



DISTRICT OF  
HARBOROUGH

## Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for Harborough District Local Plan



**SA Scoping Report**  
**October, 2014**

REVISION SCHEDULE					
Rev	Date	Details	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Approved by
1	February 2014	Draft SA Scoping Report for Harborough Local Plan – <i>Member version</i>	<b>Ian McCluskey</b> Senior Consultant <b>Marylise Schmid</b> Graduate Environmental Scientist <b>Esme Portsmith</b> Planning Consultant	<b>Paul Tomlinson</b> Associate <i>Policy &amp; Appraisal</i>	<b>Paul Tomlinson</b> Associate <i>Policy &amp; Appraisal</i>
2	April 2014	SA Scoping Report for Harborough Local Plan <i>Consultation version</i>	<b>Ian McCluskey</b> Senior Consultant <b>Esme Portsmith</b> Planning Consultant	<b>Paul Tomlinson</b> Associate <i>Policy &amp; Appraisal</i>	<b>Paul Tomlinson</b> Associate <i>Policy &amp; Appraisal</i>
3	October 2014	SA Scoping Report for Harborough Local Plan <i>Post-Consultation version</i>	<b>Ian McCluskey</b> Senior Consultant	<b>Anita Coplestone</b> Principal Consultant	<b>Paul Tomlinson</b> Associate <i>Policy &amp; Appraisal</i>

### Limitations

URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited (“URS”) has prepared this Report for the sole use of **Harborough District Council** in accordance with the Agreement under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by URS. This Report is confidential and may not be disclosed by the Client nor relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of URS.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested and that such information is accurate. Information obtained by URS has not been independently verified by URS, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

The methodology adopted and the sources of information used by URS in providing its services are outlined in this Report. The work described in this Report was undertaken between November 2013 and October 2014 and is based on the conditions encountered and the information available during the said period of time. The scope of this Report and the services are accordingly factually limited by these circumstances.

Where assessments of works or costs identified in this Report are made, such assessments are based upon the information available at the time and where appropriate are subject to further investigations or information which may become available.

URS disclaim any undertaking or obligation to advise any person of any change in any matter affecting the Report, which may come or be brought to URS’ attention after the date of the Report.

Certain statements made in the Report that are not historical facts may constitute estimates, projections or other forward-looking statements and even though they are based on reasonable assumptions as of the date of the Report, such forward-looking statements by their nature involve risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from the results predicted. URS specifically does not guarantee or warrant any estimate or projections contained in this Report.

### Copyright

© This Report is the copyright of URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1	BACKGROUND.....	1
2	WHAT’S THE SCOPE OF THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL?.....	8
3	INTRODUCTION TO HARBOROUGH.....	10
4	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT .....	12
5	BUILT AND NATURAL HERITAGE .....	29
6	HEALTH AND WELLBEING .....	38
7	RESILIENCE (TO CLIMATE CHANGE) .....	57
8	HOUSING AND ECONOMY .....	65
9	RESOURCE USE .....	83
10	KEY THEMES ON WHICH TO FOCUS THE APPRAISAL.....	95
11	APPRAISAL METHODS .....	98
12	NEXT STEPS.....	107
	APPENDIX I: REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS .....	108
	APPENDIX 2: CHANGES TO THE SA FRAMEWORK .....	109
	APPENDIX 3: SITE APPRAISAL CRITERIA .....	112
	APPENDIX 4: SCOPING REPORT CONSULTATION RESPONSES .....	118

---

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AMR	Annual Monitoring Report
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
AW	Anglian Water
BAP	Biodiversity Action Plan
BME	Black or Minority Ethnic
CAMS	Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy
CFMP	Catchment Flood Management Plan
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DECC	Department of Energy & Climate Change
Defra	Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs
HDC	Harborough District Council
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicles
HMA	Housing Market Area
HRA	Habitat Regulations Assessment
IMD	Index of Multiple Deprivation
LCA	Landscape Character Area
LCC	Leicestershire County Council
LCIP	Local Climate Impacts Profile
LDF	Local Development Framework
LGV	Light Goods Vehicle
LNR	Local Nature Reserve
LL&R	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland
LLTI	Limiting Long-Term Illness
LSOA	Lower Super Output Area
LSRO	Leicestershire Statistics and Research Online
LLTP3	Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 3
LWS	Local Wildlife Sites
MSA	Mineral Safeguarding Area
MWLP	Mineral and Waste Local Plan
NERC	Natural Environment and Rural Communities
NDP	Neighbourhood Development Plans
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen Dioxide
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
ONS	Office for National Statistics
PDL	Previously Developed Land
PPSI	Plans, Policies, Strategies and Initiatives
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
PUA	Principal Urban Area
RSL	Registered Social Landlord
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPD	Supplementary Development Plan
SPZ	Source Protection Zone
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
STW	Severn Trent Water
SUDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems
TCPA	Town and Country Planning Association
WFD	Water Framework Directive

## 1 BACKGROUND

URS is commissioned to undertake Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment in support of the new Harborough District Council Local Plan (the Plan).

The new Local Plan will incorporate a focused review of the Harborough Core Strategy (adopted in November 2011) and also identify strategic allocations.

### 1.1 What is the plan seeking to achieve?

A consultation was undertaken in March 2013 to outline the purpose and format of the proposed new Local Plan<sup>1</sup>. As stated in this consultation document, the new Local Plan for Harborough will:

- Refresh and update the Harborough Core Strategy. The Vision, Strategic Objectives, settlement hierarchy and overall structure of the document are expected to remain unchanged;
- Roll forward the end date of the Core Strategy from 2028 to 2031;
- Include strategic allocations of land for residential, employment, retail, leisure and other land uses to meet strategic development requirements, and Identify the boundaries of strategic green space;
- Provide new policies to; support the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP), provide high level policy on infrastructure costs (which may be supported by a Community Infrastructure Levy [CIL] Infrastructure Schedule), and provide a flexible criteria based policy to replace Limits to Development for settlements;
- Reflect joint working with all organisations and bodies relevant to cross boundary planning matters of common interest;
- Be fully compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), new guidance and Regulations guiding the preparation of Local Plans.

### 1.2 Planning policy context

The Harborough District Local Plan (2001) was replaced by the Core Strategy in 2011, although 14 thematic policies and 33 site allocations were retained and still remain valid. The Core Strategy was adopted in November 2011, and forms the current local planning policy guidance for the District. However, since 2011 then there has been a significant change in national planning policy, with the replacement of planning policy guidance notes (PPGs) and planning policy statements (PPS) with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012. The NPPF introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development and provides broad planning policy guidance with which local authorities are to provide more detail at the local level.

The District lies within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area in recognition that it cannot be viewed in isolation of Leicester and the wider county. Harborough is dependent on the Leicester urban area, not only for employment, but also for high order health, retail and cultural facilities and services.

To ensure that the Local Plan for Harborough reflects these wider issues and takes advantage of cross border opportunities, there needs to be an appreciation of the strategies being developed by neighbouring local authorities.

<sup>1</sup> Harborough District Council (2013) New Local Plan for Harborough District Scoping Consultation (March 2013).  
[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/2985/new\\_local\\_plan\\_scoping\\_consultation](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/2985/new_local_plan_scoping_consultation)

Table 1.1: Links with Local Authorities

Neighbouring Local Planning Authority	Local Plan Status	Links with Harborough
Blaby District Council	The Local Plan (Core) Strategy was adopted in February 2013, the Local Plan (delivery) DPD will identify new development sites and a 'call for sites' exercise is currently on-going (27/11/2013 – 03/01/2014)	The south-west of Harborough District Council borders the Blaby administrative area. The majority of allocated development is to take place within the identified SUE's and Strategic Employment Sites (SES's). Neither are located on the Harborough/ Blaby border area. Approximately 1,900 people commute daily to Harborough from Blaby. Whereas 2,600 commute from Harborough to Blaby. <sup>2</sup>
Charnwood Borough Council	The Core Strategy is at draft stage and currently being considered by SoS.	The north-west of Harborough District Council borders the Charnwood administrative area. The Core Strategy pre-submission draft document identifies two Sustainable Urban Extension's (SUE's) one of which; North East of Leicester, lies close to the Harborough boundary. The SUE will provide 4,500 homes; 13ha of employment land, roads and community facilities. Approximately 500 people commute daily from Charnwood to Harborough, whereas 600 people commute from Harborough to Charnwood. <sup>3</sup>
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council	Core Strategy adopted in 2009. Site Allocations & Development Management Policies DPD (at submission stage Autumn 2013)	Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council is within Leicestershire but it is not a neighbouring authority. The Core Strategy allocates land for; 9,000 homes between 2006 and 2026. A total of 40-45 hectares of employment land is also allocated, including significant development at the SUEs at Shilton and Barwell. A Masterplan Area Action Plan has been produced to guide development across the SUEs; which includes 4,500 new homes. Residents to the north West of Harborough in particular might benefit from improved access to jobs at this location. Approximately 1,600 commute daily from Hinckley and Bosworth to Harborough. Whereas 800 people commute from Harborough to Hinckley and Bosworth. <sup>4</sup>
Melton Borough Council	The Core Strategy was considered unsound in April 2013 and subsequently withdrawn. Current Local Plan adopted 1999. Aim to adopt new Local Plan in 2017.	The north of Harborough District Council borders the Melton administrative area. Local Plan proposals are now outdated. The councils are linked through the Housing Market Area. Approximately 200 people commute from Melton to Harborough and 200 people commute from Harborough to Melton. <sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Leicester and Leicestershire County Council (2010) Leicester and Leicestershire Economic Assessment - [online] available at: <http://www.leicester.gov.uk/EasysiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=68277&type=full&servicetype=Attachment>.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

Neighbouring Local Planning Authority	Local Plan Status	Links with Harborough
North West Leicestershire District Council	<p>The existing Local Plan was adopted on 22nd August 2002.</p> <p>The first part of the new Local Plan, (the draft Core Strategy) was withdrawn from examination in Oct 2013. The Authority is Working with other Leicestershire councils, to complete a new strategic housing market assessment by Spring 2014. The Core Strategy will be revised accordingly.</p>	<p>Approximately 300 people commute daily from North West Leicestershire to Harborough, whereas 300 people commute from Harborough North West Leicestershire.<sup>6</sup></p> <p>The East Midlands Gateway Rail Freight Interchange is a proposed Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project adjacent to East Midlands Airport in North Leicestershire. The project is currently in the pre-application stage, if undertaken it is expected to generate around 7,000 direct jobs once operational. This holds potential to be highly beneficial to the surrounding areas including Harborough.</p>
Oadby & Wigston Borough Council	<p>Core Strategy adopted in 2010.</p> <p>Aim to adopt a new Local Plan during 2016.</p>	<p>The west of Harborough District Council borders the Oadby and Wigston authority.</p> <p>The Core Strategy provides for 1,800 new dwellings.</p> <p>Approximately 900 people commute daily from Oadby and Wigston to Harborough, whereas 1,500 people commute from Harborough to Oadby and Wigston.<sup>7</sup></p>
Leicester City County	<p>Core Strategy Adopted in 2010.</p> <p>Call for Sites exercise currently on-going (ends 31/01/14)</p> <p>Aim to adopt a new Local Plan by 2016.</p>	<p>The west of Harborough District Council borders the Leicester City administrative area.</p> <p>Leicester City provides significant job opportunities for commuters across the County including Harborough. It also provides higher order retail offering and cultural / leisure facilities that attract residents from Harborough.</p> <p>The Core Strategy plans for development of high quality opportunities at a Science and innovation Park and Professional Office Area.</p> <p>The City also presents opportunities for Higher Education that residents of Harborough could be attracted to.</p> <p>Housing development in Harborough could attract workers from the wider urban area of Leicester.</p> <p>Approximately 1,900 people commute daily from Leicester to Harborough, whereas 7,000 people commute from Harborough to Leicester.<sup>8</sup></p>
Daventry	<p>Joint Core Strategy with Northamptonshire Council is being produced.</p> <p>Daventry District Local Plan 1997. Daventry Council is working towards producing a Local Plan</p>	<p>The Daventry District area borders with the south west of Harborough. As identified in the Pre-Submission version of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2012), Daventry has an outstanding housing requirement of 7,360 dwellings up to 2026. This would include a sustainable urban extension at Daventry North East (Churchfields) of 2,000 homes and local employment opportunities.</p> <p>The Daventry International Freight Terminal Phase 3 is a Nationally Strategic Infrastructure project that is currently being considered by the Planning Inspectorate before submission to the Secretary of State. This development would deliver the expansion of Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal, creating up to 9,000 jobs. It is reasonable to assume that residents of Harborough could benefit from access to these jobs.</p>

<sup>6</sup> Ibid<sup>7</sup> Ibid<sup>8</sup> Ibid



Neighbouring Local Planning Authority	Local Plan Status	Links with Harborough
		Approximately 614 people commute daily from Harborough to Daventry, with 645 travelling from Daventry to Harborough <sup>9</sup>
Kettering	North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy 2008.	The North of the Kettering District borders the south east of the Harborough boundary. The Core Strategy allocates 1,940 new dwellings to the area around Desborough, close to the south-eastern boundary of Market Harborough. Some 13,100 new dwellings are allocated for the Kettering area. Kettering provides job opportunities and higher order retail / cultural and leisure facilities for residents in the South East of the district.  Approximately 603 people commute daily from Harborough to Kettering, with 1,027 travelling from Kettering to Harborough <sup>10</sup> .
Corby	North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy 2008.	The Core Spatial strategy refers to a western urban extension of Corby comprising of an additional 4,000 homes by 2021. Corby provides job opportunities and higher order retail / cultural and leisure facilities for residents in the South East of the district.  Approximately 617 people commute daily from Harborough to Corby, with only 187 travelling from Corby to Harborough <sup>11</sup> .
Rugby Borough Council	Rugby Local Plan Pending Core Strategy adopted in 2011	Rugby is a neighbouring authority, located in Warwickshire, south west of the Harborough district boundary.  The Core Strategy allocates land for 10,800 new houses and 108 hectares of employment land development. The most of the housing development (9,800 dwellings) is to be located within or adjacent to Rugby town centre some 7 miles from Lutterworth.  Approximately 1,024 people commute daily from Harborough to Rugby, with 813 travelling from Rugby to Harborough <sup>12</sup> .
Rutland	Rutland Core Strategy 2011.	The Core Strategy allocates 20% of new housing to Uppingham (250 dwellings) which lies less than 2 miles from the Harborough boundary.  Approximately 224 people commute daily from Harborough to Rutland, with 174 travelling from Rutland to Harborough <sup>13</sup> .

## 1.2 Duty to cooperate

Harborough District Council maintains dialogue with a number of neighbouring local authorities to identify cross-boundary matters of a strategic nature. The District also works with the County Council, the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Local Nature Partnership (Built and Natural Environment Forum) to exercise its duty to co-operate.

Whilst there is some relationship with the Daventry and Rugby authorities, particularly in relation to strategic distribution / SFRI, and the Rutland, Kettering, Corby authorities the main cross boundary relationship is with adjoining Leicestershire authorities and the wider Leicester and Leicestershire area which forms a Housing Market Area and economic partnership area.

<sup>9</sup> Census 2001 Flow Data. Available online at:

[http://cider.census.ac.uk/cider/wicid/flow\\_summaries/summary\\_tabulate.php?datatype=23](http://cider.census.ac.uk/cider/wicid/flow_summaries/summary_tabulate.php?datatype=23)

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

<sup>11</sup> Ibid

<sup>12</sup> Ibid

<sup>13</sup> Ibid



Among the evidence studies that have been prepared or currently underway on identified strategic cross boundary issues is a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). This SHMA cover all local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area. Also, a Strategic Distribution Sector Study has been commissioned for the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area.

Senior officers meet at a Housing Planning and Infrastructure Group. This Group draws together representatives of City and District Councils, County Council transport, Local Enterprise Partnership and Homes and Communities Agency including the Planning Portfolio holder from each of the Leicester and Leicestershire local authorities. A Leicester and Leicestershire Member Advisory Group has been established and will consider the outcomes of the forthcoming Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Strategic Distribution Sector Study. The group is to advise on future strategic cross boundary housing matters within the HMA and will likely agree joint planning statements.

### 1.3 A brief explanation of Sustainability Appraisal


Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a process for helping to ensure that Local Plans achieve an appropriate balance between environmental, economic and social objectives. SA should help to identify the sustainability implications of different plan approaches and recommend ways to reduce any negative effects and to increase the positive outcomes.

SA is also a tool for communicating the likely effects of a Plan (and any reasonable alternatives), explaining the decisions taken with regards to the approach decided upon, and encouraging engagement from key stakeholders such as local communities, businesses and plan-makers.

Although SA can be applied flexibly, it is a legal requirement under the 'Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (*which were prepared in order to transpose into national law the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive*).<sup>14</sup> The regulations set out prescribed processes that must be followed. **In particular the Regulations require that a report is published for consultation alongside the draft plan that 'identifies, describes and evaluates' the likely significant effects of implementing 'the plan, and reasonable alternatives'**.<sup>15</sup> The SA/SEA report must then be taken into account, alongside consultation responses when finalising the plan (**See Appendix 1**).

SA/SEA can be viewed as a four-stage process that produces a number of statutory and non-statutory outputs. As illustrated in **Figure 1.1** below, 'Scoping' is a mandatory process under the SEA Directive, but the publication of a scoping report is a voluntary (but useful) output.

Figure 1.1: The 'four stage' SA process.



<sup>14</sup> Directive 2001/42/EC: <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/sea-legalcontext.htm>

<sup>15</sup> Regulation 12(2) <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2004/1633/regulation/12/made>

## 1.4 Introduction to scoping

In a nutshell, scoping is the process of gathering information about the area and factors likely to be affected by the Plan. This information helps to identify what the issues are for the area and which of these should be the focus of the appraisal.

As required by the Regulations<sup>16</sup>, the scoping process should answer the following questions:

*Table 1.2: Scoping questions answered*

Scoping Question	Corresponding requirement
What's the Plan seeking to achieve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan' i.e. <i>Harborough Local Plan</i>.</li> </ul>
What's the sustainability 'context'?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relationship of the plan with other relevant plans and programmes'</li> <li>The relevant environmental protection objectives, established at international or national level</li> </ul>
What's the sustainability 'baseline' at the current time?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment</li> <li>The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected</li> </ul>
What's the baseline projection?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The likely evolution of the current state of the environment without implementation of the plan'</li> </ul>
What are the key issues that should be a focus of SA?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any existing environmental problems / issues which are relevant to the plan including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance</li> </ul>

## 1.5 Contextual review / Policy Framework

An important step when seeking to establish the appropriate 'scope' of an SA involves reviewing 'sustainability context' messages (e.g. issues, objectives or aspirations) set out within relevant published plans, policies, strategies and initiatives (PPSIs) at international, national and local level. Sustainability context messages are important, as they aid the identification of the 'sustainability issues and opportunities' that should be a focus of the SA. Appraisals should also take account of the cumulative impacts that could arise as a result of other plans and programmes within and beyond the plan period.

Of particular importance to the scope of this SA is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF<sup>17</sup>). The NPPF, read as a whole, constitutes 'the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system. **The NPPF also reflects international and European legislation** that planning has a role in implementing. The framework is therefore strongly represented in the contextual review.

## 1.6 The current and projected baseline

Another important step when seeking to establish the 'scope' of an SA involves reviewing *the current state* for a range of sustainability topics. Doing so helps to enable identification of those key sustainability topics that should be a particular focus of the appraisal, and also helps to provide 'benchmarks' for the appraisal of significant effects.

Just as it is important for the scope of SA to be informed by an understanding of current baseline conditions, it is also necessary to consider how the baseline conditions might 'evolve' in the future under the no plan / business as usual scenario.

<sup>16</sup> Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004) [online] available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2004/1633/contents/made>

<sup>17</sup> CLG (2012) National Planning Policy Framework [online] available at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2116950.pdf>

## 2 WHAT'S THE SCOPE OF THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL?

### 2.1 Introduction

An SA Scoping Report prepared in 2008<sup>18</sup>, set out the SA Framework for undertaking appraisals on Local Development Framework Documents providing a series of objectives and sub-criteria. These objectives were based on evidence used to identify the key sustainability 'issues and opportunities'.

Further updates to the baseline position and contextual review were presented within subsequent SA Reports in 2009 and 2010<sup>19</sup>. Taking into account these updates and the comments received during consultation, the SA Framework was finalised in the SA Report that accompanied the pre-submission Core Strategy in October 2010.

This Scoping Report has been produced to update the evidence again and to:

- Reflect the objectives and scope of the new Local Plan;
- Be fully compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);
- Take account of new guidance and Regulations for the preparation of Local Plans.

The Sustainability Appraisal will focus on the policies and allocations in the Local Plan that are new (compared to the Core Strategy) or where revisions are made that could lead to significant impacts. This is reflected in the scope of the contextual review and baseline data.

It is considered that the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken for the Core Strategy remains valid for those policies that are not anticipated to change significantly, however this will be monitored in case proposed changes alter the findings of the earlier Sustainability Appraisal. These findings will therefore feed-into the updated appraisal as appropriate (see **Section 11** for further detail about the proposed methodologies).

### 2.2 Structure of this Scoping Report

To structure the Scoping Report and avoid duplication of evidence, the scope of the appraisal has been presented within one of six sustainability themes (listed below).

Sustainability Theme	Topics covered	
<b>Natural environment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity</li> <li>• Geodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water quality</li> <li>• Soil quality</li> </ul>
<b>Built and natural heritage</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape and Settlement Character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage assets</li> </ul>
<b>Health and wellbeing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health and wellbeing</li> <li>• Deprivation and community cohesion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility and transport</li> <li>• Air quality</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure and recreation</li> </ul>
<b>Resilience (to climate change)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptation to climate change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood risk</li> </ul>
<b>Housing and economy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population</li> <li>• Housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economy</li> </ul>
<b>Resource use</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waste and recycling</li> <li>• Energy and carbon emissions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water availability</li> <li>• Minerals</li> </ul>

*NB: it should be noted that there are links between different 'topics' and that some information could cut across (or be relevant to) several themes.*

<sup>18</sup> UE Associates / Harborough District Council (2009) Sustainability Appraisal of the Harborough District Local Development Framework – Scoping Report. [online] available at: [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download\\_info.php?downloadID=317](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=317)

<sup>19</sup> UE Associates / Harborough District Council (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the Harborough District Local Development Framework – SA Report to accompany the Pre-Submission Version of the Core Strategy. [online] available at: [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download\\_info.php?downloadID=605](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=605)

These themes have been identified by grouping similar sustainability objectives together as established in the existing SA Framework (*Presented in Appendix C of the pre-submission SA Report, 2010*<sup>20</sup>).

