CharacterPolicies:CHR1,CHR2andCHR3

The Character Policies comprise the following:

- CHR1: Areas of Historic Importance and their Surrounds.
- CHR2: Historic and Valued Natural Assets.
- CHR3: Areas of Special Character.

The character policies are anticipated to beneficially impact upon those objectives relating to conserving the character of the Borough and the setting of historical features by ensuring that new development is sympathetic to, and will not have adverse impacts upon the character of, both the historic environment and areas designated as being of special character. Policy CHR2 may also contribute to preserving woodland cover in the Borough by not permitting development that will have an adverse effect on the character setting of certain specified historical features that include areas of woodland (for example Bagworth Heath Woods).

Roads,ParkingandPedestrianisationPolicies:RAS1,RAS2,RAS3,andRAS4

The Roads, Parking and Pedestrianisation Policies comprise the following:

- RAS1: Local Street Scene Standards.
- RAS2: Local Parking Standards.
- RAS3: Retention of Car Parking Facilities.
- RAS4: Highway Design Standards.

Policies RAS1, RAS2 and RAS4 are anticipated to beneficially impact upon those objectives relating to participation in recreational activities (and the health benefits of such participation) by promoting walking and cycling. By promoting alternatives to the private car (including public transport, as covered by RAS4), these policies are also likely to beneficially impact upon those objectives relating to air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and global environmental effects.



The same three policies may also contribute to improving community safety and reducing the risk of crime by encouraging design that improves road safety and ensuring that opportunities for crime are minimised. In addition, encouraging soft landscaping and ensuring development is appropriate to context may contribute to objectives relating to the natural environment and maintaining the character of the Borough.

Policy RAS3 relates to retaining existing levels of car parking provision; this may potentially involve the construction of new car parks to replace any parking that is lost. The impacts of RAS3 are therefore those adverse impacts associated with construction.

6.4 Cumulative Effects

The ODPM guidance (2005i) discusses the need to investigate the potential for cumulative effects, giving the example of the significant effects of one development being increased when combined with those of another.

Cumulative effects have been investigated in a number of ways throughout the SA of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report. An example of this would be the analysis of plans and programmes conducted during Stage A of the SA process. This worked to ensure that the SA considered how the DPD might interact with the aims and objectives of those other plans and programmes. Another example would be the consideration of the effects of all Site Allocations combined in relation to specific settlements.

However, it should be noted that there are other documents with the Hinckley and Bosworth LDF itself that promote development likely to result in cumulative effects when combined with the developed proposed within the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report. One of the main documents within the LDF is the Hinckley Town Centre AAP, which proposes extensive redevelopment of the town centre that has not been accounted for in this SA. In addition, the Core Strategy identifies two locations for SUEs on the perimeters of Barwell and Earl Shilton and an AAP is also being produced for these.

With regard to adverse effects, it is considered that, combined with the AAPs the Site Allocations could increase the significance of traffic increases (including air quality and climate change issues), pressure on existing services, increased waste generation and mineral/aggregate use and increases in energy and water use. Specifically regarding Barwell and Earl Shilton, the proposed SUEs are to be located on previously undeveloped land, potentially placing increased pressure, beyond that of the Site Allocations, upon biodiversity, the rural landscape and the character of towns/villages (Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton). In general, these cumulative impacts will range from local to Borough wide in terms of their geographical scale.



It is important to note the cumulative effects of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report as a whole, i.e. how the policies/proposals interact with one another. Firstly, when combined, the Site Allocations across the Borough may also lead to a number of the cumulative effects detailed above in relation to the AAPs. However, it is also the case that the Generic Development Control Policies should act as mitigation for some of the adverse effects predicted for the Site Allocations (this has been noted where relevant within the Appraisal Tables in Appendix E). It is also the case that the Generic Development Control Policies will work to mitigate some of the adverse effects predicted for the AAPs, which are both subject to SA themselves.

6.5 Recommendations

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

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

Recommendations can be incorporated at three stages of the development:

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

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

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



7.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

7.1 Next Steps

The Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report and this SA Report will be consulted on for a period of 8 weeks. HBBC will then consider the responses to the public participation and produce their final Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD. Any significant changes made during this stage will need to be subject to further SA prior to adoption.

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

Table 7.1 Next Steps in the Sustainability Appraisal

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



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

7.2 LinkstothePlanningProcess

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

7.3 ProposalsforMonitoring

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

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

The extent of development considered within the DPD was previously determined by the Core Strategy. A list of general monitoring targets and indicators was developed for the Core Strategy and these have been presented in Appendix F. The indicators should be used as guidance only;



however due to the closely linked natures of the DPD and the Core Strategy it is considered that it will be possible to link the monitoring. It will be necessary for HBBC to build upon/refine these targets and indicators. In developing monitoring it may be possible to utilise indicators being used elsewhere within the Council, such as in the monitoring of the Local Transport Plan or other documents under the LDF.

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

- Provision of accessible services / facilities.
- Protection of the natural environment.
- Protection of the character of the Borough and the setting of historical features by ensuring that development is sensitively designed.
- Greenhouse gas emissions and air quality in relation to car use.
- Effects upon water, materials and energy use.
- Use of previously developed and previously undeveloped land.