Each theme forms a chapter to this Scoping Report and sets out the following in order:

- The policy framework / contextual review;
- The current and projected baseline;
- The key sustainability issues and opportunities;
- The Sustainability objectives and criteria; and
- Potential monitoring indicators.

By setting out the Scoping Report in this way, it is possible to demonstrate how the evidence has influenced the development of the SA Framework and that the requirements of the SEA Directive have been met.

Several indicators are proposed to stimulate discussion during consultation. In the main, these consist of core output indicators included within previous Annual Monitoring Reports. The Council is currently developing local output indicators to monitor the Local Plan, and the monitoring framework for the SA will support this (and vice versa). Monitoring measures will be finalised in the SA Statement following adoption of the Local Plan.

The scope of the SA is primarily focused on the potential impacts within the District of Harborough. However, there are cross-boundary issues that will need to be addressed in the appraisal. For example, there are movements to and from Harborough from surrounding districts for work, retail and to access services (see **Table 1.1**). Environmental assets outside of Harborough could also be affected if there are impact pathways.

### 2.3 Consultation on the Scoping Report

This Scoping Report was published for consultation in May 2014 and sent to the three statutory bodies' in-line with the requirements of the Regulations.

Comments were received from all three statutory bodies and a number of other consultees as follows.

- The Environment Agency
- English Heritage
- Natural England
- Billesdon Parish Council
- Burton Overy Parish Council

The Scoping Report has been amended as deemed necessary in response to the comments received. **Appendix 4** sets out a summary of the comments received and the actions taken / changes made in response to these.

---

<sup>20</sup> [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/1343/sustainability\\_appraisal\\_of\\_the\\_harborough\\_core\\_strategy-sustainability\\_report\\_to\\_accompany\\_the\\_pre-submission\\_version\\_of\\_the\\_core\\_strategy\\_oct\\_2010](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/1343/sustainability_appraisal_of_the_harborough_core_strategy-sustainability_report_to_accompany_the_pre-submission_version_of_the_core_strategy_oct_2010)

### 3 INTRODUCTION TO HARBOROUGH

Harborough District covers a total area of approximately 593km<sup>2</sup> of rural south Leicestershire. It is the largest of the seven Leicestershire Districts and lies within the East Midlands region. The main land use within the District is rural agriculture and grassland. The District is characterised by extensive tracts of countryside interspersed with 91 rural village parishes. The location's landscape contains a variety of woodland, steep valleys and consistent rolling hills. Despite its predominately rural setting, SSSIs account for just 1.21% of Harborough's area and 0.42% by Local Wildlife designations.


Harborough has witnessed significant growth in employment (53%) 1991-2003, over twice that of the regional and national average. The District also shares a strong economic interdependency with Leicestershire through resident commuters. Overall, Harborough is one of the least deprived areas in England, with only the main urban area of Market Harborough standing out as an area identified as suffering multiple deprivations. Approximately 85,382 people live in Harborough.

As illustrated in **Figure 3.1**, the main population centres include the market towns of Market Harborough, lying on the south western boundary of the District; Broughton Astley, close to the border with Blaby; and Lutterworth, lying further east on the southern boundary, which is closely related to Rugby.

Market Harborough is considered the principal town within Harborough, due to its position as provider of the largest range of services and facilities. Great Glen, Kibworth, Fleckney, Billesdon, Ullethorpe and Husbands Bosworth serve as rural centres for the numerous smaller settlements spread throughout the remainder of the District. Thurnby, Bushby and Scraftoft adjoin and form part of the built up area of the Leicester Principal Urban Area (PUA).



Figure 3.1: Harborough District Council





## 4 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

### 4.1 Introduction

This section sets out the relevant policy framework and baseline position for the following sustainability factors that have been grouped under the theme of 'Natural Environment':

- Geodiversity;
- Biodiversity;
- Water Quality; *and*
- Soil Quality.

Information has then been assembled to establish the key issues and opportunities that relate to the 'natural environment' and which should be a focus for the SA. The chapter concludes by drawing together key sustainability issues to establish the sustainability objectives and indicators that will form the SA Framework.

### 4.2 Geodiversity

#### *Contextual review*

The **NPPF**<sup>4</sup> sets out how the planning system should protect and enhance geological conservation interests. It states that local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development affecting geodiversity sites will be judged, with these policies distinguishing between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites. The NPPF also states that restoration to a geodiversity end-use is appropriate for minerals extraction sites.

#### *The current and projected baseline*

The geodiversity of Harborough is dominated by sedimentary deposits of the Quaternary period including diamicton, clay and sand and gravel. These were deposited by the movement of glaciers and ice sheets during the ice age. In the north and east of the District, older Jurassic rocks occur. Their erosion has led to a ridge and valley landscape, where clays are present in the valleys and harder limestones form the tops of hills and valley sides<sup>21,22</sup>.

There is one nationally designated geological site in Harborough: Tilton Railway Cutting SSSI located about 2km east of Tilton just off the Tilton to Oakham Road (**Table 4.1**). This site is a 750m section of disused railway cutting which provides exposures of sediments deposited during the Lower Jurassic Period, between 189 and 186 million years. A rich assemblage of fossils has been found in the SSSI<sup>23</sup>.

The SSSI is currently assessed as being in 'Favourable' condition. Due to its' conservation status, it is unlikely that inappropriate development would be permitted that would directly affect the site. The main threats to the conservation of railway cuttings are developments which obscure the geological features. The location of this site does not make it susceptible to major developments that could have an impact on the setting of the geological features. It is therefore anticipated that the condition of the site will remain favourable over the plan period.

<sup>21</sup> Scott Wilson (2009) Harborough District Council Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – Appendix A and E [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/344/harborough\\_district\\_strategic\\_flood\\_risk\\_assessment](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/344/harborough_district_strategic_flood_risk_assessment)

<sup>22</sup> UE Associates (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the Harborough Core Strategy – Baseline Data

<sup>23</sup> Natural England (2013) Tilton Railway Cutting SSSI [online] available at [http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/geodiversity/englands/sites/local\\_ID51.aspx](http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/geodiversity/englands/sites/local_ID51.aspx)

### 4.3 Biodiversity

#### *Contextual review*

Sites of European status are protected under the **Birds (79/409/EEC as amended) and Habitats (92/43/EEC) Directives**, while national legislation protects Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and listed species.

The European Commission Guidance on **Integrating Climate Change and Biodiversity into Strategic Environmental Assessment** (2013) suggests that an SEA should focus on ensuring 'no-net-loss of biodiversity' before considering mitigation and compensation. The assessment should also take account of 'ecosystem services' and the links between natural environment and economy.

The **Natural Environment White Paper** states that there is a need to halt the overall decline in biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services; and restore them in so far as feasible and seek to deliver net gains in biodiversity where possible<sup>24</sup>.

The **NPPF** also says that Local Plans should support healthy well-functioning ecosystems, encourage the 'preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks' and promote the 'protection and recovery of priority species'.

**Biodiversity 2020** is the Government's Strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services. It encapsulates the aims of the EU Biodiversity Strategy and seeks to achieve the following outcomes by 2020:

- More, bigger and less fragmented areas for wildlife. No net loss of priority habitat and a net increase in priority habitats.
- Restoring at least 15% of degraded ecosystems as a contribution to climate change mitigation and adaptation.
- An overall improvement in the status of species and prevention of further human-induced extinctions.
- Improved engagement in biodiversity issues.

The Wildlife Trust guidance document **A Living Landscape** says that Local plans should adopt a 'landscape approach' to protecting and enhancing biodiversity. This focuses on the conservation of biodiversity over large areas of land (i.e. at the landscape scale) where habitat patches that are now fragmented would once have functioned more as an interconnected whole<sup>25</sup>.

According to **the NPPF**, Local Authorities should set out their strategic approach to Green Infrastructure in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of biodiversity and green infrastructure.

At a local level, **the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LL&R) Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP)**<sup>26</sup> sets the following three priorities:

- To promote the restoration, management and creation of BAP Priority Habitats;
- To promote the creation of new wildlife habitat in the wider countryside; and
- To survey, monitor and promote favourable management of existing good sites through the Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) system.

#### *The current and projected baseline:*

##### European Sites

While there are no European designated sites located within Harborough, three *Natura 2000* sites fall within or just over 25km from the administrative border. :

- Rutland Water Special Protection Area (SPA, Ramsar);
- River Mease Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and

<sup>24</sup> Defra (2012) The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature (Natural Environment White Paper) [online] available at: <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm80/8082/8082.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> The Wildlife Trusts (2010) A Living Landscape: play your part in nature's recovery [online] available at: <http://www.wildlifetrusts.org/aliveinglandscape>

<sup>26</sup> Space for Wildlife - Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR) Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) – 2010-2015 [online] available at: [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/1656/ll\\_and\\_r\\_biodiversity\\_action\\_plan](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/1656/ll_and_r_biodiversity_action_plan)

- Ensor’s Pool Special Area of Conservation (SAC)<sup>27</sup>.

The Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report (HDC, 2010) considered the effects of Harborough’s previous LDF Core Strategy on the Natura 2000 network of protected areas. The following is a list of potential links between development and the sites identified:

- *“Additional development – including the quantum, type and location of proposed growth;*
- *Changes to water flows and quality e.g. effect on flood risk areas, increased surface run-off;*
- *Changes to air and noise pollution (development and associated travel) and its effect on site habitats / species;*
- *Increased accessibility and the attraction of more people / visitors to the District. This is particularly relevant for Rutland Water SPA due to its proximity to Market Harborough and other District visitor assets; and*
- *Disturbance to protected habitat / species (including birds) that sites support from development, including some forms of renewable energy development”.*

The Ensor’s Pool SAC is a waterbody in Nuneaton that formed in an abandoned clay pit. It is designated primarily for its importance as a habitat for white-clawed crayfish. This site was screened out due to its distance from the District’s boundary (12.5km) and to its self-contained ecosystem. Furthermore, the identified site’s vulnerabilities are very local in nature and were deemed unlikely to be exacerbated by the previous Core Strategy.

As the River Mease SAC is located 27km away from Harborough’s District boundary, is not connected to any watercourses in the District and does not contribute to the water supply of the District, the previous Core Strategy was not considered to lead to any significant adverse effects on the SAC.

Rutland Water SPA is the closest site, though still at some distance (7.5km). Effects identified were reported as likely to be indirect and linked to a greater number of visitors being attracted to the site. The report advised that further appraisal work would be necessary to confirm this assessment.

### SSSIs

Leicestershire is one of the poorest counties in the UK for sites of recognised nature conservation value and is experiencing continued biodiversity loss. The very best sites (the SSSIs) represent only approximately 1.3% of the land area<sup>28</sup>. Despite being largely rural, Harborough is no exception. The District does not have any National Nature Reserves; there are 14 SSSIs falling either wholly or partially within the District covering approximately 718ha, and representing 1.2% of Harborough’s total land area (see below and **Figure 4.1**).

<sup>27</sup> Harborough District Council (2010). Harborough Local Development Framework Core Strategy – Habitat Regulations Assessment – Screening Report

<sup>28</sup> Space for Wildlife - Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR) Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) – 2010-2015 [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/1656/ll\\_and\\_r\\_biodiversity\\_action\\_plan](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/1656/ll_and_r_biodiversity_action_plan)

**Table 4.1: Summary of SSSI in Harborough**

SSSI Name	Main Habitat	(ha)	Condition
Allextton Wood	Broadleaved mixed and yew woodland	25.89	Unfavourable recovering
Cave's Inn Pits	Neutral grassland	5.82	Unfavourable recovering
Chater Valley	Neutral grassland	3.84	Unfavourable recovering
Eyebrook Reservoir (straddles Rutland)	Broadleaved mixed and yew woodland	201.3	Unfavourable recovering
Eyebrook Valley Woods	Broadleaved mixed and yew woodland	65.71	Unfavourable recovering
Great Bowden Borrowpit	Fen, marsh and swamp	2.43	Favourable
Kilby-Foxton Canal (straddles Oadby and Wigston)	Standing open water and canals	32.09	Unfavourable no change
Launde Bigwood	Broadleaved mixed and yew woodland	41.16	Unfavourable recovering
Leighfied Forest	Broadleaved mixed and yew woodland and neutral grassland	149.76	Most of it is unfavourable recovering.
Misterton Marshes	Fen, marsh and swamp and neutral grassland	6.81	Unfavourable recovering
Owston Woods	Broadleaved mixed and yew woodland	139.56	Unfavourable recovering
Saddington Reservoir	Fen, marsh and swamp and broadleaved mixed and yew woodland and neutral grassland	19.08	Favourable
Stanford Park	Broadleaved mixed and yew woodland	20.44	Unfavourable recovering
Tilton Railway Cutting	Designated for geological assets	4.44	Favourable

Source: Natural England (2013) – Condition of SSSI units<sup>29</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Natural England, (2013) Condition of SSSI units [online] available at <http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/reportAction.cfm?Report=sdr13&Category=C&Reference=1025>

### Local sites and species

Harborough provides two Local Nature Reserves (LNR): Scraptoft (14.33ha) and North Kilworth (2.02ha), which consist primarily of grassland and scrub<sup>30</sup>. There are also 207<sup>31</sup> non-statutory nature conservation designated sites known as Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) covering 248.5ha (0.42%) of Harborough's land area.

These local sites provide a range of habitats including woodland, grassland, hedgerows, meadows, marshland, quarries, railway corridors, roadside verges, ponds and individual ash and oak trees. In addition to the above-mentioned designated biodiversity sites, the network of river/stream and canal corridors, gardens and allotments provide good wildlife corridors, whilst brownfield sites and underutilised buildings can also often be important habitats for flora and fauna<sup>32</sup>.

**Figure 4.1** shows the locations of Harborough's designated nature conservation assets.

The LL&R BAP provides a framework for biodiversity initiatives in the area. It contains the Habitat and Species Action Plans listed in **Table 4.2**.

Habitats and species that have been highlighted in this table have been recorded in Harborough. Those that are not highlighted are either absent or could not be confirmed as present in Harborough.

**Table 4.2:** *Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Habitat and Species Action Plans*

Priority Habitats	Priority Species
<p><b>Habitats of national importance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broadleaved woodland</li> <li>Calcareous grassland</li> <li>Eutrophic standing waters</li> <li>Field margins</li> <li>Heath-grassland</li> <li>Hedgerows</li> <li>Lowland wood-pasture and parkland</li> <li>Mesotrophic lakes</li> <li>Neutral grassland</li> <li>Reedbed</li> <li>Wet woodland</li> </ul> <p><b>Habitats of local importance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fast-flowing streams</li> <li>Floodplain wetland</li> <li>Mature trees</li> <li>Roadside verges</li> <li>Rocks and built structures</li> <li>Sphagnum ponds</li> <li>Springs and flushes</li> <li>Urban habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bats</li> <li>Otter</li> <li>Dormouse</li> <li>Water vole</li> <li>Barn owl</li> <li>Redstart</li> <li>Nightingale</li> <li>Sand Martin</li> <li>Black hairstreak butterfly</li> <li>Dingy and grizzled skipper</li> <li>White-clawed crayfish</li> <li>Black poplar</li> <li>Purple small-reed</li> <li>Violet helleborine</li> <li>Wood vetch</li> </ul>

*Source: Space for Wildlife - Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR) Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) – 2010-2015.*

<sup>30</sup> Natural England – Local Nature reserves in Leicestershire [online] available at [http://www.lnr.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/lnr/lnr\\_results.asp?N=&C=25&Submit=Search](http://www.lnr.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/lnr/lnr_results.asp?N=&C=25&Submit=Search)

<sup>31</sup> WYG Environment (2008) Harborough District Council: Phase 1 Habitat Survey

<sup>32</sup> UE Associates (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the Harborough Core Strategy – Baseline Data

*Settlement and/or Ward Review*

WYG Environment was commissioned in 2008 by HDC to undertake an ecological assessment of approximately 90 potential development sites identified in the 2008/09 SHLAA. The sites were mainly in areas adjacent to existing urban settlements consequently the study focused on Market Harborough, Lutterworth, Broughton Astley, Scraftoft / Thurnby / Bushby, and close to Great Glen and Oadby in the Leicester urban fringe area<sup>33</sup>. Key findings from the study are summarised in the table below.

**Table 4.3: Settlement Biodiversity Features**

Area	Key Features Important to Biodiversity		Designated Areas	Protected & Notable Species Recorded in the Area
Market Harborough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>River Welland and associated semi-improved grassland and brooks</li> <li>Other rivers, railways and canals</li> <li>Mature hedgerows around Great Bowden</li> <li>Ponds found to support breeding great crested newts</li> </ul>	SSSI	Great Bowden Borrowpit within 2km - any proposed development must not negatively impact the integrity of the site.	Badgers, bats, reptiles, great crested newts and otters
		LWS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sections of the Grand Union Canal</li> <li>Two veteran ash trees at Orchard House</li> </ul>	
		Sites of Parish Level Importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A grassland pasture.</li> <li>Roadside verge on Leicester Road.</li> <li>River Welland – considered likely to meet LWS criteria due to presence of Red Data Book species.</li> </ul>	
Blutterworth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bitteswell Brook</li> <li>River Swift</li> <li>Disused railway to the east of town</li> </ul>	SSSI	Misterton Marsh within 1km to the east - any proposed development must not negatively impact the integrity of the site.	Badgers, freshwater crayfish, bullhead and common redstart.  A notable species is the Hungarian brome, a grass with restricted distribution nationally and very few county records though it is not considered to be a native species.
		Sites of Parish Level Importance	Several sites along the River, brook and disused railway.	
Broughton Astley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>River Sence and associated brooks</li> <li>Disused railway</li> <li>Veteran trees to the north and south of Broughton Astley around Primethorpe Meadows LWS and south of Old Mill Road</li> <li>Mature hedgerows to the north of Broughton Astley</li> </ul>	SSSI	Croft Pasture, Croft Hill and Croft & Huncote Quarry – those three sites located at Croft (outside HDC) could potentially suffer from increased visitor pressure should any large residential or employment developments occur to the north of Broughton Astley	Water voles, white-clawed crayfish, bats and badgers, ponds with potential to support amphibian populations. Other notable species – kingfishers and mistletoe.
		LWS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primethorpe Meadows</li> <li>Broughton Astley Grassland</li> <li>River Sence</li> </ul>	
		Sites of Parish Level Importance	Six sites	

<sup>33</sup> WYG Environment, (2008). Harborough District Council: Phase 1 Habitat Survey [online] available at: [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download\\_info.php?downloadID=78](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=78)


Area	Key Features Important to Biodiversity	Designated Areas		Protected & Notable Species Recorded in the Area
Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bushby Brook</li> <li>• Thurnby Brook</li> <li>• Species rich hedgerow along the A47</li> <li>• Semi natural broad-leaved woodland at Bushby Spinney &amp; The Mount</li> <li>• Other brooks, disused railway line and a number of mature hedges</li> </ul>	LNR	Scraptoft	Badgers, bats, great crested newts (recorded approx. 1km to the southeast of Bushby), ponds with potential to support amphibian populations.
		LWS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bushby Spinney</li> <li>• The species rich hedgerow, two veteran trees and a small area of herb-rich neutral grassland adjacent to Bushby Brook are potential LWSs.</li> </ul>	
		Sites of Parish Level Importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bushby Brook</li> <li>• Thurnby Brook</li> <li>• A number of hedgelines</li> <li>• Disused railway line</li> </ul>	
Urban Fringe (three discrete sites surveyed around Oadby and Great Glen)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plantation woodland at Glen Gorse</li> <li>• River Sence which runs within 50m of the surveyed areas</li> </ul>	SSSI	Kilby – Foxtan Canal within 2km and known to support an important roost of Daubenton's bats – any proposed development must not negatively impact the integrity of the canal corridor or its interest features	Badgers, bats, kingfishers and bullfinches.
		LNR	Lucas Marsh (in Oadby) is approx. 1km away	
		LWS	Several sites within close proximity though none within the surveyed areas	
		Sites of Parish Level Importance	One of the sites, the hedgerow between Oadby and Wigston, is likely to meet LWS criteria	

Source: WYG Environment, 2008. Harborough District Council: Phase 1 Habitat Survey

In the future, designated and locally important sites are expected to improve with the implementation of the LL&R Biodiversity Action Plan, however, wildlife habitats and corridors are likely to experience continued pressure from development and climate change.



Figure 4.1 Statutory biodiversity designations



## 4.4 Water Quality

### *Contextual review*

The **European Water Framework Directive (WFD)** (2000/60/EC)<sup>34</sup> promotes an integrated and coordinated approach to water management at the river basin scale. One of its key objectives is the requirement to prevent deterioration in status and achieve at least Good Ecological Status in inland and coastal waters following deadlines ranging from 2015 to 2027. The WFD also requires all Artificial or Heavily Modified Water Bodies to achieve Good Ecological Potential.

The **Nitrates Directive** (91/676/EEC) aims to protect water quality across Europe by preventing nitrates from agricultural sources polluting ground and surface waters and by the promoting of the use of good farming practices. The Nitrates Directive forms an integral part of the WFD and is one of the key instruments in the protection of waters against agricultural pressures<sup>35</sup>.

The UK strategy **Future Water (2011)**<sup>36</sup> seeks to achieve a secure supply of water resources whilst protecting the water environment. This means greater efficiency in water use, application of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, managing diffuse pollution from agriculture, tackling flood risk and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Anglian Water, Water Resources Management Plan, (2010)<sup>37</sup> and Severn Trent Water, Water Resources Management Plan, (2010)<sup>38</sup> detail where each company will direct their investment in water infrastructure.

The key issues identified in the **Humber River Basin Management Plan**<sup>39</sup> include:

- Point source pollution from water industry sewage works;
- Diffuse pollution from agricultural activities;
- Diffuse pollution from urban sources;
- Physical modification of water bodies; and
- Disused mines; point and/or diffuse pollution source.

### *The current and projected baseline*

The majority of the south eastern part of Harborough is drained by the River Welland, and north eastern area is drained by the Rivers Chater and Gwash and Eye Brook. The south western area of the District is drained by the River Avon and River Swift, and the north western region is drained by the River Sence and tributaries of Gaddesby Brook and Barkby Brook, which carry water to the north west of Harborough towards the River Soar. Many local watercourse tributaries assist in conveying water into these watercourses; those that have been named are presented in **Table 4.4**.

The Grand Union Canal runs generally south east from the west of Newton Harcourt parallel to the River Sence through the centre of the District towards Market Harborough with a second branch redirecting south west passing through Husbands Bosworth towards Rugby<sup>40</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and the Council establishing a framework for the Community action in the field of water policy accessible at: <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/>

<sup>35</sup> Directive 91/676/EEC of the European Council, concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources.

<sup>36</sup> DEFRA (2011) Future Water: The Governments Water Strategy for England.

<sup>37</sup> Anglian Water, Water Resources Management Plan, 2010 accessible at: [http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/\\_assets/media/AW\\_WRMP\\_2010\\_main\\_Report.pdf](http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/_assets/media/AW_WRMP_2010_main_Report.pdf)

<sup>38</sup> Severn Trent Water, Water Resources Management Plan, 2010 accessible at: [http://www.stwater.co.uk/upload/pdf/Final\\_WRMP\\_2010.pdf?bcsi\\_scan\\_AB11CAA0E2721250=0&bcsi\\_scan\\_filename=Final\\_WRMP\\_2010.pdf](http://www.stwater.co.uk/upload/pdf/Final_WRMP_2010.pdf?bcsi_scan_AB11CAA0E2721250=0&bcsi_scan_filename=Final_WRMP_2010.pdf)

<sup>39</sup> Environment Agency (2009) River Basin Management Plan, Humber River Basin District [online] available at <http://a0768b4a8a31e106d8b0-50dc802554eb38a24458b98ff72d550b.r19.cf3.rackcdn.com/gene0910bsqr-e-e.pdf>


<sup>40</sup> Scott Wilson (2009) Harborough District Council Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/819/harborough\\_district\\_strategic\\_flood\\_risk\\_assessment-main\\_report](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/819/harborough_district_strategic_flood_risk_assessment-main_report)

**Table 4.4: Local Watercourse Tributaries**

Local Watercourse Tributaries		
Laughton Brook	Barkby Brook	Medbourne Brook
Burton Brook	Queniborough Brook	Great Glen Brook
Langton Brook	Melton Brook	Gaddesby Brook
Saddington Brook	Broughton Astley Brook	Eye Brook
Scraptoft Brook	Stonton Brook	Foxtton Brook
Thurnby Brook	Whetstone Brook	Bushby Brook
Mowsely Brook		

Source: Scott Wilson (2009) HDC Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZs) indicate the risk to groundwater supplies from potentially polluting activities and accidental releases of pollutants. They are used to inform pollution prevention measures in areas, which are at higher risk and to monitor potential polluting activities nearby. As shown in **Figure 4.2**, there are three groundwater SPZs in Harborough located close to the southern boundary between the parishes of North Kilworth, Husbands Bosworth and Sulby<sup>41</sup>.

**Figure 4.2: Groundwater Source Protection Zones in Harborough**

© Environment Agency copyright and database rights 2013. © Ordnance Survey Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Environment Agency, 100026380. Contains Royal Mail data © Royal Mail copyright and database right 2013.

Source: Environment Agency (2013)

<sup>41</sup> Environment Agency (2013) Groundwater Source Protection Zones Map [online] available at <http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?topic=groundwater&layerGroups=default&lang=e&ep=map&scale=11&x=473500&y=287500#x=461227&y=282702&lg=1,&scale=10>



When looking at historical measurements of water quality (*both chemical and ecological*), it appears that water quality has improved considerably in Harborough since 1990<sup>42</sup>. Classifications of water quality are now linked to the Water Framework Directive, and are based primarily on ecological factors. As illustrated in **Table 4.5** most of the watercourses in the District are classified as either 'poor' or 'moderate', with a handful of watercourses classified as 'bad' and only two classified as 'good' (both part of the Grand Union Canal).

Activities in certain parts of the District could present issues for water quality in the River Welland Catchment. For example, surface water run-off (*mainly from farming practices*) can lead to an overabundance of nutrients, sediment, pesticides and organic matter entering the local water environment, which affects water quality.

The River Welland runs through the District and is joined by numerous tributaries. Several stretches of river have been categorised by the Environmental Agency as in 'Bad' or 'Poor' condition (under the Water Framework Directive Classification) and in 2012 the stretch of river from the source of the Welland to Stonton Brook was classified as 'bad'. Studies undertaken by the Environment Agency at the Marston Trussell stretch of the river, south-west of Market Harborough, found that average levels of nitrates have fallen considerably (37.28– 28.98 mg NO<sub>2</sub>/litre) in the years 2006-2009. However, over the same time period, only a small reduction has occurred for phosphates in the percentage of river length where phosphates exceed 0.1 mg/litre (18% - 17%). The river maintains a consistent 'poor' standard of quality from Market Harborough through north-east to the district boundary. Pollutant levels along this stretch could be particularly damaging as it is within the Welland Drinking Water Protected Area.

The Welland Valley Partnership has undertaken numerous integrated initiatives to help to alleviate the river from further diffuse pollution. This has included workshops for land and water management, encouraging septic tank maintenance and partnership grants for investments on farms seeking to tackle diffuse pollution.

Although the Local Plan will focus largely on housing and employment development (as opposed to agricultural practices), it will be important to ensure that the distribution and scale of development does not compound water quality issues in this area.

The River Jordan (Welland Catchment) to the south of Market Harborough is the only water body in the District where the ecological status (WFD) is predicted to improve from poor to moderate by 2015. However, it is anticipated that continued efforts to manage diffuse and point-source pollution will help to improve the quality of watercourses in the longer-term.

The additional homes and businesses that are planned for in the Local Plan will need to be serviced by waste water and drainage infrastructure. This will increase the amount of waste water that is released into the river system, and may also require upgrades to the sewerage system. The Council has not produced a Water Cycle Study to investigate these issues, but has engaged with the service suppliers (Anglian Water and Severn Trent Water) to have regard to water /sewage issues in the area.

The foul sewerage infrastructure requirements would be dependent on the location, size and phasing of the development. All sites will require a local connection to the existing sewerage network which may include network upgrades. To enable new developments to connect to existing infrastructure, local connections and sewer reinforcements can be funded by developers through the provisions of the Water Industry Act (1991).

At the time this Scoping Report was prepared, Anglian Water have committed to provide a Red, Amber Green capacity assessment to give an indication of whether there are any constraints in particular settlements that are reliant upon their waste water treatment assets. This data has not been compiled yet, but once available will be used to inform the SA appraisal process.

<sup>42</sup> Defra (2007) River Water Quality data for regional and local authority areas in England and Wales [online] available at <http://archive.defra.gov.uk/evidence/statistics/environment/inwater/iwriverquality.htm>

**Table 4.5:** Ecological Status of water bodies in Harborough

Waterbody	Type	Status	Certainty
Countesthorpe Brook from Source to River Sence	River	Bad	Quite Certain
River Soar from source to Soar Brook	River	Moderate	Uncertain
River Soar from Soar Brook to Thurlaston Brook	River	Bad	Quite Certain
R Sence from Burton Brook to Countesthorpe Brook	River	Moderate	Very Certain
Burton Brook from Source to River Sence	River	Poor	Very Certain
River Sence from Source to Burton Brook	River	Poor	Very Certain
Whetstone Brook Catchment (trib of River Soar)	River	Bad	Very Certain
Evington Brook from Source to Willow Brook	River	Bad	Quite Certain
Willow Brook from Source to Evington Brook	River	Moderate	Very Certain
Syston Brook Catchment (trib of Wreake)	River	Bad	Very Certain
Queniborough Brook Catchment (trib of Wreake)	River	Poor	Quite Certain
Jordan	River	Poor	Quite Certain
Welland	River	Moderate	Very Certain
Langton Brook	River	Moderate	Uncertain
Welland	River	Bad	Very Certain
Chater	River	Poor	Very Certain
Stonton Brook	River	Bad	Very Certain
South Gwash	River	Moderate	Uncertain
Medbourne Brook	River	Poor	Very Certain
Eye Brook	River	Moderate	Very Certain
Welland	River	Poor	Quite Certain
R Avon - ClaycotonYelvertoft Bk to conf R Sowe	River	Poor	Quite Certain
R Swift source to conf Avon	River	Poor	Quite Certain
Eyebrook Reservoir	Lake	Moderate	Uncertain
Stanford Reservoir	Lake	Moderate	Uncertain
Grand Union Canal, Leicester Line, summit to Aylestone	Canal	Moderate	No Information
Grand Union Canal, Leicester Line (Welford Arm)	Canal	Good	No Information
Grand Union Canal, Leicester Line, summit pound	Canal	Good	No Information

Source: Environment Agency (2014)

## 4.5 Soil Quality

### *Contextual review*

In **Safeguarding our Soils: A strategy for England (2009)**<sup>43</sup>, a vision is set out for the future of soils in the country: “By 2030, all of England’s soils will be managed sustainably and degradation threats tackled successfully. This will improve the quality of England’s soils and safeguard their ability to provide essential services for future generations”. An element of this vision is the condition of soils in urban areas, which are to be ‘sufficiently valued for the ecosystem services they provide and given appropriate weight in the planning system’. Good quality soils in urban areas are recognised in this strategy as being ‘vital in supporting ecosystems, facilitating drainage and providing urban green spaces for communities’. That planning decisions take sufficient account of soil quality is a concern highlighted in the strategy, in particular in cases where ‘significant areas of the best and most versatile agricultural land are involved’. Preventing the pollution of soils and addressing the historic legacy of contaminated land is another element of the reports vision. Changing demands on our soils need to be better understood and it must be ensured that ‘appropriate consideration is given to soils in the planning process.

The **NPPF** recognises that both new and existing development should not contribute to, be put at unacceptable risk from, or be adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil pollution or land instability. In addition, despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land should be remediated and mitigated where appropriate.

Part IIA of the **Environmental Protection Act (1990)**<sup>44</sup> sets the following duties on local authorities:

- To inspect the local authority for land that may be contaminated; and
- To inspect individual sites which may be contaminated and to ensure the appropriate action is taken to remediate the land.

HDC’s **Contaminated Land Strategy (2008)**<sup>45</sup> details how the District will fulfil its duties under the above legislation. The strategy highlights that the inspection process should not interfere or discourage the redevelopment of brownfield sites and/or land that is contaminated.

### *The current and projected baseline*

The main land use within the District is rural agriculture and grassland<sup>46</sup>. The Agricultural Land Classification system classifies land into five grades, with Grade 3 subdivided into sub-grades 3a and 3b. Grades 1, 2 and 3a represent the best and most versatile land. As shown in **Figure 4.3**, Harborough is dominated by Grade 3 agricultural land, with patches of both Grade 2 and Grade 4 land<sup>47</sup>. The majority of Grade 2 agricultural land occurs in small pockets between the A47 and A6 with other areas found to the east and south of Lutterworth, between Broughton Astley & Lutterworth and around the village of Medbourne.

Agriculture will continue to be an important land use and economic enterprise in Harborough. However, there could be some reduction in agricultural land due to development pressure resulting from predicted population growth. Climate Change could also have an effect on growing seasons and disrupt agricultural activities as a result of increased erosion, increased and changing pest loads and a change in the growth of vegetation. Conversely, warmer weather may present opportunities to grow different crops and improve yields. There may also be a change in use of agricultural land if energy crops become viable.

<sup>43</sup> DEFRA (2009) Safeguarding our Soils: A Strategy for England.

<sup>44</sup> <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/43/contents>

<sup>45</sup> Harborough District Council (2008) Contaminated Land Strategy Framework Document [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download\\_info.php?downloadID=169](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=169)

<sup>46</sup> Scott Wilson (2009) Harborough District Council Level 1 Strategic Flood risk Assessment

<sup>47</sup> Defra & Natural England (2013) MAGIC maps [online] available at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>

During the industrial development of settlements within Harborough, factories may have led to land contamination. In particular, the production of town gas often left sites contaminated with waste products such as tar and sulphur. Finally, due to the geology quarrying and extraction sites may subsequently have been used as landfill sites<sup>48</sup>. The Environment Agency and Local Authorities have a defined role in supporting the remediation of contaminated land. The redevelopment of contaminated sites can remove or stabilise soil pollutants and bring these sites back into productive use. An investigation is currently being undertaken by the Council to identify potentially contaminated sites. As stated in the Contaminated Land Strategy, where development on potentially contaminated sites is proposed, developers must carry out a risk assessment. If the risk assessment concludes that clean-up is necessary, the developer is required to prepare a remediation method statement. There are risks to receptors such as: ground water and implications for public health when contaminated sites are being redeveloped. However within the UK there is considerable experience and associated guidance for redeveloping contaminated land. There are therefore numerous examples of environmental improvements due to contaminated land redevelopment.


It is expected that levels of contamination will slowly improve with advances in remediation technologies and increased development pressures bringing sites back into productive use.

---

<sup>48</sup> Harborough District Council (2008) Contaminated Land Strategy Framework Document [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download\\_info.php?downloadID=169](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=169)



Figure 4.3: Agricultural Land Classification in Harborough



#### 4.6 Key Issues & Opportunities for Natural Environment

This table draws together the issues and opportunities for the 'natural environment', established from the contextual review and baseline information presented above. For those factors where it is considered that significant impacts could occur - these will be the focus of the appraisal and have therefore been 'scoped-in'. Conversely, those factors that the Plan is unlikely to have a significant impact on have been 'scoped out'.

Issues and Opportunities	Scoping Decision
<p><i>Geodiversity</i></p> <p>One geologically recognised site exists at Tilton Railway Cutting SSSI about 2km east of Tilton.</p>	<p><b>OUT:</b> Development in the vicinity of Tilton will need to take account of potential impacts on Tilton Railway Cutting SSSI.</p>
<p><i>Biodiversity</i></p> <p>Protecting, maintaining and enhancing wildlife habitats are key objectives at national and local level, with a specific goal to enhance wildlife value and connectivity in the countryside.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> Designated sites should be afforded significant protection from development.</p> <p><b>IN:</b> New development has the potential to affect, species and habitat connectivity.</p>
<p><i>Water Quality</i></p> <p>Industrial and domestic activities and diffuse run-off have the potential to affect the water quality of groundwater and watercourses if not subject to suitable control measures. There are particular issues with levels of phosphates and nitrates to the south of the District where the River Welland and its' tributaries pass through Market Harborough.</p> <p>Increased development may need to be supported by upgrades to the waste water treatment and drainage networks.</p>	<p><b>OUT:</b> Risks of pollution from development activities should be addressed at a project scale, when detailed information concerning risk and mitigation measures is available.</p> <p><b>IN:</b> At a strategic level, the effects of increased development could have significant effects on water quality if required upgrades to the network are not secured in-phase with development and increased demands.</p>
<p><i>Soil Quality</i></p> <p>Safeguarding soil resource is a key objective at the national level, with a specific goal to take sufficient account of significant areas of the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>Development on brownfield sites may pose pollution and health risk due contamination.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> Greenfield development may affect the best and most versatile land.</p> <p><b>OUT:</b> Redevelopment should not be discouraged on brownfield sites and/or on potentially contaminated land. Also, this issue is appropriately addressed at a project scale, when detailed information concerning risk and remediation measures is available.</p>

## 4.7 Sustainability Objectives

The key issues and opportunities that have been 'scoped-in' to the appraisal for 'natural environment' have been used to establish the following sustainability objective(s) and criteria as part of the overall SA Framework (see **Section 11**).

Sustainability Objectives	Guiding Questions / Criteria	Potential Monitoring Indicators*
1) Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity.  2) Protect, enhance and manage environmental resources.	1.1) Would biodiversity interests be affected?  2.1) What could be the effects on the quality of water environments?  2.2) What could be the effects on land quality?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Net contribution towards habitat creation / improvement (hectares).</li> <li>• Net loss of Best and Most versatile Agricultural land.</li> <li>• Effect on condition of SSSIs and overall percentage of SSSI in favourable or unfavourable recovering condition.</li> <li>• Net effect on number and area of Local Wildlife Sites.</li> <li>• Impact on Water Framework Directive compliance.</li> <li>• Hectares of contaminated land brought back into productive use.</li> <li>• The number of new systems or area of land covered by Sustainable Drainage Systems.</li> </ul>

## 5 BUILT AND NATURAL HERITAGE

### 5.1 Introduction

This section sets out the relevant policy framework and baseline position for the following sustainability factors that have been grouped under the theme of 'Built and Natural Heritage'.

- Landscape and settlement character; and
- Heritage assets.

Information has then been assembled to establish the key issues and opportunities that relate to 'built and natural heritage' and which should be a focus for the SA. The chapter concludes by establishing the objectives and indicators that will form the SA Framework.

### 5.2 Landscape and Settlement Character

#### *Contextual review*

The **European Landscape Convention** states that the planning system should protect and enhance valued landscapes. Particular weight is given to 'conserving landscape and scenic beauty'. Local Authorities should adopt policies and measures for the protection, management and planning of all landscapes, whether outstanding or ordinary, that determine the quality of people's living environment<sup>49</sup>.

In the **NPPF**, Authorities are encouraged to 'plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, with inappropriate development not to be approved 'except in very special circumstances'<sup>50</sup>.

The **LL&R Landscape and Woodland Strategy (2001)**<sup>51</sup> sets out objectives and guidelines for individual landscape character areas (LCAs), with the emphasis on conserving and enhancing existing landscape features and increasing woodland cover in ways appropriate to the character of each area.

#### *The current and projected baseline*

Harborough falls broadly within two of Natural England's Landscape Character Areas. The first is 'High Leicestershire', which covers the area to the North and North East of Market Harborough and is characterised by a pattern of small attractive villages, hamlets and farm buildings set within an agricultural landscape.

The western parts of the district fall mostly into the Leicestershire Vales Character Area which is a large, relatively open and uniform landscape interrupted by a range of varied river valleys. It's sense of place is contributed to by its visually dominant settlements and views towards higher ground. The northern parts of the district are typically less tranquil, with a dominance of settlements, whilst the southern areas have a distinctly greater rural feel.

A local character study has been undertaken to build upon these national classifications and has split the district into five broad Local Character Areas (LCAs) as detailed in **Figure 5.1** and **Table 5.1**. There are no National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) within Harborough. However, the District's eastern countryside was designated in the former Structure Plan<sup>52</sup> as being an 'Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside' being characterised by undulating landscapes, stretches of unfenced pasture and cultivated fields, patches of woodland, hedges and hedgerow trees. Most of the villages are compact and found in visually sensitive locations. Church towers and spires also punctuate the skyline and landscape, making a noticeable contribution to the attractiveness of the area.

<sup>49</sup> Council of Europe (2000) The European Landscape Convention [online] available at: <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm>


<sup>50</sup> DCLG (2012) National Planning Policy Framework [online] available at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2116950.pdf>

<sup>51</sup> LCC (2001) Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Landscape and Woodland Strategy [online] available at [http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/countryside/environment\\_management/environment\\_policy\\_statement/landscape\\_woodland\\_strategy.htm](http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/environment/countryside/environment_management/environment_policy_statement/landscape_woodland_strategy.htm)

<sup>52</sup> Leicestershire County Council (2005) Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan 1996-2016 (now expired)



Figure 5.1: Landscape Character Areas<sup>53</sup>



<sup>53</sup> Taken from Harborough District Landscape Character Assessment (2007) available online at: [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/101/district\\_wide\\_landscape\\_character\\_assessment](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/101/district_wide_landscape_character_assessment)

Table 5.1: Harborough Landscape Character Areas

Harborough Landscape Character Areas
<p><b>High Leicestershire LCA:</b> <i>“High Leicestershire LCA is the largest character area and covers the north of the District. [This character area is predominantly rural and] defined by steep valleys and broad ridges containing many woodlands and a network of small villages connected by winding country lanes and gated roads. [...] Other characteristics include undulating fields with a mixture of pasture on higher sloping land and arable farming on lower flatter land. [Lastly,] the urban influence of Leicester encroaches onto the west of the area”.</i></p>
<p><b>Laughton Hills LCA:</b> <i>“[Located between Lutterworth Lowlands LCA and Welland Valley LCA], this area is defined by a distinct ridgeline of rolling hills with steep sides containing a scattering of small villages and hamlets, and areas of woodland. Hill areas are used mainly for grazing although these flatten out to arable areas towards the south of the area. Medium sized fields are defined by mature declining hedgerows with boundary trees throughout the area. Wooded areas are more common and larger towards the north of the character area”.</i></p>
<p><b>Welland Valley LCA:</b> <i>“[Located to the south of the High Leicestershire LCA, this character area] follows the gently meandering course of the River Welland and its wide flat river valley, passing through Market Harborough the largest settlement in the District. [It is] defined by the wide valley form with pasture on the floodplain areas, arable farming on the valley sides [and little tree cover]. Market Harborough is the only urban influence within the character area”.</i></p>
<p><b>Upper Soar LCA:</b> <i>“This area lies on the westernmost boundary of the District [extending outside of the District]. [...] It is characterised as a large wide river basin [of the River Soar] with high ridges. There is a general lack of woodland across the landscape, with predominantly pasture agricultural land use, but urban influences are apparent in particular around Broughton Astley. [Ullesthorpe is a second significant settlement within the character area]”.</i></p>
<p><b>Lutterworth Lowlands LCA:</b> <i>“Lutterworth Lowlands lies to the west of the Laughton Hills and is characterised by an open and relatively flat to gently rolling landscape, of predominantly grazing farmland, and a scattering of small villages and the larger settlements of Kibworth, Fleckney to the north and Lutterworth to the south. Generally there are few large woodland areas although there is some woodland associated with parkland estates towards the north of the area. Open views are available across the flatter expanses of the area”.</i></p>

Source: Atkins (2007) Harborough District Landscape Character Assessment

#### Settlement and/or Ward Review

In 2007, an analysis of local landscapes was undertaken around selected urban fringe/settlement edge areas across the District<sup>54</sup>. The analysis also considered the capacity of the urban fringe/settlement edge areas to accommodate potential change/ development without significant adverse impact on the landscape setting of the settlement.

Further landscape assessments were undertaken in 2009 for the Leicester Principal Urban Area and Market Harborough and in 2011 for Broughton Astley and Lutterworth. These studies established areas that may be suitable, or more sensitive to development. The findings are summarised in **Table 5.2** below.

Harborough Council is commissioning further Landscape Character Assessments and Landscape Capacity studies to establish the baseline position for its six rural centres due to report in Spring 2014 and will be part of the key evidence for the SA and the site appraisal process

<sup>54</sup> Atkins (2007) Harborough District Landscape Character Assessment.

**Table 5.2: Harborough Landscape Character Focus Areas**

Harborough Landscape Character Focus Areas
<p><b>Scraptoft, Bushby and Thurnby Focus Area</b></p> <p><i>“These are three separate but partly coalesced settlements on the eastern fringes of Leicester, which fall within the High Leicestershire LCA. The wider landscape surrounding the settlements can accommodate change but [only] to a limited degree, [being] constrained by [...] the sensitive rural characteristics of the LCA.</i></p> <p><i>Potential development sites are limited to [...] sites directly contiguous with the existing settlement edge. The rolling landform pattern of ridges and valleys of the surrounding countryside determines which sites will not impact in landscape and visual terms. Enclosed and flatter sites adjacent to the existing settlements and roads on the edge of Scraptoft and Bushby are most suitable for potential development.”</i></p> <p><i>A total of 29 different Land Parcels were assessed in this part of the 2009 landscape capacity study in the Leicester PUA<sup>55</sup>. This helped to identify areas with relatively higher landscape capacity to accommodate new development. These included a number of Parcels of land south east of Oadby and in close proximity to the recent residential development in the former Stretton Hall estate, enclosed Land Parcels to the north east of Thurnby and Land Parcels to the north of Scraptoft.</i></p> <p><i>Areas least suitable for development include the steep slopes to the south of Thurnby and Bushby, and small Parcels of land between Scraptoft and Leicester.</i></p>
<p><b>Great Glen Focus Area</b></p> <p><i>“Great Glen is located south of Leicester adjacent to the A6 [between] Leicester [and] Market Harborough. It falls within the High Leicestershire LCA and is vulnerable to development pressure [from] Leicester.</i></p> <p><i>“[There are] potential sites for development situated away from the core of existing central settlement, particularly on radial routes to the north west and north east. Visually prominent slopes on all sides of Great Glen preclude development as this would have a negative effect on adjoining sensitive landscapes. [Development encroachment on higher, steeper slopes must be avoided in order to protect Great Glen’s landscape setting]”.</i></p>
<p><b>Kibworth Focus Area</b></p> <p><i>“This area is located on the A46, between Leicester and Market Harborough, and includes the combined settlement of Kibworth Harcourt to the north, and Kibworth Beauchamp to the south. The northern settlement edge of Kibworth adjoins the High Leicestershire LCA although the village itself falls within the Lutterworth Lowlands LCA. [In landscape terms] the Lutterworth Lowlands LCA is [generally] more able to accommodate development [than the High Leicestershire LCA]”.</i></p> <p><i>“There are few small potential development sites on the northern side of the settlement which fall within the built envelope. On the southern side, sites contiguous to Kibworth are more suitable for development, falling within the higher landscape capacity category of Lutterworth Lowlands with fewer long distance views”.</i></p>

<sup>55</sup> HDC (2009) Leicester PUA Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study  
[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/345/leicester\\_pua\\_landscape\\_character\\_assessment\\_and\\_landscape\\_capacity\\_study](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/345/leicester_pua_landscape_character_assessment_and_landscape_capacity_study)



## Harborough Landscape Character Focus Areas

### Market Harborough Focus Area

*“This [...] area [is] in the south of the District [and] falls within the Welland Valley LCA. [It] is well contained by landform, which constrains potential development in landscape terms. The distinctive ridgeline to the north precludes development, but other sites contiguous to existing development area available to the west and south. These sites are mainly small in size and would need mitigation measures to reduce impacts on local views”.*

*A total of 45 different Land Parcels were assessed as part of the LCA and capacity study undertaken in 2009<sup>56</sup>. This helped to identify areas with higher landscape capacity to accommodate new development. These include several small plots around the northern edge of Market Harborough and around Great Bowden. There are also isolated Land parcels to the east and south west of Market Harborough. However, should a larger, more comprehensive development area be required, the most suitable location in relative terms would appear to be to the south east of Market Harborough, extending the existing urban area along the valley slopes of the River Jordan. Areas least suitable for development include the scarp slopes along the northern edge of Market Harborough, the top of hills located between Market Harborough and Lubenham to the west of the town, and prominent slopes to the south of the town, in Northamptonshire.*

### Lutterworth Focus Area

*“Lutterworth, to the western side of the District, sits within the Lutterworth Lowlands LCA [...]. [Although this LCA] is generally capable of accepting some potential development, [...] the local landscape features constrain development considerably so that potential development is limited to small contiguous sites directly associated with the existing settlement edge”.*

*As part of the LCA and capacity study undertaken in 2011<sup>57</sup>, a total of 29 different land parcels were assessed in the vicinity of Lutterworth. This helped to identify areas with relatively higher landscape capacity to accommodate new development. In relation to Lutterworth these included small to medium parcels to the south west of Lutterworth, on the north eastern boundary of Lutterworth and to the west of Bitteswell. Areas least suitable for development around Lutterworth include areas of land between Lutterworth and Bitteswell.*

### Fleckney Focus Area

*“Falling within the Lutterworth Lowlands LCA, [this area] offers a range of potential development sites. Fleckney is set within higher surrounding land to the west and south, which encloses the settlement from wider external views. All the potential sites for development will, however, require landscape mitigation to fit the sites into their local landscape setting”.*

### Broughton Astley Focus Area

*“[This area is located] within the Upper Soar LCA, [...] in the far west of the District. [It] is contained within generally rising slopes of the wider countryside. Lower and inward facing slopes offer [...] a number of potential sites suitable in landscape terms. [As for the other potential sites identified above, landscape mitigation will be required to integrate the sites into their local landscape setting]”.*

*As part of the LCA study undertaken in 2011, a total of 22 different Land Parcels were assessed in the vicinity of Broughton Astley<sup>49</sup>. This helped to identify areas with relatively higher landscape capacity to accommodate new development. For Broughton Astley, these included parcels immediately to the south and east of Broughton Astley. Areas least suitable for development around Broughton Astley include an area called Clack Hill to the south of the settlement.*

<sup>56</sup> Harborough District Council (2009) Market Harborough Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study. [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200074/planning/52/background\\_reports/23](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200074/planning/52/background_reports/23)

<sup>57</sup> Harborough District Council (2011) Lutterworth and Broughton Astley Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study. [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200074/planning/52/background\\_reports/22](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200074/planning/52/background_reports/22)

Over time, the character of landscapes across the district, particularly around the settlements discussed above could be eroded if significant development takes place within in these areas. The effects of climate change and the loss of tree species due to disease could also see changes to the natural landscape.

Settlements throughout the District contain important ‘townscapes’. This is recognised by the designation of 62 Conservation Areas. Development in these areas should reflect the local value of settlements and the historic layout and urban form.

Each village across the District has its own character, which may be reflected by the density or layout of buildings and open space, the prominent building materials, important landmarks and evidence of historical local economies such as market squares. Important views and vistas are also prominent and would be taken into consideration when sites are being allocated. For example, there are particularly important views from the south into the Nevill Holt Conservation Area, whose parish church spire creates a landmark from miles around. There are also especially fine views into East Norton when seen from the Hallaton Road and the south.

### 5.3 Heritage Assets

#### *Contextual review*

The **NPPF** defines heritage assets as “a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest”. Some heritage assets are designated under legislation such as Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas. Some undesignated heritage assets may also be recognised by Local Planning Authorities as having a degree of local interest or significance.

At the national level, the **Government White Paper: Heritage Protection for the 21st Century** (2007)<sup>58</sup> seeks to put the historic environment at the heart of the planning system.

**The NPPF** says that Authorities should set out in their local plan a ‘positive strategy’ for the ‘conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment’, including those heritage assets that are most at risk. Assets should be recognised as being an ‘irreplaceable resource’ that should be conserved in a ‘manner appropriate to their significance’, taking account of ‘the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits’ that conservation can bring, whilst also recognising the positive contribution new development can make to local character and distinctiveness.

#### *The current and projected baseline*

Harborough contains over 1,400 important features and areas which are protected by statutory designations as detailed in **Table 5.3** and shown in **Figure 5.2**.


There are 62 Conservation Areas throughout the district with Listed Buildings found across the District, with a higher proportion in Market Harborough and Lutterworth. Smaller settlements also often contain one or more Listed Buildings.

A cluster of three historic parks and gardens to the north east of the District occur near to Lowesby and Hungarton making these areas sensitive to development. The gardens of Stanford Hall to the south east of Lutterworth are also designated and present a constraint to development at Swinford and South Kilworth.

As with Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments are scattered across the District on the edge of settlements and within open rural areas.

<sup>58</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/heritage-protection-for-the-21st-century-white-paper>

Figure 5.2: Statutory Designated Heritage Assets in Harborough





**Table 5.3: Designated Heritage Assets in Harborough**

Feature	Number and Sites		
Scheduled Ancient Monuments	66		
Historic Parks & Gardens	Baggrave Hall; Stanford Hall; Quenby Hall; Lowesby Hall; Nevill Holt and Langton Hall.		
Listed Buildings	Grade I: 22	Grade II: 1,142	Grade II*: 107
Conservation Areas	62		
Total	1,405		

Source:<sup>59, 60</sup>

The Grand Union Canal is a particularly important cultural heritage asset for Harborough. It was constructed in the early 1800s to transport heavy goods including coal from the Derbyshire and Nottingham coalfields, and is now part of the network which connects Birmingham to London. The Grade II\* listed Foxton Locks is a prominent feature within the canal CA, which also contains various other listed buildings. This site is also a Scheduled Ancient Monument and has been recently subject to conservation works, including improved access and interpretation<sup>61</sup>.

Via its Heritage at Risk programme, English Heritage publishes a list of sites most at risk of being lost through neglect, decay or inappropriate development<sup>62</sup>. Of the heritage sites identified in **Table 5.3**, the following six are found in the risk register:

- Church of St Andrew in Burton Overy<sup>63</sup> (Listed Building Grade II\*);
- Moated site at Ingarsby in Hungarton (Scheduled Ancient Monument);
- Scraftoft Hall (Listed Building Grade II\*);
- Walls, gate piers and gates of Scraftoft Hall (Listed Building Grade II\*);
- Church of St Peter in Tilton on the Hill (Listed Building Grade I);
- Withcote Hall (Listed Building Grade II\*).

In addition to designated heritage assets, there is also a wealth of non-designated assets that have local importance, especially when considered together with other features in an area.

The 'setting' of individual heritage assets is also important as it sets the context for their appreciation and conservation. This means that changes to non-designated buildings and their surroundings can also have negative or positive effects on heritage assets.

Planning policies are in place at a national and local level that protect and enhance heritage assets. Therefore, it is unlikely that significant harm would occur to heritage features as a future baseline. There could also be some improvement should new development restore heritage features in poor condition. However, the need to develop land for housing and employment uses could have a cumulative impact on the setting of heritage assets across the District. This could have a negative effect on the baseline position.

<sup>59</sup> English Heritage (2013) Heritage Register for HDC [online] available at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/advancedsearch.aspx>

<sup>60</sup> HDC (2007) Conservation Area Character Statements Review [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/2536/2007\\_conservation\\_area\\_character\\_statements\\_review](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/2536/2007_conservation_area_character_statements_review)

<sup>61</sup> UE Associates (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the Harborough Core Strategy – Baseline Data

<sup>62</sup> English Heritage (2013) Heritage at Risk Register [online] available at: <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/heritage-at-risk/>

<sup>63</sup> Burton Overy Parish Council state that investment that has occurred in St Andrews Church, which ought to ensure that this heritage asset is at lower risk.

## 5.4 Key Issues for Built and Natural Heritage

The table below draws together the issues and opportunities for ‘built and natural environment’; established from the contextual review and baseline information presented above. For those factors where it is considered that significant impacts could occur - these will be the focus of the appraisal and have therefore been ‘scoped-in’. Conversely, those factors that the Plan is unlikely to have a significant impact on have been ‘scoped out’.

Issues and Opportunities	Scoping Decision
<p><i>Landscape and settlement Character</i></p> <p>The District’s eastern countryside is recognised as being of high quality and particularly attractive.</p> <p>Local landscape features such as hedgerows, open space, trees and field boundaries make certain parts of some settlement edges more sensitive to development.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> New development has a potential to erode the District’s landscape character and quality.</p> <p><b>IN:</b> New development has a potential to erode (or enhance) a settlement’s character and quality.</p>
<p><i>Heritage Assets</i></p> <p>There are over 1,400 designated heritage assets located across the District and further features of local value (i.e. non-designated heritage assets). Development has the potential to affect the condition, setting, and access to these assets either positively or negatively.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> New development has a potential to harm heritage sites directly or indirectly by affecting their historic setting.</p>

## 5.5 Sustainability Objectives

The key issues and opportunities that have been ‘scoped-in’ to the appraisal for ‘built and natural heritage’ have been used to establish the following sustainability objective(s) and criteria as part of the overall SA Framework (see **Section 11**).

Sustainability Objectives	Guiding Questions / Criteria	Potential Monitoring Indicators
<p>3) Protect, enhance and manage the character and distinctiveness of the District’s settlements and their surrounding landscapes.</p>	<p>3.1) How could proposals affect the character of settlements and/or surrounding landscapes?</p> <p>3.2) Could proposals hinder or assist efforts to maintain and enhance features (designated and non-designated) of historic, cultural or archaeological interest?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of heritage features ‘at risk’.</li> <li>- Number of development proposals with significant adverse effects upon landscape qualities.</li> <li>- Development granted contrary to heritage policies.</li> <li>- Percentage of people that think the character of their neighbourhood has improved / stayed the same / declined.</li> </ul>

## 6 HEALTH AND WELLBEING

### 6.1 Introduction

This section sets out the relevant policy framework and baseline position for the following sustainability factors that have been grouped under the theme of 'health and wellbeing'.

- Health and wellbeing;
- Deprivation and community cohesion;
- Accessibility and transport;
- Air quality; and
- Green infrastructure and recreation.

Information has then been assembled to establish the key health and wellbeing' issues and opportunities and which should be a focus for the SA. The chapter concludes by establishing the objectives and indicators that will form the SA Framework.

### 6.2 Health and Wellbeing

#### *Contextual review*

The **NPPF** identifies the importance of the social role of the planning system, which is defined as 'supporting vibrant and healthy communities', with a 'core planning principle' being to 'take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all'. The NPPF also outlines that high quality open spaces should be protected or their loss mitigated, unless a lack of need is established. Planning policies should be based on robust and up to date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision.

**Fair Society, Healthy Lives ('The Marmot Review')**<sup>64</sup> investigated health inequalities in England and the actions needed in order to tackle them. Subsequently, a supplementary report was prepared providing additional evidence relating to spatial planning and health on the basis that there is: '*overwhelming evidence that health and environmental inequalities are inexorably linked and that poor environments contribute significantly to poor health and health inequalities*'.

To ensure that the built environment promotes health and reduces inequalities for all local populations there is a need to:

- Fully integrate the planning, transport, housing, environmental and health systems to address the social determinants of health in each locality;
- Prioritise policies and interventions that both reduce health inequalities and mitigate climate change by improving active travel; good quality open and green spaces; the quality of food in local areas; and the energy efficiency of housing; and
- Support developments which provides high quality social infrastructure, including education, skills and sports facilities.

**The Public Health Outcomes Framework for England 2013-2016** builds upon these principles and seeks to achieve two key outcomes:

- *Increased healthy life expectancy* - Taking account of health quality as well as length of life.
- Reduced differences in life expectancy and healthy life expectancy between communities - Through greater improvements in more disadvantaged communities.

The public health role now resides within local authorities supported by Health and Well-Being Boards and informed by Joint Strategic Need Assessment's and Joint Wellbeing Strategies. **Leicestershire's Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2013-16**<sup>65</sup> sets out the following priorities for improving local health and wellbeing:

- Getting it right from childhood;
- Managing the shift to early intervention and prevention;

<sup>64</sup> The Marmot Review (2011) The Marmot Review: Implications for Spatial Planning [online] available at: <http://www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/live/12111/53895/53895.pdf>

<sup>65</sup> Leicestershire County Council (2012) Leicestershire's Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2013-16 [online] available at: <http://www.leics.gov.uk/hwstrategy.pdf>



- Supporting the ageing population;
- Tackling the wider determinants of health; and
- Improving mental health and wellbeing.

The Harborough Housing Requirements Study (2013)<sup>66</sup> recommends provision of 440 homes per annum over the period 2011-31. However, the Strategic Housing Market Needs Assessment for Leicestershire is currently being updated. The findings will be presented in the Scoping report when they become available.

#### *The current and projected baseline*

Health service provision in Harborough reflects the rural nature of the District with smaller health facilities located in rural areas, and a greater concentration of services in Market Harborough.

There are two small hospitals in Market Harborough (St Luke's Hospital and Market Harborough and District Hospital). Both of these facilities offer a limited scope of healthcare services, so there is a degree of reliance on hospital provision from Leicester and Kettering<sup>67</sup>.

As documented in Appendix 2 of the Adopted Core Strategy (Infrastructure Schedule), the provision and quality of healthcare facilities is mixed across the district. The Primary Care Trust has indicated where issues around capacity, workload and standards exist. A score for each facility was generated, ranging from red (most development needs), deep amber, amber and green (least development needs). **Table 6.1** below reproduces this assessment.

It is clear that the facilities in the rural areas are generally in need of greater development compared to the larger towns of Lutterworth and Market Harborough. Kibworth and Hunsbonds Bosworth in particular would struggle to support additional demand.

**Table 6.1: Healthcare development needs**<sup>68</sup>

Area	Practice	Development needs
<b>Market Harborough</b>	Market Harborough Medical Practice	Light amber
	Two Shires	Green
<b>Leicester PUA</b>	-	To be determined
<b>Rural</b>	Kibworth Health Centre	Red
	The Old School Surgery, Kibworth	Deep amber
	Great Glen	Deep amber
	High Street, Fleckney	Light amber
	Ullesthorpe	Light amber
	Billesdon	Deep amber
	Husbands Bosworth	Red
<b>Lutterworth /</b>	Lutterworth Health Centre	Green
	Wycliff Medical Centre, Lutterworth	Green
<b>Broughton Astley</b>	Broughton Astley	Deep amber

<sup>66</sup> GL Hearn Ltd (2013) Harborough Housing Requirements Study [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/1160/harborough\\_housing\\_requirements\\_study-march\\_2013](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/1160/harborough_housing_requirements_study-march_2013)

<sup>67</sup> UE Associates (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the Harborough Core Strategy – Baseline Data

<sup>68</sup> <http://www.harborough.gov.uk/corestrategy>

Despite the need for health care facilities to be developed in certain parts of the District, the Harborough population fares well in most categories of health issues (see **Table 6.2**). In the 2011 Census, 85.2% of people reported they were in 'good' or 'very good' health, with only 3.5% reporting that they were in 'bad' or 'very bad' health<sup>69</sup>. In addition, 14.6% of people reported being limited in day-to-day activities<sup>70</sup>, which is lower than the England average at 17.6%.

The Harborough Health Profile (2013)<sup>71</sup> shows that the health of the people of Harborough is generally better than the England average. Life expectancy for both men and women is lower than the England average and increasing. However there are notable differences between areas; life expectancy is 5 years lower for men in the most deprived areas of Harborough than in the least deprived areas. In addition, all causes of mortality rates have fallen over the last 10 years, including early death rates from heart disease and stroke and from cancer.

Teenage pregnancy, low birth-weights and infant deaths are lower than national averages and are improving. On the other hand, levels of childhood obesity, though lower than the England average, continue to rise in Harborough despite national and local strategies aimed at increasing knowledge and encouraging healthy lifestyles. Indicators of adult health and lifestyles are also better than the England average and are generally improving.

Priorities in Harborough include healthy weight, mental health and emotional wellbeing, housing and accommodation needs and health, smoking, and alcohol and substance misuse.

The trends identified in **Table 6.2** below suggest that in the future, health is expected to remain generally good in Harborough. However, access to health facilities is poor from certain rural areas. With a growing and aging population, these issues could be exacerbated unless transport links are improved or enhanced / new facilities are provided to support rural communities.

*Table 6.2: Health in Harborough*

Domain	Indicator	Harborough	National Comparator	Trends
Life Expectancy	Male (2009-11)	80.3	78.9	2004-06: 79.8
	Female (2009-11)	84.8	82.9	2004-06: 82.3
Infants and children health	Teenage pregnancy (under 18 conception rate per 1,000 females, 2009-11)	15.6	34	2004-06: 19.8
	Low Birth-weight (% , 2007)	5.9	7.2	2003-05: 6.3
	Infant Mortality (rate per 1,000; 2009-11)	2	2.5	2003-05: 3.1
	Childhood Obesity (% of children classified as obese at year 6, 2013)	13.4	19.2	2006-07: 7.8
Adults health and lifestyle	Adults smoking (% , 2011-12)	15	20	2003-05: 18.2
	Healthy eating adults (% , 2006-08)	33.9	28.7	2003-05: 29.7

<sup>69</sup> ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Census 2011 Key Figures for Health and Care [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadKeyFigures.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=6&q=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1385053112703&enc=1>

<sup>70</sup> ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Census 2011 Long-Term Health Problem or Disability [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=6&q=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1385053112703&enc=1&dsFamilyId=2504>

<sup>71</sup> Public Health England, (2013). Harborough Health Profile 2013 [online] available at <http://www.apho.org.uk/resource/item.aspx?RID=127007>

Domain	Indicator	Harborough	National Comparator	Trends
	Physically active adults (% of adults achieving at least 150 mins physical activity per week, 2012)	62.8	56	2005-06: 13
	Obese adults (% , 2006-08)	23	24.2	2003-05: 22.8%
Diseases and poor health	Limiting Long-Term Illness (LLTI) (% of people reporting day-to-activities limited a lot, a little or not limited, 2011)	A lot: 6 A little: 8.6 Not limited: 85.4	A lot: 8.3 A little: 9.3 Not limited: 82.4	2001: 13.7% with a LLTI
	Early deaths due to heart disease and stroke (directly age standardised rate per 100,000 population aged under 75, 2009-11)	45.1	60.9	2004-06: 52
	Early deaths due to cancer (directly age standardised rate per 100,000 population aged under 75, 2009-11)	84.7	108.1	2004-06: 87
	Hospital stays for alcohol related harm (directly age sex standardised rate per 100,000 population, 2010-11)	1383	1895	2006-07: 137
Other	Good Health (% of population that consider themselves to have good (incl. very good), fairly good health or bad/not good (incl. very bad) health, 2011)	85.2% good 11.4% fairly good 3.5% bad	81.4% good 13.1% fairly good 5.4%bad	2003: 73.2% good 20.6% fairly good 6.2% not good

Source: ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Census 2011 Key Figures for Health and Care; Public Health England – Harborough Health Profile 2013 and Public Health England – Harborough Health Profile 2008

### 6.3 Deprivation and Community Cohesion

#### *Contextual review*

**The Public Health Outcomes Framework for England 2013-2016** seeks to reduced differences in life expectancy and healthy life expectancy between communities; particularly those where deprivation is an issue.

The briefing paper, **The Rural Big Society** (2011)<sup>72</sup> makes a series of recommendations for action to tackle rural disadvantage including:

- Making better use of Church of England assets to better support rural communities;
- Developing models of community energy generation suitable for rural areas;
- Developing rural access to next-generation broadband; *and*
- Capturing a higher amount of revenue from CIL and New Homes Bonus for rural communities.

**The National Rural Proofing Guidelines**<sup>73</sup> set out some important principles and actions for ensuring that rural areas are not disadvantaged including:

- Looking for alternative ways of delivering services in rural areas;
- Reducing the need to travel;
- Better integration and improvement of transport links;
- Make use of rural networks and meeting points such as post offices, parish halls, etc;
- Address the needs of smaller businesses;
- Use small area based data to identify issues and impacts; and
- Engage with rural stakeholders to identify the impact of proposals.

**DCLG Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2012)** states that Local Plans should seek to treat travellers in a fair and equal manner that facilitates their traditional and nomadic way of life, whilst also respecting the interest of the settled community, through promoting more private traveller site provision, whilst recognising that there will be those that cannot afford private sites; enabling the provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure; and having due regard for the protection of local amenity and environment<sup>74</sup>.

**The Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment refresh (2013)**<sup>75</sup> sets the evidence for the need to provide provision of formal pitches for Gypsy and Traveller groups. For Harborough, this was determined at 27 pitches, plus 5 transit pitches and 2 plots for show people. A failure to meet this need would have a negative effect on levels of deprivation and may have adverse implications on community cohesion.

#### *The current and projected baseline*

In general, deprivation in Harborough is low. Based on the 2010 Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)<sup>76</sup>, the District is ranked as the 35<sup>th</sup> least deprived Local Authority (out of 354) in England and is the least deprived in Leicestershire. However the 2010 IMD suggests that Harborough is more deprived than it was in 2007, losing 25 places relative to all other local authorities.

Comparison of Harborough's Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) with the rest of England further reveals that<sup>77,78</sup>:

<sup>72</sup> The Rural Development Commission (2011) .The Rural Big Society.

<sup>73</sup> DEFRA (2013) National Rural Proofing Guidelines v July 2013 [online] available at:

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/200093/rural-proofing-pamphlet.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/200093/rural-proofing-pamphlet.pdf)

<sup>74</sup> DCLG (2012) Planning policy for traveller sites [online] available at:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2113371.pdf>

<sup>75</sup> De Montfort University(2013) The Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment refresh (2013)

[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200074/planning/52/background\\_reports/7](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200074/planning/52/background_reports/7)

<sup>76</sup> Research and Information Team, Leicestershire County Council (2011) Indices of Deprivation Headline Results for Leicestershire

<sup>77</sup> DCLG (2011) English Indices of Deprivation 2010: Overall [online] available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/english-indices-of-deprivation-2010>

<sup>78</sup> Leicestershire Statistics and Research Online (2013) Indices of Deprivation 2010, 2007 & 2004 – Interactive Reports – Harborough [online] available at <http://www.lsr-online.org/static/lsr/atlas/DeprivationHarborough2010/atlas.html>

- 38% of Harborough’s Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) fall within the 10% least deprived in England. These are concentrated in the centre and north western tip of Harborough and to the north of Market Harborough (see **Figure 6.1**).
- Only one LSOA, located in Market Harborough (Welland Ward), is ranked within the 50% most deprived in England.
- The rest are ranked within the 50% least deprived of England.

**Table 6.3** provides the ranking of the five most deprived LSOAs in the District.


*Table 6.3: Five most deprived LSOAs in Harborough*

LSOA Name	Ward	National Rank*		Trends (2007 data)	
Market Harborough – Welland Park	Welland	10,844	Within 50% most deprived	10,168	Within 50% most deprived
Market Harborough Coventry Road	Logan	16,402	Within 50% least deprived	17,996	Within 50% least deprived
Lubenham	Lubenham	17,314	Within 50% least deprived	23,662	Within 50% least deprived
Market Harborough East & Welland Industrial Estate	Great Bowden and Arden	17,341	Within 50% least deprived	18,522	Within 50% least deprived
The Langtons	Kibworth	19,616	Within 50% least deprived	19,670	Within 50% least deprived

\*Where 1 is most deprived and 32,482 is least deprived

Source: LSRO (2013) Indices of Deprivation 2010, 2007 & 2004 – Interactive Reports – Harborough

**Figure 6.1:** Index of Multiple Deprivation in Harborough: Overall Scores



Source: LSRO (2013) Indices of Deprivation 2010, 2007 & 2004 – Interactive Reports – Harborough




Harborough scores comparatively well on each deprivation domain, except for the Barriers to Housing and Services domain, where the District experiences significant levels of deprivation<sup>79</sup>. Five of Harborough's LSOAs are ranked within the 10% most deprived in England for this category<sup>80</sup>, three of which are also ranked within the ten most deprived in Leicestershire<sup>81</sup>. **Table 6.4** below provides details on these five LSOAs and **Figure 6.2** depicts the extent of deprivation for the Barriers to Housing and Services domain in the District. While **Table 6.5** presents the levels of deprivation in Harborough in the context of East Midlands and England.

**Table 6.4:** Barriers to Housing and Deprivation – Five Most Deprived LSOAs in Harborough

LSOA Name	Ward	National Rank	Trends (2007 data)		
Tilton, Hungarton & Tugby	Tilton	555	Within 10% most deprived	679	Within 10% most deprived
Foxton, Saddington & Theddingworth	Lubenham	1,354	Within 10% most deprived	2,124	Within 10% most deprived
Peatling, Bruntingthorpe, Kimcote & Walton	Peatling	1,393	Within 10% most deprived	2,423	Within 10% most deprived
Greater Billesdon	Billesdon	2,285	Within 10% most deprived	1,738	Within 10% most deprived
The Langtons	Kibworth	2,819	Within 10% most deprived	1,818	Within 10% most deprived

Source: LSRO (2013) Indices of Deprivation 2010, 2007 & 2004 – Interactive Reports – Harborough

**Figure 6.2:** Index of Multiple Deprivation in Harborough: Barriers to Housing and Services



Source: LSRO (2013) Indices of Deprivation 2010, 2007 & 2004 – Interactive Reports – Harborough

<sup>79</sup> Leicestershire Statistics and Research Online (2013) Indices of Deprivation 2010, 2007 & 2004 – Interactive Reports – Harborough [online] available at <http://www.lsr-online.org/static/lsr/atlas/DeprivationHarborough2010/atlas.html>

<sup>80</sup> Leicestershire Statistics and Research Online (2013) Indices of Deprivation 2010, 2007 & 2004 – Interactive Reports – Harborough [online] available at <http://www.lsr-online.org/static/lsr/atlas/DeprivationHarborough2010/atlas.html>

<sup>81</sup> Research and Information Team, Leicestershire County Council (2011) Indices of Deprivation Headline Results for Leicestershire



**Table 6.5: Deprivation in Harborough**

Feature	Indicator	Current Data	East Midlands	England	Trends
IMD	Rank of average score (2010)	319 (out of 354)	-	-	2007: 344
	Wards within 50% most deprived in England (2010)	Welland	-	-	2007: Welland
Unemployment	Percentage of working age population unemployed (2011)	2.5%	3.3%	3.4%	2001: 1.76%
Affordable Housing	Annual shortfall of affordable housing per year (2011)	264	No data available	No data available	2007: 144
Homelessness	Percentage of statutory homeless households (2011)	4%	4.4%	4.7%	2001: 9%
Benefits	Percentage of people of working age claiming a key benefit (2010)	8%	15%	15%	2001: 7%

Source: LSRO (2013) Indices of Deprivation 2010, 2007 & 2004 – Interactive Reports<sup>82</sup>  
 ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Economic Activity 2001 & 2011<sup>83</sup> – Homelessness (2001 – 2011)<sup>84</sup>  
 – Benefits Data Indicator: Working Age Client Group (2001 – 2011)<sup>85</sup> HDC – 2007<sup>86</sup> & 2011<sup>87</sup> AMRs

The trend data suggests that levels of deprivation remain low in the District. The distribution of deprivation also remains the same, with only Welland Ward falling within the 50% most deprived areas in England in 2010.

Whilst Harborough is ranked as more deprived in 2010 compared to 2007, it is not a significant difference. Unemployment also remains under the East Midlands and national average suggesting that deprivation unlikely to become a key issue for the District within the plan period.

<sup>82</sup> Leicestershire Statistics and Research Online (2013) Indices of Deprivation 2010, 2007 & 2004 – Interactive Reports – Harborough [online] available at <http://www.lsr-online.org/static/lsr/atlas/DeprivationHarborough2010/atlas.html>

<sup>83</sup> ONS (2011) Neighbourhood Statistics – Work Deprivation – Economic Activity 2001 & Economic Activity 2011 [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadDatasetList.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&q=6444516&i=1001x1003&m=0&r=1&s=1385912277602&enc=1&domainId=9>

<sup>84</sup> ONS (2011) Neighbourhood Statistics – Homelessness (2001 – 2011) [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=9&q=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1385912868477&enc=1&dsFamilyId=1623>

<sup>85</sup> ONS (2011) – Neighbourhood Statistics – Benefits Data Indicator: Working age Client Group (2001 – 2011) [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=9&q=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1385912868477&enc=1&dsFamilyId=1623>

<sup>86</sup> HDC (2007) 2007 Annual Monitoring Report

<sup>87</sup> HDC (2011) 2011 Annual Monitoring Report

## 6.4 Accessibility and Transport

### *Contextual review*

The **NPPF** states that the transport system should be balanced ‘in favour of sustainable transport’, with developments to be located and designed to facilitate these modes of travel, in order to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure and other activities. Planning policies should also aim for ‘a balance of land uses’ and wherever practical, key facilities should be located within walking distance of most properties.

Higher levels of walking and cycling could reduce congestion, improve local environmental quality, improve personal health and reduce transport-related CO<sub>2</sub> emissions<sup>88</sup>. Plans should ensure that local, strategic policies support and encourage both walking and cycling<sup>89</sup>.

Local plans should also encourage transport solutions that support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion; notably through concentrating new developments in existing cities and large towns and/or ensuring they are well served by public transport.

The **Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 3 (LLTP3) 2011-2026**<sup>90</sup> seeks to develop a transport system that:

- Supports a prosperous economy and provides successfully for population growth;
- Is efficient, resilient, sustainable, well management and well maintained;
- Helps to reduce the carbon footprint of Leicestershire;
- Is accessible and integrated and helps promote equality of opportunity for all residents;
- Improves the safety, health and security of the residents; and
- Helps to improve the quality of life for the residents and makes Leicestershire a more attractive place to live, work and visit.

There are no major transport schemes identified within the Harborough District area, however various road improvement schemes are identified;

- Speed limitation areas at schools within Kibworth, Langton, Market Harborough, Ullesthorpe;
- Cycle and footway improvements at various locations; and
- Various local safety schemes including signalling improvements.

**Leicestershire’s Draft Carbon Reduction Strategy 2013-2020**<sup>91</sup> also seeks to ensure that carbon emissions from transport do not exceed current levels over the life of the strategy, irrespective of growth in net travel.

### *The current and projected baseline*

Located at the heart of England, Harborough has excellent transport links. The M1, located to the east of the District, provides a north-south link connecting Harborough with Felixstowe, Birmingham, London and Edinburgh. The M6/A14, located to the south, provides a link to the West Midlands and East Anglia. The Districts other main roads include the A6, the A47, the A508, the A4304 and the A5199, which link Harborough’s main settlements with Leicester, Northampton, Kettering and Corby<sup>92,93</sup>.

The Midland Main Line railway runs through Market Harborough with direct links to London, Leicester, Nottingham, Derby and Sheffield. The Cross-County Cambridge to Birmingham line is also available via Oakham, Melton Mowbray and Leicester outside of the District. Harborough also has proximity to regional airports, with Birmingham Airport and Nottingham East Midlands Airport both located approximately 45 miles away from Market Harborough<sup>94,95</sup>.

<sup>88</sup> Lancaster University, University of Leeds & Oxford Brookes University (2011) Understanding Walking and Cycling: Summary of Key Findings and Recommendations [online] available at: [http://www.its.leeds.ac.uk/fileadmin/user\\_upload/UWCRptSept2011.pdf](http://www.its.leeds.ac.uk/fileadmin/user_upload/UWCRptSept2011.pdf)

<sup>89</sup> National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2012) Walking and cycling: local measures to promote walking and cycling as forms of travel or recreation, Public Health Guidance PH41 [online] available at: <http://guidance.nice.org.uk/PH41>

<sup>90</sup> LCC (2011) Local Transport Planning in Leicestershire 2011-2026 - Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 3 [online] available at [http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/highways/transport\\_plans\\_policies/ltp/current\\_transport\\_plans.htm](http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/highways/transport_plans_policies/ltp/current_transport_plans.htm)

<sup>91</sup> LCC (2013) Leicestershire Together - Draft Carbon Reduction Strategy 2013-2020 [online] available at [http://www.leicestershiretogether.org/crs\\_consultation\\_draft\\_vfinal.pdf](http://www.leicestershiretogether.org/crs_consultation_draft_vfinal.pdf)

<sup>92</sup> UE Associates (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the Harborough Core Strategy – Baseline Data

<sup>93</sup> HDC (2013) 2013 Air Quality Progress Report for Harborough District Council

<sup>94</sup> UE Associates (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the Harborough Core Strategy – Baseline Data

Despite these good road, rail and air links, rural accessibility is an issue in Harborough, as reflected in the relatively poor IMD scores for the category “Barriers to Housing and Services”. This is mainly due to the disparate nature of settlements and to the difficulty of providing a frequent and economical public transport network<sup>96</sup>. Whilst both Lutterworth and Market Harborough have frequent bus services, including between each other and to surrounding towns such as Leicester and Hinckley, elsewhere buses are often infrequent with smaller settlements relying on community transport services<sup>97,98</sup>.

Due the District’s relative affluence and rural nature, household car ownership in Harborough is higher (88.2%) than regional (77.9%) and national (74.2%) averages<sup>99</sup>.

**Table 6.6: Car Ownership in Harborough**

Feature	Indicator	2010 Data	East Midlands	England	Trends (2001 Data)
Car Ownership	Percentage of households with access to a car or van	88.2%	77.9%	74.2%	83.75%

Source: ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Car or Van Availability, 2011<sup>100</sup>

Travel to work data (**Table 6.7**) reveals a higher proportion of the population travelling to work by car than regional and national averages and a lower proportion of the population travelling by public transport, cycling or walking<sup>101</sup>.

**Table 6.7: Travel to Work in Harborough**<sup>102</sup>

Feature	Indicator	2011 data	East Midlands	England	Trends (2001)
Travel to Work	Percentage of working population who usually travel to work by train	1.41%	0.86%	3.46%	1.28%
	Percentage of working population who usually travel to work by bus, mini bus or coach	1.43%	3.96%	4.85%	2.14%
	Percentage of working population who usually travel to work by driving a car or van	50.30%	42.23%	36.90%	65.76%
	Percentage of working population who usually travel to work by bicycle	1.47%	1.77%	1.91%	2.76%
	Percentage of working population who usually travel to work by foot	6.88%	7.09%	6.95%	9.41%

Source: ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Method of Travel to Work, 2011<sup>103</sup> & Travel to Work, 2001<sup>104</sup>

<sup>95</sup> HDC (2013) 2013 Air Quality Progress Report for Harborough District Council

<sup>96</sup> UE Associates (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the Harborough Core Strategy – Baseline Data

<sup>97</sup> HDC (2013) Bus Services [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200078/public\\_transport/248/transport/3](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200078/public_transport/248/transport/3) )

<sup>98</sup> HDC (2013) Community Mini Buses [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200078/public\\_transport/248/transport/5](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200078/public_transport/248/transport/5)

<sup>99</sup> ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Car or Van Availability, 2011 [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=62&g=6444516&i=1001x1003x1032x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1385911981243&enc=1&dsFamilyId=2483>

<sup>100</sup> ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Car or Van Availability, 2011 [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=62&g=6444516&i=1001x1003x1032x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1385911981243&enc=1&dsFamilyId=2483>


<sup>101</sup> ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Method of Travel to Work, 2011 [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=7&g=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1386066071480&enc=1&dsFamilyId=2567>

<sup>102</sup> NB: Modes of travel do not add up to 100% as a proportion of the working age population are not working or working from home.

Just over half of Harborough's working population (51% or 20,294) (2001 data) commute outside of the District for work. **Figure 6.3** shows the main destinations of these commuters, most popular being Leicester City and Blaby District respectively with 34% and 13% of commuters. Some 21% of travel is to areas outside of Leicestershire, including London, Coventry and Melton (not shown on **Figure 6.3**). Out-commuting is partly balanced by 13,142 persons travelling into Harborough for work, mainly coming from Blaby, Leicester City, Hinckley and Bosworth and Kettering<sup>105</sup>.

Due to the rural character of Harborough, accessibility is likely to remain a critical issue. Nevertheless, some improvement in road travel is expected through the implementation of the Leicestershire Local Transport Plan (LLTP3). As of April 2013, current LTP3 projects in Harborough include the resurfacing and repair of several Harborough's principle roads such as the A4304 Coventry Road and A4303 Lutterworth Road, and upgrades to the M1 Junction 20 roundabout. The LLTP3 also supports the delivery of a Strategic Development Area to the north west of Market Harborough, a project development which emerged from the Core Strategy process. Modal shift to cycling and walking would also be encouraged, although this would be difficult for some rural settlements.

*Figure 6.3: Journey Destination for Work*



*Annual Monitoring Report  
NB: Data presented is from 2001.*

<sup>103</sup> ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Method of Travel to Work, 2011 [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=7&g=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1386066071480&enc=1&dsFamilyId=2567>

<sup>104</sup> ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Travel to Work, 2001 [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&g=6444516&i=1001x1003x1006&k=average+distance&m=0&r=1&s=1385984489473&enc=1&domainId=58&dsFamilyId=283>

<sup>105</sup> HDC (2011) 2011 Annual Monitoring Report [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download\\_info.php?downloadID=43](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=43)

The Council is currently preparing a series of settlement profiles that will help to identify how key settlements in the District perform as 'sustainable places'. This study will determine how each settlement scores against the following headline themes:


- A. Active with a strong sense of community
- B. Well run and well represented
- C. Well connected (in terms of transport links)
- D. Well serviced (by facilities and services)
- E. Environmentally sensitive
- F. Well designed with appropriate housing and open spaces
- G. Thriving with a successful local economy.
- H. Fair (i.e. equality and diversity)

The information gathered as part of this study will be utilised to inform the appraisal processes when determining the impact of additional development within and between various settlements. Once available, the key messages from these studies will be included as part of an update to the scope of the SA.

**Figure 6.4** illustrates the distribution of basic services and facilities across the District. This will be updated following the settlement profiles study that is currently being undertaken by Harborough District Council. The study is anticipated in Spring 2014.



Figure 6.4: Access to services and facilities in Harborough District



## 6.5 Air Quality

### *Contextual review*

The **NPPF** identifies that there is a need to: prevent 'both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability'.

The **NPPF** identifies that 'Planning policies should sustain compliance with and contribute towards EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and the cumulative impacts on air quality from individual sites in local areas. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas is consistent with the local air quality action plan'.

The **UK Air Quality Strategy (2007)**<sup>106</sup>, sets out air quality objectives and policy options to further improve air quality in the UK. This is supplemented by more recent guidance on how air pollution and climate objectives can be realised together through an integrated policy approach.

The **2013 Lutterworth Air Quality Management Area Action Plan Framework for Harborough District Council**<sup>107</sup> recognises it is unlikely that major road building schemes will obtain funding in the current economic climate and therefore proposes to rely on traffic management and road layout modification schemes. It also sets out a methodology to assess the impacts of those schemes.

### *The current and projected baseline*

The Environment Act (1995) set out a procedure for the review and assessment of air quality, to be undertaken by Local Authorities. The process consists of various stages of review and assessment examining specific pollutants. The First Stage Review and Assessment is a screening exercise to identify if there are any particular problems in a Local Authority Area. The second and third stages require progressively more detailed investigations to determine if the National Air Quality Strategy (NAQS) Objectives will be met in the local authority's area.

A First Stage Review and Assessment was undertaken for Harborough following the UK Air Quality Strategy which was published in 1997. This assessment found that elevated levels of carbon monoxide, lead, particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) might be present in Harborough. Consequently, a Second and Third Stage Review (2001) were undertaken which concluded that, with the exception of NO<sub>2</sub>, all of the national air quality objectives were likely to be met. An Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) was declared in July 2001 for the Market Street area of Lutterworth Town Centre due to an anticipated exceedence of the NO<sub>2</sub> objective. A Stage 4 assessment (which is required when an AQMA is declared) confirmed that the source of the problem was traffic related<sup>108</sup>.

An updated air quality assessment undertaken in 2009 found that air quality in Harborough is very good with the exception of Lutterworth, where it exceeds the national air quality objective for NO<sub>2</sub>. Following further detailed assessments of Lutterworth in 2010 and 2012, the AQMA was extended in 2012 south towards Stoney Hollow Street (see **Figure 6.5**). Results from these assessments revealed that:

- There have been exceedences of the Annual Mean Air Quality Standard for NO<sub>2</sub> within the AQMA for the last 9 years
- There are approximately 15,000 vehicle movements through the AQMA on a daily basis:
  - 85% made by cars, contributing 45-50% of NO<sub>2</sub>;
  - 6% made by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), contributing 40-45% of NO<sub>2</sub>;

<sup>106</sup> Defra (2007) Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland [online] available at: <http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/quality/air/air-quality/approach/>


<sup>107</sup> HDC (2013) 2013 Air Quality Progress Report for Harborough District Council

<sup>108</sup> HDC (2013) 2013 Air Quality Progress Report for Harborough District Council

- 8% made by Light Goods Vehicles (LGVs); and
- 1% by buses and motorcycles<sup>109</sup>.

Air quality is likely to remain a major issue within Lutterworth town centre. However, some improvement may be expected resulting from future traffic management and road layout modification schemes prioritised by the Lutterworth AQMA Action Plan.

Figure 6.5: Lutterworth AQMA Boundary, 2013



Source: HDC (2013) 2013 Air Quality Progress Report for Harborough District Council

<sup>109</sup> HDC (2013) 2013 Air Quality Progress Report for Harborough District Council



## 6.6 Green Infrastructure and recreation

### *Contextual review*

The **NPPF** recognises that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities.

**Natural England's Accessible Natural Green space Standards**<sup>110</sup> recommend that people living in towns and cities should have access to natural green space of at least 2ha within 300m (or 5 minute walk) from home.

**The Leicestershire and Rutland Sports Facilities Strategic Framework 2010-2013**<sup>111</sup> sets out a range of high level aims for the delivery and management of sporting activities across the county. Of particular importance to the local plan is the need to ensure that '*Sports facilities are high quality, accessible and effectively programmed*'.

The **Harborough Play Strategy 2007-2012**<sup>112</sup> seeks "to support the children and young people of Harborough District, and to improve and develop the opportunity for play. To enable a choice of where, when and how to play in a safe and secure environment".

### *The current and projected baseline*

As a predominantly rural district with low population density, Harborough has a wide diversity of open space (including parks and gardens, local wildlife sites, allotments, sports/play areas and golf courses) as well as high quality and accessible open countryside<sup>113</sup>. According to the ONS 2005 Land Use Statistics<sup>114</sup>, green space in Harborough makes up 93.7% of the total land area, which is better than both the East Midlands (89.8%) and the whole of England (87.5%).

In 2004, an Open Space, Sport and Recreation study<sup>115</sup> was undertaken to provide a clear picture of existing and future needs for Harborough in light of the policy requirements of the time. The study concluded that the District has predominantly good quality (92.4% of open space holds 'good' and above Green Flag Standard<sup>116</sup>) and accessible open space. The main issue regarding accessibility concerned public transport. On the other hand, certain areas were found to have quantitative deficiencies as summarised below by open space type:

- **Parks & Gardens:** Includes urban parks, formal gardens and country parks. There is a deficiency of parks and gardens across the District, the largest of which is in Kibworth, Fleckney and Great Glen.
- **Natural and Semi-Natural:** Includes woodlands, scrub, grasslands, wetlands, open and running water and nature reserves with a primary purpose of wildlife conservation and biodiversity. Overall, there is considered to be an oversupply of natural and semi natural open spaces, and only Market Harborough and Lubenham are perceived to have shortfalls in natural and semi-natural provision.
- **Green Corridors:** Includes towpaths along canals and riverbanks, cycleways, rights of way and disused railway lines. There is a vast network of green corridors within Harborough District. The most notable are the Grand Union Canal, Brampton Valley Way and Cycle Route 6. Supply is considered sufficient, however further corridors should be developed on a demand led basis when the opportunity arises.

<sup>110</sup> Natural England (2009) Green Infrastructure Guidance [online] available at:

<http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35033>

<sup>111</sup> Leicestershire and Rutland Sport (2009) Leicestershire and Rutland Sports Facilities Strategic Framework:

[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download\\_info.php?downloadID=572](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=572)

<sup>112</sup> HDC (2007) Harborough District Council Play Strategy 2007-2012 – The Strategy [online] available at

[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/975/harborough\\_district\\_council\\_play\\_strategy\\_2007-2012-full\\_strategy\\_excluding\\_covers](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/975/harborough_district_council_play_strategy_2007-2012-full_strategy_excluding_covers)

<sup>113</sup> UE Associates (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the Harborough Core Strategy – Baseline Data

<sup>114</sup> ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Land Use Statistics (Generalised Land Use Database) [online] available at

<http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=8&g=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1385718954626&enc=1&dsFamilyId=1201>

<sup>115</sup> HDC (2004) Open Space/Sport and Recreational Facilities and Assessment of Local Needs [online] available at

[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/3018/ppg17\\_main\\_report](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/3018/ppg17_main_report)

<sup>116</sup> HDC (2013) Strategic Planning Monitoring Report Oct 2012 – Mar 2013

- **Amenity Green space:** Includes informal recreation spaces and green spaces in and around housing. Only the Market Harborough and Lubenham areas have a surplus of amenity green space, all other areas are currently considered to have a shortfall of provision.
- **Provision for Children and Young People:** Includes equipped play areas, ball courts, skateboard areas and teenage shelters. There is a total deficiency of provision across the District equating to over 10 hectares, and there is a deficiency in each of the analysis areas, the largest of which is in Market Harborough and Lubenham.
- **Allotments & Community Gardens:** There is an overall deficiency of allotments within the District; however there is a small oversupply of provision within the Peatling and Bosworth analysis area.
- **Outdoor Sports Facilities:** Includes playing pitches, athletics tracks, bowling greens and golf courses either publicly or privately owned. Due to the wide ranging definition of this type of open space, development should be demand led.

In addition, the overall supply and demand of indoor sports and recreation provision, consisting of sports halls, swimming pools, health and fitness facilities and village halls was also assessed in a community facilities assessment<sup>117</sup>. This study concluded that:

- Provision of additional sports hall space should be a priority;
- Existing swimming provision marginally exceeds demand, hence there is no immediate need (or future need based on current participation rates) for additional facilities;
- There is an under supply of health and fitness provision within the District; and
- The village halls have an important role to play with regards to indoor sport and recreation provision within the District.

There are planning policies in place at a national and local level that seek to protect and enhance green infrastructure, sports / leisure and community facilities.

Whilst new development could have a negative effect on some aspects of green infrastructure (such as access to natural open space), it is more likely that development would provide the opportunities to enhance the function of green infrastructure and opportunities for recreation. It is therefore possible that the baseline position could improve over the plan period. However, accessibility to leisure facilities and open space may continue to be 'unequal' across the district; which could be exacerbated by an aging and growing population. The Local Plan provides an opportunity to help address some of these issues.

---

<sup>117</sup> Harborough District Council (2010). Assessment of Local Community Facilities Provision and Developer Contribution.  
[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/1375/community\\_facilities\\_assessment](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/1375/community_facilities_assessment)



## 6.7 Key Issues for Health and wellbeing

This table draws together the issues and opportunities for ‘health and wellbeing’; established from the contextual review and baseline information presented above. For those factors where it is considered that significant impacts could occur - these will be the focus of the appraisal and have therefore been ‘scoped-in’. Conversely, those factors that the Plan is unlikely to have a significant impact on have been ‘scoped out’.

Issues and Opportunities	Scoping Decision
<p><i>Health and Wellbeing</i></p> <p>There is a lack of health service provision in rural areas, which could be exacerbated by population growth, an ageing of the population and challenges of rural transport.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> The Local Plan should seek to improve access to services and facilities, particularly from rural areas.</p>
<p><i>Deprivation &amp; Community Cohesion</i></p> <p>Harborough is one of the least deprived authorities in England and there are no major inequality gaps throughout the District.</p>	<p><b>OUT:</b> The Local Plan is unlikely to have a significant impact on levels of deprivation, which are already low for the majority of the District.</p>
<p><i>Accessibility &amp; Transport</i></p> <p>Whilst Harborough has good road, rail and air links, accessibility is a critical issue in the rural areas of the District.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> New development ought preferentially to be located in areas accessible to key services or to help improve accessibility in poorly served areas.</p>
<p><i>Air Quality</i></p> <p>An AQMA has been designated in Lutterworth. Monitoring due to elevated NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations from road traffic.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> Development in and around Lutterworth will need to take account of the adverse air quality.</p>
<p><i>Green Infrastructure and recreation</i></p> <p>There is a deficiency in the provision of certain types of green infrastructure. (<i>Parks &amp; gardens, provision for children and young people and allotments</i>).</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> The Local Plan should seek to maintain and address local needs for open space /green infrastructure.</p>

## 6.8 Sustainability Objectives

The key issues and opportunities that have been ‘scoped-in’ to the appraisal for ‘health and wellbeing’ have been used to establish the following sustainability objectives and criteria as part of the overall SA Framework (see **Section 11** for further detail).

Sustainability Objectives	Guiding Questions / Criteria	Potential Monitoring Indicators
4) Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing.	<p>4.1) How could proposals affect standards of open space green infrastructure, recreation and leisure provision?</p> <p>4.2) Could proposals have an effect on efforts to maintain and strengthen local identity and community cohesion?</p> <p>4.3) Could proposals have different impacts on the health and wellbeing of certain social groups (<i>For example; age, gender, social class, religion, disability, race</i>)</p> <p>4.4) How could proposals impact upon air quality (particularly in Lutterworth)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Average healthy life expectancy.</li> <li>- Participation levels in sport and recreation.</li> <li>- Area of green infrastructure provided in conjunction with new housing.</li> <li>- Area of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard.</li> <li>- Number of properties experiencing pollutant concentrations in excess of the standard.</li> </ul>
5) Improve accessibility to employment, retail, business, health and community services, supporting health and well-being in the district.	<p>5.1) What impact could there be on local service provision, particularly in rural areas?</p> <p>5.2) What modes of transport would most likely be encouraged and how would these affect greenhouse gas emissions?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Percentage of completed non – residential development complying with car-parking standards;</li> <li>- Length of new/improved cycleway and pedestrian routes.</li> </ul>

## 7 RESILIENCE (TO CLIMATE CHANGE)

### 7.1 Introduction

This section sets out the relevant policy framework and baseline position for the following sustainability factors that have been grouped under the theme of 'resilience to climate change':

- Adaptation to climate change;
- Flood risk.

Information has then assembled to establish the key issues and opportunities that relate to 'resilience' and which provide a focus for the SA. The chapter concludes by establishing the objectives and indicators that will form the SA Framework.

### 7.2 Adaptation to climate change

#### *Contextual review*

According to the **NPPF**, Local Plans should take account of the effects of climate change in the long term, taking into account factors such as flood risk, coastal change, water supply and changes to biodiversity and landscape.

The **NPPF** also states that Planning authorities are encouraged to 'adopt proactive strategies' to adaptation. New developments should be planned so that they avoid increased vulnerability to climate change impacts. Where new development is at risk to such impacts, this should be managed through adaptation measures including the planning of green infrastructure. Development should also be directed away from areas at highest risk from flooding, and should 'not to be allocated if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding'. Where development is necessary, it should be made safe without increasing levels of flood risk elsewhere.

**The National Adaptation Programme (2013)**<sup>118</sup> highlights the importance of adaptation to help the UK become more resilient to climate change. It also reiterates the need for Local Plans to be proactive in adaptation as set out in the NPPF.

**Leicestershire's Climate Ready Plan 2013-2016**<sup>119</sup> puts a strong emphasis on prevention: taking action now to prevent adverse impacts on communities, the economy and the environment. It identifies actions focused on raising awareness, improving understanding of climate change impacts and vulnerability, building capacity in organisations and embedding climate change resilience into commissioning processes.

Harborough District Council is also committed to producing a **Climate Local Plan**. The key messages from this document will be reflected in future updates to the Scope of the SA.

#### *The Current and Projected Baseline*

According to the 2009 UK Climate Projections, the effects of climate change for the East Midlands are likely to be as follows by 2050 (under a medium emissions scenario)<sup>120</sup>:

- An increase in winter mean temperature of 2.2°C;
- An increase in summer mean temperature of 2.5°C;
- An increase in summer mean daily maximum temperature of 3.3°C;
- An increase in summer mean daily minimum temperature of 2.7°C;
- No change in annual mean precipitation;
- A 14% increase in winter mean precipitation; and
- A 16% decrease in summer mean precipitation.

<sup>118</sup> DEFRA (2013) The National Adaptation Programme: Making the Country Resilient to a Changing Climate [online] available at: [www.gov.uk/defra](http://www.gov.uk/defra)

<sup>119</sup> LCC (2013) Leicestershire Together - Climate Ready Plan 2013-2016 [online] available at: [http://www.leicestershiretogether.org/leicstogtherclimateplan\\_11085.pdf](http://www.leicestershiretogether.org/leicstogtherclimateplan_11085.pdf)

<sup>120</sup> UK Climate Projections (2009) [online] available at: <http://ukclimateprojections.defra.gov.uk/22130>

Climate change is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events already being experienced, such as heat waves, flooding and draught. On the other hand, it may reduce the occurrence of severe winter cold spells.

According to Leicestershire's Local Climate Impacts Profile (LCIP)<sup>121</sup>, a total of 711 weather-related incidents were recorded between 2000 and 2010 in the County. High winds and excessive rainfall represented the majority of these weather events. These weather events are estimated to have cost LCC £5 million and the services most frequently affected included:

- Highways;
- Forestry;
- Children & Young Children (incidents relating to schools);
- Properties;
- Waste Management;
- Adult Social Care;
- Leicestershire Fire & Rescue Service;
- Utility Companies (Anglian Water, Severn Trent, electricity companies);
- Leicestershire Constabulary;
- District and Town Councils;
- The Environment Agency;
- Leicestershire Primary Care Trust; and
- Network Rail and Train Operating Companies.

The severity of weather related impacts differed between districts due to local variation in geography and built environment. Priority risks have thus been identified within individual districts. For Harborough, watercourse flooding causing damage to property and infrastructure represents the main priority risk.

**Table 7.1** summarises the anticipated threats and opportunities across Leicestershire resulting from climate change, no specific issues were identified for Harborough.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> LCC (2011) A Summary of Local climate Impacts Profile for Leicestershire [online] available at [http://www.leics.gov.uk/leicestershire\\_lclip\\_summary.pdf](http://www.leics.gov.uk/leicestershire_lclip_summary.pdf)

<sup>122</sup> LCC (2013) Leicestershire Together - Climate Ready Plan 2013-2016 [online] available at: [http://www.leicestershiretogether.org/leicstogetherclimateplan\\_11085.pdf](http://www.leicestershiretogether.org/leicstogetherclimateplan_11085.pdf)

Table 7.1: Summary of Climate Change Threats and Opportunities

Threats	Opportunities
<b>People</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health risks (dehydration, UV exposure, air quality, contamination)</li> <li>Risks for staff (health, comfort, travel to work)</li> <li>Risks for vulnerable groups (people with complex health needs, young children, elderly, those in care, those in poor housing)</li> <li>Increased anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder during warmer weather</li> </ul>	Reduction in excess winter deaths
<b>Demand</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased demand for services protecting and supporting vulnerable people</li> </ul>	Economic opportunities to develop new products and services in response to a changing market
<b>Premises</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disruption to services</li> <li>Increased running costs of maintenance, insurance premium and claims, summer cooling</li> <li>New and existing housing becoming uninhabitable during hot weather or due to flooding</li> </ul>	Reduced costs of heating during winter
<b>Process</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disruption to services</li> <li>More frequent severe weather events have the potential to disrupt access to information, facilities and services, whether access is via ICT or in person</li> </ul>	
<b>Finance</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrictions to, and higher costs of, development</li> </ul>	
<b>Logistics</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Damage to infrastructure</li> <li>Global impacts on food, energy and water supplies, commodity prices and supply chains</li> <li>A reduction in the efficiency of energy generation and supply</li> </ul>	Reduced cold weather maintenance needed
<b>Environment</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased carbon emissions due to increased summer cooling demand; this could be balanced to some extent by decreased winter heating demand</li> <li>Insufficient habitat connectivity for species to move as they adapt to climate change</li> </ul>	<p>Decreased winter heating demand</p> <p>Opportunity to use Green Infrastructure to increase resilience, with multiple benefits for health, ecology, and the economy, as well as helping to prevent and reduce the adverse impacts of climate change</p>

Source: LCC (2013) Climate Ready Plan<sup>112</sup>



### 7.3 Flood risk

#### *Contextual review*

**The Flood and Water Management Act**<sup>123</sup> sets out the following approaches to flood risk management:

- Incorporating greater resilience measures into the design of new buildings, and retro-fitting at risk properties (including historic buildings);
- Utilising the environment, such as management of the land to reduce runoff and harnessing the ability of wetlands to store water; and Identifying areas suitable for inundation and water storage.

Three **Catchment Flood Management Plans (CFMP)** cover the District – River Welland CFMP, River Trent CFMP and River Severn CFMP. The CFMP's detail the extent of flooding and set policies for managing flood risk within the catchment.

**The Welland Flood Risk Management Strategy**<sup>124</sup> suggests that the risk of flooding from the Welland is relatively low for Market Harborough. The proposed policy for this area is to continue with current flood management practices. However, it is recommended that development incorporates resilience measures so that the location, layout and design can reduce flood risk.

#### *The current and projected baseline*

A Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) was undertaken by Scott Wilson in 2009 on behalf of HDC<sup>125</sup>. The results of this SFRA are summarised below.

#### *Surface Water Flooding*

Surface water (pluvial) flooding occurs when heavy rainfall exceeds the capacity of local drainage networks and water flows across the ground. The flashy nature and short duration of such events can make them difficult to mitigate.

Harborough and its town centres regularly suffer from flooding:

- Market Harborough, Peatling Magna, Dunton Bassett, North Kilworth and Kibworth Beauchamp are particularly susceptible to surface water flooding;
- The last major flood in Market Harborough occurred in July 2002 from the River Welland. Over 70 business properties were flooded within the town centre. The main factor attributed to this flooding was insufficient capacity of the drainage system. The town also experienced flooding in 1999 and 2006;
- The last major flood in Lutterworth occurred during 2008 from the River Swift. There was regular more localised flooding, caused by inadequate drains, affecting Station Road near the Town Hall;
- Great Glen has flooded eight times since 1999;
- Kibworth has flooded three times since 2004;
- The 2008 flooding event affected a number of Harborough's rural areas including Great Glen, Foxton, Billesdon, Burton Overy, Newton Harcourt, Kibworth, Thurnby, Lubenham and Scraftoft.

<sup>123</sup> Flood and Water Management Act (2010) [online] available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/29/contents>

<sup>124</sup> Environment Agency (2009) River Welland Flood Risk Management Strategy [online] available at: <http://a0768b4a8a31e106d8b0-50dc802554eb38a24458b98ff72d550b.r19.cf3.rackcdn.com/gean1209briz-e-e.pdf>

<sup>125</sup> Scott Wilson (2009) Harborough District Council Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/344/harborough\\_district\\_strategic\\_flood\\_risk\\_assessment](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/344/harborough_district_strategic_flood_risk_assessment)

An increase in impermeable surfaces in urban areas is one of the main causes of increased surface water flooding. Many flood events are the result of heavy rain running off impermeable surfaces which then overwhelms drainage systems or small water courses resulting in fast-rising flood water. Climate change is likely to cause more extreme weather events so an effective way to reduce the risks of surface water flooding in urban areas is to reduce the percentage of impermeable surface. New development could lead to an increase in impermeable surfaces, but also offers the opportunity to implement measures that help to manage surface water flood risk.

### *Sewer Flooding*

Sewer flooding is thought to be the most common cause of flooding in the UK. It is usually caused by excess surface water entering the drainage network but can also be due to 'one off' events such as trees falling and fly tipping blocking drains and screens. The data provided by Severn Trent Water (STW) and Anglian Water (AW) shows that sewer and drainage flooding have occurred throughout the District, with a particular clustering of events in Market Harborough, Billesdon, Great Glen and Lutterworth.

### *Groundwater Flooding*

Groundwater flooding occurs as a result of water rising up from an aquifer or from water flowing from abnormal springs. No records of groundwater flooding were found during the SFRA baseline study. However, this does not mean that groundwater flooding does not occur, more that it has not been reported. There may be potential for groundwater flooding to occur following periods of sustained high rainfall and this should be considered in the planning process of any new developments within the District.

### *Overall Flooding*

The SFRA provided a flood risk map for the District (see **Figure 7.1**). Flood risk is classified in the following zones:

- **Zone 1:** Areas considered to be at low risk of fluvial (or tidal) flooding. Whilst fluvial and tidal flooding is not a major concern in these areas, the risk of flooding from other sources, such as surface water, groundwater, sewers or artificial sources may still be an issue;
- **Zone 2:** This is the extreme 1 in 1000 year fluvial flood event outline;
- **Zone 3a:** This is the 1 in 100 year fluvial flood event outline that is outside of Flood Zone 3b. It has been determined with an allowance for climate change; and
- **Zone 3b:** The functional floodplain.

Overall, less than 10% of the administrative area of HDC falls within Flood Zone 3, with the majority of the flood zones falling in rural areas. Nevertheless, as detailed above and shown on **Figure 7.1**, there are a number of urban locations likely to be affected by flooding.

Indeed, recent years have seen more areas within the District suffer from flooding. For example, the leisure centre in Market Harborough experienced surface water flooding during winter 2012/2013 as did the neighbouring football club and the Pumping station on Northampton Road. Great Bowden Cemetery, although not flooded on this occasion has previously been flooded and work has been carried out on the adjacent watercourse to alleviate the problem.

In July/August 2013 the District was also hit with flooding including The Square in Market Harborough when many retail outlets were affected and the Town Centre had to be closed to traffic.

There are approximately 23 flood defence balancing areas within the District, some of which are maintained by HDC and an annual inspection and condition survey is carried out on all of


them (**see Figure 7.1**). There are also six critical ordinary watercourses within the District that are also inspected on an annual basis. These are located in Billesdon, Fleckney Foxton, Little Bowden, Lutterworth and Walcote; and are all currently in 'good condition' and receiving maintenance to an acceptable or good standard<sup>126</sup>.

Climate change is anticipated to increase the frequency and intensity of flood events, so it is reasonable to anticipate similar flooding events in the future, with resulting disruption to economic activity.

---

<sup>126</sup> Harborough District Council (2013) Critical Ordinary Watercourses Condition Survey.

Figure 7.1: Flood zones 2 and 3 in Harborough District



## 7.4 Key Issues for Resilience (to Climate Change)

This table draws together the issues and opportunities for ‘resilience (to climate change)’; established from the contextual review and baseline information presented above. For those factors where it is considered that significant impacts could occur - these will be the focus of the appraisal and have therefore been ‘scoped-in’. Conversely, those factors that the Plan is unlikely to have a significant impact on have been ‘scoped out’.

Issues and Opportunities	Scoping Decision
<p><i>Adaptation to climate change</i></p> <p>Climate change is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events such as heat waves, flooding and draught.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> The Local Plan has an important role to play in increasing resilience to the effects of climate change.</p>
<p><i>Flood risk</i></p> <p>Watercourse and surface water flooding causing damage to property and infrastructure represents the priority risk for Harborough.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> There is a need to ensure that development avoids areas at risk of flooding and helps to reduce flood risk wherever possible.</p>

## 7.5 Sustainability objectives and indicators

The key issues and opportunities that have been ‘scoped-in’ to the appraisal for ‘resilience’ have been used to establish the following sustainability objectives and criteria as part of the overall SA Framework (see **Section 11** for further detail).

Sustainability Objectives	Guiding Questions / Criteria	Potential Monitoring Indicators
<p>6: Make the natural environment, people, property, business and essential services more resilient to a changing climate.</p>	<p>6.1) How does the proposal affect the risk of flooding to business?</p> <p>6.2) How would the proposal affect the risk of flooding to private dwelling?</p> <p>6.3) How would the proposal affect the delivery of essential services?</p> <p>6.4) What will be the effects on green infrastructure and its ability to contribute to climate change resilience?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding.</li> <li>- Annual local authority expenditure on flood management measures.</li> </ul>



## 8 HOUSING AND ECONOMY

### 8.1 Introduction

This section sets out the relevant policy framework and baseline position for the following sustainability factors that have been grouped under the theme of 'Housing and Economy'


- Population;
- Economy;
- Housing.

The chapter starts with a discussion of demographics as trends in population are one of the key drivers of the need for housing and jobs. This information has then been used to establish the key issues and opportunities that relate to 'housing and economy' and which should be a focus for the SA. The chapter concludes by setting out the objectives and indicators that will form the SA Framework.

### 8.2 Population

Harborough is one of the least densely populated areas in Leicestershire with an estimated population density of 1.4 people per hectare and an estimated total population of 85,382<sup>127</sup>. Some 62.5% of the population is of working age, 19.1% is under 16 years old and 18.2% is of state pension age (65+)<sup>128</sup>. **Figure 8.1** below provides a more detailed age structure of Harborough.

*Figure 8.1: Age Structure of Harborough*




<sup>127</sup> ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Census 2011 Population and Migration [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadDatasetList.do?a=3&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&q=6444516&i=1001x1003&m=0&r=1&s=1384254808403&enc=1&domainId=13>

<sup>128</sup> ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Census 2011 Key Statistics [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadDatasetList.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&q=6444516&i=1001x1003x1032&m=0&r=1&s=1384270475601&enc=1&domainId=62>

The 2010-based Sub-National Population Projections estimate Harborough's population will rise from 84,000 in 2010 to 104,500 in 2035<sup>129</sup>. This represents a 17.5% increase which confirms the longer-term increasing population trend of the District. As shown in **Figure 8.2** below, the most rapid growth will occur in the number of people of state pension age, from 15,500 in 2010 to 31,500 in 2035.

*Figure 8.2: 2010-Based Harborough Population Projections by Broad Age Groups*



As illustrated in **Table 8.1**, the population in Harborough is predominately white in ethnic origin (95.3% in 2011)<sup>130</sup>. Harborough's Black or Minority Ethnic background (BME) population is approximately 7.19% (6,140 people). This percentage is considerably lower than the East Midlands figure of 14.6% and the national figure of 20.2%. The three largest BME groups are Indian (1,849), Other White (1,588) and Irish (486).

The age structure of the population is broadly similar to the national and regional averages. However, the proportion of the population over 65 is already slightly higher and the proportion in the 16-65 age range is slightly lower in Harborough District.

There are differences in the composition of the population as well as the rates of growth in different age groups across the District. These trends are illustrated in **Table 8.2**.

<sup>129</sup> Office for National Statistics – Sub-National Population Projections [online] available at <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/taxonomy/search/index.html?pageSize=50&sortBy=none&sortDirection=none&newquery=Harborough&content-type=Reference+table&content-type=Dataset&nscl=Sub-national+Population+Projections>

<sup>130</sup> ONS – Neighbourhood Statistics – Census 2011 Key Statistics [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadDatasetList.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&q=6444516&i=1001x1003x1032&m=0&r=1&s=1384270475601&enc=1&domainId=62>

**Table 8.1: Population and Ethnicity in Harborough**

Feature	2011 Census Data	Regional/National Comparator (2011 Census Data)		Trends (2001 Census Data)	Projections for 2035 (2010-Based Sub National Population Projections)
		East Midlands	England		
Population Size	85,382	4,533,222	53,012,456	76,559	104,500
Population Density (people per hectare)	1.4	2.9	4.1	1.29	Data not available
Age profile	0-15: 19.1% 16-64: 62.5% 65+: 18.2%	0-15: 18.4% 16-64: 64.4% 65+: 17%	0-15: 18.9% 16-64: 64.8% 65+: 16.4	0-15: 20.15% 16-64: 64.19% 65+: 15.64%	0-15: 17.22% 16-64: 52.63% 65+: 30.14%
Ethnicity	White: 95.3% Mixed: 1.1% Asian: 3.2% Black: 0.3% Arab & Other: 0.2%	White: 89.3% Mixed: 1.9% Asian: 6.4% Black: 1.7% Arab & Other: 0.6%	White: 85.5% Mixed: 2.2% Asian: 7.7% Black: 3.4% Arab & Other: 1%	White: 97.87% Mixed: 0.64% Asian: 1.01% Black: 0.2% Chinese & Other: 0.26%	Data not available

Source: Neighbourhood Statistic - Census 2011 and 2001 Key Statistics & Office for National Statistics – 2010-Based Sub-National Population Projections

### Settlement and/or Ward Review

**Table 8.2** below summarises the population data for each ward within Harborough and the changes that have occurred since the 2001 Census.

Overall, every ward except for Primethorpe (*which has seen a 4.3% decrease in population*) has experienced an increase in population ranging from modest growth of less than 3% in areas such as Dunton Ward to significant growth above 30% in areas such as Little Bowden Ward in Market Harborough, and Swift Ward in Lutterworth.

The population trends show that many parts of the District are also experiencing an increase in the proportion of people aged over 65. In particular, Little Bowden in Market Harborough has seen an 88.3% increase in this age bracket between 2001 and 2011. Other wards such as Bosworth, and Fleckney have also seen significant increases in this age group.

Most wards have experienced population growth across the three age categories, although the trends suggest that this is mainly in the older age range, followed by the age range under 16. However, other wards experiencing overall growth have witnessed a decrease in the population between 0-16 and 16-65.

Overall the data suggests that there is a growing population that will be economically dependent.

Table 8.2: Population trends in Harborough Wards<sup>131</sup>

Ward		2011	%	2001	% change	Ward		2011	%	2001	% change
Broughton Astley - Astley	Total	<b>2,324</b>		<b>2262</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	Misterton	Total	<b>2,587</b>		<b>2442</b>	<b>5.9%</b>
	<16	<b>613</b>	26%	609	0.7%		<16	<b>522</b>	20%	509	2.6%
	16-65	<b>1555</b>	67%	1550	0.3%		16-65	<b>1665</b>	64%	1576	5.6%
	>65	<b>156</b>	7%	103	<b>51.5%</b>		>65	<b>400</b>	15%	357	12.0%
Billesdon	Total	<b>1,863</b>		<b>1586</b>	<b>17.5%</b>	Nevill	Total	<b>2,308</b>		<b>1970</b>	<b>17.2%</b>
	<16	<b>331</b>	18%	274	20.8%		<16	<b>478</b>	21%	389	22.9%
	16-65	<b>1157</b>	62%	1012	14.3%		16-65	<b>1375</b>	60%	1253	9.7%
	>65	<b>375</b>	20%	300	25.0%		>65	<b>455</b>	20%	328	<b>38.7%</b>
Bosworth	Total	<b>2,557</b>		<b>2134</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	Lutterworth - Orchard	Total	<b>2,227</b>		<b>2152</b>	<b>3.5%</b>
	<16	<b>502</b>	20%	383	<b>31.1%</b>		<16	<b>391</b>	18%	391	0.0%
	16-65	<b>1586</b>	62%	1429	11.0%		16-65	<b>1268</b>	57%	1318	<b>-3.8%</b>
	>65	<b>469</b>	18%	322	<b>45.7%</b>		>65	<b>568</b>	26%	443	28.2%
Lutterworth - Brookfield	Total	<b>2,328</b>		<b>2203</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	Peatling	Total	<b>2,348</b>		<b>2147</b>	<b>9.4%</b>
	<16	<b>477</b>	20%	501	<b>-4.8%</b>		<16	<b>399</b>	17%	421	<b>-5.2%</b>
	16-65	<b>1444</b>	62%	1428	1.1%		16-65	<b>1509</b>	64%	1367	10.4%
	>65	<b>407</b>	17%	274	<b>48.5%</b>		>65	<b>440</b>	19%	359	22.6%
Broughton Astley - Broughton	Total	<b>2,840</b>		<b>2286</b>	<b>24.2%</b>	Broughton Astley - Primethorpe	Total	<b>1,772</b>		<b>1851</b>	<b>-4.3%</b>
	<16	<b>683</b>	24%	590	15.8%		<16	<b>298</b>	17%	366	<b>-18.6%</b>
	16-65	<b>1922</b>	68%	1545	24.4%		16-65	<b>1123</b>	63%	1193	<b>-5.9%</b>
	>65	<b>235</b>	8%	151	<b>55.6%</b>		>65	<b>351</b>	20%	292	20.2%
Dunton	Total	<b>2,200</b>		<b>2159</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	Lutterworth - Springs	Total	<b>2,297</b>		<b>2085</b>	<b>10.2%</b>
	<16	<b>373</b>	17%	394	<b>-5.3%</b>		<16	<b>370</b>	16%	394	<b>-6.1%</b>
	16-65	<b>1405</b>	64%	1452	<b>-3.2%</b>		16-65	<b>1430</b>	62%	1279	11.8%
	>65	<b>422</b>	19%	313	<b>34.8%</b>		>65	<b>497</b>	22%	412	20.6%
Fleckney	Total	<b>4,894</b>		<b>4613</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	Broughton Astley - Sutton	Total	<b>2,004</b>		<b>1893</b>	<b>5.9%</b>
	<16	<b>1031</b>	21%	1120	<b>-7.9%</b>		<16	<b>387</b>	19%	365	6.0%
	16-65	<b>3212</b>	66%	3050	5.3%		16-65	<b>1326</b>	66%	1347	<b>-1.6%</b>
	>65	<b>651</b>	13%	443	<b>47.0%</b>		>65	<b>291</b>	15%	181	<b>60.8%</b>
Glen	Total	<b>4,358</b>		<b>3876</b>	<b>12.4%</b>	Lutterworth - Swift	Total	<b>2,501</b>		<b>1853</b>	<b>35.0%</b>
	<16	<b>802</b>	18%	716	12.0%		<16	<b>517</b>	21%	397	<b>30.2%</b>
	16-65	<b>2613</b>	60%	2439	7.1%		16-65	<b>1646</b>	66%	1231	<b>33.7%</b>
	>65	<b>943</b>	22%	721	<b>30.8%</b>		>65	<b>338</b>	14%	225	<b>50.2%</b>
Market Harborough - Great Bowden and Arden	Total	<b>7,296</b>		<b>6519</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	Thurnby and Houghton	Total	<b>6,980</b>		<b>6516</b>	<b>7.1%</b>
	<16	<b>1357</b>	19%	1205	12.6%		<16	<b>1249</b>	18%	1200	4.1%
	16-65	<b>4559</b>	62%	4130	10.4%		16-65	<b>4120</b>	59%	4015	2.6%
	>65	<b>1380</b>	19%	1184	16.6%		>65	<b>1611</b>	23%	1301	23.8%
Kibworth	Total	<b>6,823</b>		<b>6081</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	Tilton	Total	<b>2,030</b>		<b>1857</b>	<b>9.3%</b>
	<16	<b>1277</b>	19%	1261	1.3%		<16	<b>360</b>	18%	332	8.4%
	16-65	<b>4199</b>	62%	3739	12.3%		16-65	<b>1276</b>	63%	1256	1.6%
	>65	<b>1347</b>	20%	1081	24.6%		>65	<b>394</b>	19%	269	<b>46.5%</b>
Market Harborough - Little Bowden	Total	<b>5,055</b>		<b>3862</b>	<b>30.9%</b>	Ullesthorpe	Total	<b>2,281</b>		<b>2049</b>	<b>11.3%</b>
	<16	<b>1142</b>	23%	876	<b>30.4%</b>		<16	<b>460</b>	20%	371	24.0%
	16-65	<b>3190</b>	63%	2602	22.6%		16-65	<b>1411</b>	62%	1333	5.9%
	>65	<b>723</b>	14%	384	<b>88.3%</b>		>65	<b>410</b>	18%	345	18.8%
Market Harborough - Logan	Total	<b>4,155</b>		<b>4060</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	Market Harborough - Welland	Total	<b>6,405</b>		<b>5686</b>	<b>12.6%</b>
	<16	<b>725</b>	17%	791	<b>-8.3%</b>		<16	<b>1215</b>	19%	1153	5.4%
	16-65	<b>2524</b>	61%	2596	<b>-2.8%</b>		16-65	<b>3,600</b>	56%	3377	6.6%
	>65	<b>906</b>	22%	673	<b>34.6%</b>		>65	<b>1306</b>	20%	1156	13.0%
Lubenham	Total	<b>2,949</b>		<b>2419</b>	<b>21.9%</b>						
	<16	<b>389</b>	13%	418	<b>-6.9%</b>						
	16-65	<b>2108</b>	71%	1644	28.2%						
	>65	<b>452</b>	15%	<b>357</b>	26.6%						

Source: Neighbourhood Statistics - Census 2011 / 2001

<sup>131</sup>Data in red text highlights where there has been a decreasing population trend. Data in green text highlights where there has been a significant population increase (above 30%).

**Table 8.3** below summarises the population trends for each ward. This table draws from the statistics presented in **Table 8.2**.

*Table 8.3: Population trends by Ward for Harborough District.*

<b>Billesdon</b>	Has experienced fairly high levels of growth overall (17.5%). The growth is mainly in the over 65 and under 16 age ranges.
<b>Bosworth</b>	Has experienced fairly high levels of growth overall (19.8%). However, the growth is spread fairly evenly across all age categories.
<b>Broughton Astley:</b> Astley, Broughton, Primethorpe, Sutton.	Although Primethorpe Ward has seen an overall decrease in population, all other three wards have experienced growth. In particular, Broughton Ward has witnessed a growth rate of 25%.  Despite there being significantly higher rates of growth in the over 65 age range in each of the wards, the proportion of the population in this age range remains well lower than the average for the district (which is 18.2%). For example, in Broughton and Astley wards, the proportion of people over 65 is less than 8%. Conversely, the proportion of people in the 16-65 age range is significantly above the district average for Broughton Astley.
<b>Dunton</b>	Has experienced very low rates of growth (1.9%) overall. This is due to a decrease in the population aged under 16 and from 16-65. Growth has only occurred because the number of people over 65 has increased significantly.
<b>Fleckney</b>	Has experienced stable levels of growth overall (6.1%), however, there has been a decrease in the population under 16 and an increase in the population over 65.
<b>Glen</b>	Has experienced an overall increase of 12.4%, which is represented by growth across all age ranges. However, the rate of growth is significantly higher for the age range over 65.
<b>Kibworth</b>	Has experienced an overall increase of 12.2%. In the under 16 age range the levels of growth have been very low, whilst they have been much higher for the over 65 age range.
<b>Lubenham</b>	Has experienced fairly high growth overall of 21.9%, which has occurred in the economically active and over 65 age ranges. There was a decrease in population aged under 16. The proportion of people in the 16-65 age range is significantly above the average in this Ward.
<b>Lutterworth:</b> Brookfield, Orchard, Springs, Swift	There has been an overall growth in the population in Lutterworth. However, this has not been spread evenly. The highest rate of growth has occurred in Swift Ward (35%), whilst the lowest growth has occurred on Orchard Ward (3.5%). The patterns of growth in Orchard Ward suggest that there is a growing population over 65, which now makes up 26% of the population in this area. There have been increases in the over 65 population in other parts of Lutterworth too. Some parts of Lutterworth have also experience population decline.



<p><b>Market Harborough:</b> Great Bowden and Arden, Little Bowden, Logan, Welland.</p>	<p>In total, the four wards of Market Harborough have experienced an average population growth of approximately 12%. However, the spread of growth has not been even, with Logan Ward experiencing very low levels of growth and Little Bowden experiencing very high levels of growth. In the main, the economically active population has remained steady across each ward, but there has been a decrease in Logan Ward. There has also been particularly high growth in the over 65 age range in both Logan and Little Bowden Wards. However, despite this growth, the % of people in the over 65 age range in Little Bowden is still only 14%, which is under the average across the district (18.2%).</p>
<p><b>Misterton</b></p>	<p>Has experienced modest population growth (5.9%). Although the growth has been highest in the over 65 range, the proportion of the total population in the ward for this group (15%) remains lower than the District average.</p>
<p><b>Nevill</b></p>	<p>Has experienced a fairly high overall growth rate of 17.2 %. A large proportion of this has come in the under 16 age range and over 65 age range.</p>
<p><b>Peatling</b></p>	<p>Has experienced an overall growth rate of 9.4 % but there has been a decrease in the population under 16.</p>
<p><b>Thurnby and Houghton</b></p>	<p>Has experienced fairly modest rates of growth overall (7.1%), but has witnessed high rates of growth in the over 65 age range. The over 65 population is higher than the District average for Thurnby and Houghton.</p>
<p><b>Tilton</b></p>	<p>Has experienced average population growth of 9.3%. However, it has witnessed a very high growth rate in the over 65 age range and a very low growth rate in the 16-65 age range.</p>
<p><b>Ullesthorpe</b></p>	<p>Has experienced an overall growth rate of 11.3 % but a large proportion of this has come in the under 16 age range and over 65 age range.</p>

### 8.3 Economy

#### *Contextual review*

The **NPPF** outlines that the planning system should contribute to building a strong, responsive economy by 'ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure'<sup>132</sup>.

Local plans should support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas. It should also promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. The improvement of transport links and the provision of adequate digital infrastructure can facilitate the 'significant untapped potential' of rural areas to contribute to economic growth and employment<sup>133</sup>.

Broadband is a key enabler of socio-economic development, and as such the Government intends to establish world-class Broadband connectivity throughout the UK. Positive impacts associated with Broadband development have been identified in the **UK Broadband impact study**<sup>134</sup> which includes; increased productivity, social benefits and reductions in carbon emissions. This is particularly beneficial in rural areas, where access to jobs and services can be more difficult.

The **(draft) Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan (2014-2020)**<sup>135</sup> seeks to help create at least 45,000 additional private sector jobs and attract over 2 billion pounds of private sector investment. The strategy will seek to build upon the regions strengths, with significant investment planned at key locations including along the M1 corridor, at the proposed strategic rail freight terminal close to East Midlands Airport, MIRA Technology Park Enterprise Zone and the rural economy. The strategy aims to make Leicester and Leicestershire:

- An exceptional place to make and distribute goods and services;
- An exceptional place to easily access employment, leisure and learning;
- A place with excellent quality and range of housing and urban environments;
- A place where the natural environment and heritage is celebrated and protected; and
- Able to accommodate the additional growth of businesses and population.

Of particular relevance to the HDC Local Plan, is the focus on infrastructure investment in the Strategy. This will help to improve rail and road links through Market Harborough into Leicester and beyond. The Strategy also sets out an action to support the development of Sustainable Urban Extensions through the use of a revolving Intervention fund to advance delivery on allocated SUE and SES development sites throughout Leicester and Leicestershire

The **Leicestershire Rural Partnership Framework 2011-2014**<sup>136</sup> categorises the majority of Harborough District as 'Rural'. The only exception being the town of Market Harborough. Its vision, the following aims are particularly pertinent to the Local Plan:

- Well-connected and innovative farming communities;
- Joined-up planning systems to support good quality housing, services, employment and green spaces;
- Open and maintained countryside;
- Well integrated network of community and public transport systems;
- Excellent town and rural centres in which to live, work and visit;
- High performing home-based businesses, micro enterprises and SMEs;
- Destinations for family days-out and short-break holidays;
- High quality equestrian services and facilities.

<sup>132</sup> DCLG (2012) National Planning Policy Framework [online] available at:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2116950.pdf>

<sup>133</sup> Federation of Small Businesses (2012) The Missing Links - Revitalising our rural economy [online] available at:

[http://www.fsb.org.uk/policy/assets/rural\\_report\\_web\\_final\\_proof.pdf](http://www.fsb.org.uk/policy/assets/rural_report_web_final_proof.pdf)

<sup>134</sup> Department for Culture, Media and Sport (2013) UK Broadband Impact Study: Impact Report [online] available at:

[http://www.sqw.co.uk/file\\_download/412](http://www.sqw.co.uk/file_download/412)

<sup>135</sup> Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (2013) Strategic Economic Plan 2014-2020

[http://www.llep.org.uk/index/downloads/filename/img\\_1390320385\\_1937.pdf/catid/22/filetitle/draft-sep.pdf](http://www.llep.org.uk/index/downloads/filename/img_1390320385_1937.pdf/catid/22/filetitle/draft-sep.pdf)

<sup>136</sup> Leicestershire Rural Partnership (2011) Leicestershire Rural Partnership Framework 2011-2014

<http://www.oakleaves.org.uk/uploads/leicestershire-rural-framework-2011-2014.pdf>

According to the **Harborough Open for Business Prospectus**<sup>137</sup>, Harborough is the 'understated jewel' of the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP) economy – with a strong enterprise culture and the highest levels of performance across most metrics. This performance, though, is founded on quality of residential experience and high levels of out-commuting for employment. It is not, therefore, assured in the long term. With the national economy showing signs of recovery, and LLEP formulating major plans that will shape economic investment in the area to 2020, a Harborough 'open for business' strategy is timely and important. Six key intervention strategies are recommended:

- Building an 'open for business' strategic leadership team, and focus its support on business growth ambitions particularly in professional, financial and business services; agriculture and land-based industries; transport and logistics; visitor economy; start-ups and self-employed; and high potential broadband beneficiaries;
- Ensure LLEP and national programmes are legible and accessible to business; and scale up existing local infrastructure and services to increase their local reach;
- Accompany superfast broadband roll out with measures to enable businesses to make the most of improvements in connectivity and web-fuelled business growth opportunity;
- Enhance the business dividend from Harborough's already strong quality of place through strong participation in the visitor economy 'blueprint', sorting out town centre and destination management and encouraging business, leisure, rural and heritage tourism;
- Develop, with Melton, a LEADER programme for rural diversification, agriculture and land-based industries development; and
- Work positively with the MP business community to make it an integral part of the district's economic narrative; and exemplar for Logistics' contribution to wider business growth.

**Harborough District Blueprint for Tourism (2013-2018)**<sup>138</sup> seeks to capitalise on the districts tourism offer by promoting the district as a place that represents 'Quintessential England'. This would include specific focus on Market Harborough as 'England's finest Rural Market Town', Lutterworth as the 'home of Wycliffe and Whittle and Foxton Locks as 'A perfect day out for all the family'. To help achieve this vision, four strategic themes will be implemented as summarised below:

- Destination - Offer people a wide range of quality attraction, accommodation and experiences.
- Positioning –Developing and promoting the County's assets while differentiating between business and leisure markets in a way that offers a unique and quality product.
- People – Ensure visitor enjoy a world class experience, promoting tourism as a first choice career and investing in skills and training.
- Intelligence – Providing evidence to allow public sector and tourism businesses to make informed investment decisions.

<sup>137</sup> Third Life Economics (2013) Harborough Open for Business Prospectus (*not yet published*)


<sup>138</sup> Leicester Shire Promotions , District Partnership Development (2013) Harborough District Blueprint for Tourism 2013-2019

*The current and projected baseline*

Harborough’s industrial structure reflects the District’s rural character with an over representation of agriculture, increasing dominance of the service sector, under representations in public administration and a generally declining manufacturing sector<sup>139</sup>.


With a higher employment rate (69%) and a lower unemployment level (2.9%), Harborough fares better than the East Midlands and England (see Table 8.3)<sup>140</sup>. **Figures 8.3 and 8.4** present the District’s employment and unemployment trends from 2006 to 2011. The decline in employment rates and rise in unemployment levels experienced in recent years is largely attributable to the current economic downturn.

*Figure 8.3: Employment Rate in Harborough*



Source: HDC (2011) 2011 Annual Monitoring Report<sup>141</sup>

*Figure 8.4: Unemployment Rate in Harborough*



Source: HDC (2011) 2011 Annual Monitoring Report

<sup>139</sup> HDC (2011) Harborough District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy 2006 – 2028 [online] available at:

[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/2211/harborough\\_district\\_adopted\\_core\\_strategy](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/2211/harborough_district_adopted_core_strategy)

<sup>140</sup> ONS (2011) – Neighbourhood Statistics – Economic Activity, 2011 [online] available at:

<http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=9&g=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1386003148379&enc=1&dsFamilyId=2484>

<sup>141</sup> HDC (2011) 2011 Annual Monitoring Report [online] available at:

[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download\\_info.php?downloadID=43](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=43)

By 2021, the forecast number of jobs in the District is anticipated to rise to 44,100, some 600 more than 2012. This trend is projected to continue up to 2031 when the total number of workforce jobs is predicted to be 48,200<sup>142</sup>. However, the number of jobs in the industrial sector is expected to decline, whilst office based and warehousing based jobs is forecast to increase slightly.

### Employment land

In total, Harborough has approximately 300ha of employment land, predominantly for industrial (17%) and warehousing/distribution uses (77%), with relatively little office space (5%). Most employment land and economic activity is concentrated around Market Harborough and Lutterworth. Both towns are the main shopping centres in the District. Main employment land areas include<sup>143</sup>:

- Magna Park near Lutterworth, which occupies 200ha and is one of the largest dedicated strategic logistics parks in the UK;
- Bilton Way Industrial Estate, Leicester Road area (various estates) and St John's Business Park (Lutterworth);
- Airfield Farm Business Park incorporating The Harborough Innovation Centre on the outskirts of Market Harborough; and
- Rockingham Road area (various estates), Riverside Industrial Estate, The Point, Compass Point (Market Harborough);
- Swannington Road Industrial Estate (Broughton Astley)
- Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground / Industrial Estate which occupies a former airfield near Bruntingthorpe

Recent or planned major commercial development in the District has included; Harborough Innovation Centre, Symington Building (HDC & office /library / museum / retail scheme), Market Hall Redevelopment and the development of Waitrose in Market Harborough and the development of Waitrose in Lutterworth<sup>144</sup>.

Between 2008 and 2012, a total of 9.1 hectares of employment land was lost to housing.

The most recent employment land study for the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA (2013) concludes that the supply/demand balance for Harborough shows a surplus of offices (37,530 sq. m) and deficits of 6.27 ha of industrial land and 38 ha of strategic warehousing land. The forecast demand for strategic warehousing land is based on a trend established by the growth in national distribution centres at Magna Park. This development reflects demand for locations next to the Motorway network within an area of central England called the 'Golden Triangle'. However, it is not demand specific to Harborough.

### Skills

Harborough benefits from a relatively highly skilled population. A significantly higher proportion of the District's population is qualified to level 4 (31.8%) than regional (23.6%) and national averages (27.4%). The proportion of the population with no qualifications (18.1%) is also lower than for the East Midlands (24.5%) and England (22.5%)<sup>145</sup>. Reflecting this, over 52% (2008)

<sup>142</sup> Leicester and Leicestershire Local Enterprise Partnership (2013) Leicester and Leicestershire HMA Employment Land Study 2012 update. [online] available at:

[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/3067/leicester\\_and\\_leicestershire\\_hma\\_employment\\_land\\_study\\_april\\_2013](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/3067/leicester_and_leicestershire_hma_employment_land_study_april_2013)

<sup>143</sup> HDC (2011) Harborough District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy 2006 – 2028 [online] available at:

[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/2211/harborough\\_district\\_adopted\\_core\\_strategy](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/2211/harborough_district_adopted_core_strategy)

<sup>144</sup> HDC (2013) Market Hall Redevelopment [online] available at

[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200066/markets/584/market\\_hall\\_redevelopment](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200066/markets/584/market_hall_redevelopment)

<sup>145</sup> ONS (2011) – Neighbourhood Statistics – Qualification and Students, 2011 [online] available at

<http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=5&g=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1386017786095&enc=1&dsFamilyId=2536>



of the District's working population are in managerial/senior professional or associate professional and technical occupations<sup>146</sup>.

In 2008, 8.3% of Harborough's jobs were in the tourist sector, which was higher than the average for the East Midlands (7.6%)<sup>147</sup>.

Policy CS11 in the Adopted Core Strategy sets out the Council's support for further development of the tourism and recreational potential of Foxton Locks, in recognition of its value not only as a designated heritage asset but also as a key strategic Green Infrastructure corridor which presents significant recreational, biodiversity and countryside access opportunities.

The travel to work patterns described in the Accessibility and Transport section of this report demonstrate Harborough's strong economic relationship and interdependency with Leicester City, the wider Leicester urban area, other neighbouring authorities such as Kettering, Rugby and Corby and further afield to London.

**Table 8.3** outlines some of the economic statistics for Harborough and provides a comparison with the East Midlands and National averages. The data shows that employment rates are higher than the national average. There has been little change since 2001 in this respect. It is also apparent that skills levels have improved in Harborough since 2001, with fewer people having no qualifications and more people achieving a qualification to level 4 or above. Skills levels in Harborough remain higher than the national average. There is also a significant gap in the percentage of working age population achieving level 4 or above in Harborough compared to the average for the East Midlands.

**Table 8.3:** Economic Factors in Harborough

Feature	Indicator	2011 Data	East Midlands	England	Trends (2001 Data)
Employment	Percentage of the working age population economically active	69%	61.9%	62.1%	69.52%
Unemployment	Percentage of the working age population unemployed	2.5%	3.3%	3.4%	1.76%
Skills	2011: Percentage of the population with no qualifications 2001: Percentage of the working population with no qualifications	18.1%	24.7%	22.5%	22.68%
	2011: Percentage of the population qualified to level 2 2001: Percentage of the working population qualified to level 2	16.3%	15.6%	15.2%	21.11%
	2011: Percentage of the population qualified to level 4 and above 2001: Percentage of the working population qualified to level 4 and above	31.8%	23.6%	27.4%	23.07%

<sup>146</sup> HDC (2011) Harborough District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy 2006 – 2028 [online] available at: [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/2211/harborough\\_district\\_adopted\\_core\\_strategy](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/2211/harborough_district_adopted_core_strategy)

<sup>147</sup> NOMIS (2014) <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157143/report.aspx?town=harborough#tabempocc>

Feature	Indicator	2011 Data	East Midlands	England	Trends (2001 Data)
Enterprise	All active enterprises	4,455	153,615	2,001,885	2006: approx. 4,041
	Enterprise births	9.1%	9.3%	10.4%	2006: 9%
	Enterprise deaths	13.5%	12.7%	13.1%	2006: 7.2%

Source: ONS (2011) – Neighbourhood Statistics – Employment/Unemployment Features<sup>148</sup> - Skills Feature<sup>149</sup> - Enterprise Feature<sup>150,151</sup>

Enterprise births are similar to the regional and national averages. However, the level of enterprise deaths has increased in Harborough compared to 2001; reflecting the increased pressures of recession on businesses.

### Retail

The Harborough Retail Study 2013<sup>152</sup> identifies that Harborough's main existing retail centres, (Market Harborough, Lutterworth and Broughton Astley) are the most capable of accommodating further future growth. Each of these locations maintain very low levels of shop vacancy rates, at 7.4% overall, much lower than the national average of 13.7%.

Though Market Harborough supports a considerably larger retail economy than other centres within Harborough, some areas suffer from limited physical scope for development. The study recommends that in order to meet longer term demand (after 2021) the release of a number of edge of centre sites, along St Mary's Road towards the railway station, could be required. Should this be undertaken, the study suggests that Market Harborough could potentially support 6,300 of the 7,500sq.m projected additional retail floorspace for the entire district up until 2031.

Growth opportunities outside of Market Harborough have been identified most notably in the provision of food stores, particularly in Broughton Astley, which has a notable deficiency with only two small outlets. Therefore, it is recommended that a large food store should be developed in Broughton Astley, increasing the town's market share of expenditure. Besides this Broughton Astley has limited retail capacity for additional facilities and is projected to accommodate only 400sq.m (up to 2031) gross floorspace through vacant shop units and small scale extensions.

Lutterworth is projected to accommodate at least 2,100sq.m gross additional floorspace. As the centre can only support a small amount of this, the report suggests that medium term priorities should lie in exploring the redevelopment potential of land at Bank Street, along with the possible extension of the town's Waitrose store.

<sup>148</sup> ONS (2011) Neighbourhood Statistics – Work Deprivation - Economic Activity, 2011 & 2001 [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadDatasetList.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&q=6444516&i=1001x1003&m=0&r=1&s=1386026330910&enc=1&domainId=9>

<sup>149</sup> ONS (2011) – Neighbourhood Statistics – Education, Skills and Training – Qualification and Students, 2011 & 2001 [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadDatasetList.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&q=6444516&i=1001x1003&m=0&r=1&s=1386026330910&enc=1&domainId=5>

<sup>150</sup> ONS (2011) – Neighbourhood Statistics – Business Demography: Enterprise Births and Deaths, 2011 [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=9&q=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1386024054717&enc=1&dsFamilyId=20879>

<sup>151</sup> UE Associates (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the Harborough Core Strategy – Baseline Data

<sup>152</sup> Harborough District Council (2013) Harborough District Retail Study Update, December 2013. [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200074/planning/52/background\\_reports/31](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/info/200074/planning/52/background_reports/31)

### *Broadband development*

Broadband coverage is an important factor in helping businesses become more efficient and to access wider markets. This is particularly important in rural areas where transport links are typically poorer and businesses may need to take advantage of digital media to operate more effectively.

Data collected from BDUK in 2011 identified that approximately a third of Leicestershire's broadband connectivity operated on download speeds of less than 2 megabytes per second. Much of this lagging connectivity is within areas such as Laughton, Ullestrope and Broughton Astley are poorly served. As part of the Government's objective to implement super-fast broadband in 95% of UK premises by 2017, Leicestershire County Council is rolling out fibre broadband and attempting to meet this coverage target by the end of March 2016, with large areas of central Harborough covered from summer 2014. The strategic plan is designed to improve quality of life and cater to future economic requirements, considering 90% of new jobs will require IT skills by 2015.

## 8.4

### Housing

#### *Contextual review: Housing*

The **NPPF** states that local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period.

The **NPPF** states that, in rural areas, when exercising the duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities, local planning authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate. Authorities should consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs.

**Laying the Foundations (2011)**<sup>153</sup> is the UK Government's Housing Strategy for England which sets out the case for a significantly increased supply of housing that offers flexibility, affordability and quality.

#### *The current and projected baseline*

The Harborough Housing Requirements Study (2013)<sup>154</sup> recommends provision of 440 homes per annum over the period 2011-31, (*figure to be updated following completion of Leicester & Leicestershire HMA Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update, expected Spring 2014*). Between October 2012 and March 2013, 284 dwellings were completed<sup>155</sup>. Of these, only 10% were delivered on previously developed land (PDL) (or brown sites) as opposed to Greenfield<sup>156</sup>. **Figure 8.5** shows a general improvement in housing completions on PDL between 2002 and 2010<sup>157</sup>.

A total of 51 affordable units were built between October 2012 and March 2013, which represents 18% of the total completed dwellings<sup>158</sup>. The 2010 Affordable Housing Requirements Update to the SHMA identified a need for 255 affordable homes per year in Harborough District<sup>159</sup>. Affordability of housing is an important issue in Harborough, as

<sup>153</sup> HM Department for Communities and the Local Environment (2011) Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England.

<sup>154</sup> GL Hearn Ltd (2013) Harborough Housing Requirements Study [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/1160/harborough\\_housing\\_requirements\\_study-march\\_2013](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/1160/harborough_housing_requirements_study-march_2013)

<sup>155</sup> HDC (2013) Strategic Planning Monitoring Report Oct 2012 – Mar 2013

<sup>156</sup> HDC (2013) 5 Year Land supply Update: Apr 2012 to Mar 2013 [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/631/5\\_year\\_housing\\_land\\_supply](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/631/5_year_housing_land_supply)


<sup>157</sup> HDC (2011) 2011 Annual Monitoring Report [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download\\_info.php?downloadID=43](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=43)

<sup>158</sup> HDC (2013) 5 Year Land supply Update: Apr 2012 to Mar 2013 [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/631/5\\_year\\_housing\\_land\\_supply](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/631/5_year_housing_land_supply)

<sup>159</sup> GL Hearn Ltd (2013) Harborough Housing Requirements Study [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/1160/harborough\\_housing\\_requirements\\_study-march\\_2013](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/1160/harborough_housing_requirements_study-march_2013)

highlighted by the relatively poor scores in the 'Barriers to Housing and Services' deprivation category (see Deprivation section of this Scoping Report). Housing prices are higher than the national average and significantly higher than the regional average<sup>160</sup> (see **Table 8.4**).

**Figure 8.5:** Percentage of Housing Completions on Previously Developed Land (PDL)



Source: HDC (2011) – 2011 Annual Monitoring Report<sup>161</sup>

The percentage of privately owned dwellings has slightly risen to 92.1% since 2001 and is above regional and national averages. During the same period dwellings owned by local authority or registered social landlords (RSL) have decreased from 9.6% to 7.9%<sup>162</sup>. Homelessness had also been decreasing and is slightly lower than regional and national averages<sup>163</sup> although this may be due to differences in measurement techniques (see **Table 8.4**).

<sup>160</sup> ONS (2011) – Neighbourhood Statistics – Key Figures for Housing [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadKeyFigures.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=7&g=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1386068131699&enc=1>

<sup>161</sup> HDC (2011) 2011 Annual Monitoring Report [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download\\_info.php?downloadID=43](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=43)

<sup>162</sup> ONS (2011) – Neighbourhood Statistics – Dwelling Stock by Tenure and Condition (2001-2011) [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=7&g=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1386068930605&enc=1&dsFamilyId=811>

<sup>163</sup> ONS (2011) – Neighbourhood Statistics – Homelessness (2001-2011) [online] available at <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=7&b=6275118&c=Harborough&d=13&e=7&g=6444516&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1386068930605&enc=1&dsFamilyId=656>

**Table 8.4: Housing in Harborough**

Feature	Indicator	2011 Data	National/Regional Comparator		Trends (2001 Data)
			East Midlands	England	
House Prices	Average house price (2009 data)	£179,000	£135,000	£170,000	2003 data: £179,020
Affordable housing	Annual shortfall of affordable housing per year	264	No data available	No data available	2007 data: 144
Homelessness	Percentage of statutory homeless households	4%	4.4%	4.7%	9%
Private housing stock	Percentage of owner occupied and privately rented dwellings	92.1%	83.9%	82.1%	89.9%
Local authority housing stock	Percentage of dwellings owned by local authority	0%	9.4%	7.5%	8%
RSL housing stock	Percentage of dwellings owned by registered social landlord	7.9%	6.5%	10.1%	1.6%

Source: ONS (2011) – Neighbourhood Statistics – Key Figures for Housing – Homelessness (2001-2011) – Dwelling by Tenure and Condition (2001-2011)

HDC (2007) – 2007 AMR; HDC (2011) 2011 AMR

HDC (2006) Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document

The 2011 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment<sup>164</sup> (SHLAA) assessed a total of 206 sites for their potential for housing. Of this total, 10 sites (5%) were deemed to be ‘deliverable’ and a further 103 sites (50%) classed as ‘potentially developable’. Until the new housing assessment is complete, **Table 8.5** summarises the expected housing capacity. The ‘deliverable’ sites with planning permission for 5 or more dwellings are expected to deliver 1,142 dwellings within the next 5 years.

**Table 8.5: Potential Housing Capacity in Harborough**

Housing Potential Site Categories	Number of Sites	Estimated Number of Dwellings
‘Deliverable’ sites with planning permissions	10	1,142
‘Potentially developable’ sites	103	9,103
Total	113	10,245

Source: HDC SHLAA 2011 Update

As shown in **Table 8.6**, of the 113 sites assessed as either ‘deliverable’ or ‘potentially developable’ 20 (18%) are on PDL. The potential estimated capacity is focused on Greenfield sites, as the 20 PDL sites only account for 5% of the total estimated capacity.

<sup>164</sup> HDC (2012) Harborough District Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2011 Update [online] available at [https://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/939/2011\\_shlaa](https://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/939/2011_shlaa)



**Table 8.6:** Potential Housing Capacity by Land Type

Land Type	Number of Sites	Estimated Number of Dwellings
Previously Developed Land (PDL)	20	526
Greenfield Land	93	9,719
Total	113	10,245

Source: HDC SHLAA 2011 Update

**Table 8.7** summarises the total potential housing capacity by settlement. Market Harborough has the greatest total potential capacity for housing with 30%, followed by; Broughton Astley with 22%, the Rural Centres with 17%, Leicester Principal Urban Area with 16%, Lutterworth with 11% and Selected Rural Villages with 5%.

Of the 1,142 dwellings with planning consent expected to be delivered within the next 5 years; 45% are within Market Harborough, 11% within the Leicester Principal Urban Area and 11% within Lutterworth and 4% within Broughton Astley. The remaining 29% are within the Rural Centres, in particular at Kibworth Beauchamp and Great Glen.

**Table 8.7:** Potential Housing Capacity by Settlement

Settlement	Deliverable	Potentially Developable			Total
	Yrs 0-5	Yrs 6-10	Yrs 11-15	Yrs 15+	
Market Harborough	520	1,489	683	334	3,026
Leicester Principal Urban Area	123	1,159	310	0	1,592
Broughton Astley	50	1,692	304	189	2,235
Lutterworth	120	804	161	0	1,085
Rural Centres	329	1,158	281	0	1,768
Selected Rural Centres	0	539	0	0	539
Total	1,142	6,841	1,739	523	10,245

Source: HDC SHLAA 2011 Update

An updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area is scheduled for completion in Spring 2014 and an updated HDC SHLAA will be published in April 2014. Both their conclusions on housing need and potential housing land availability in the District will be incorporated into the SA.

## 8.5 Key Issues for Housing and Economy

This table draws together the issues and opportunities for 'housing and economy'; established from the contextual review and baseline information presented above. For those factors where it is considered that significant impacts could occur - these will be the focus of the appraisal and have therefore been 'scoped-in'. Conversely, those factors that the Plan is unlikely to have a significant impact on have been 'scoped out'.

Issues and Opportunities	Scoping Decision
<p><i>Population</i></p> <p>Increased pressure on housing and services resulting from increasing population.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> The Local Plan has to meet the various housing requirements of an ageing and growing population.</p>
<p><i>Economy</i></p> <p>Harborough has a highly skilled workforce, with an increasingly important service sector. 51% of the workforce commutes out of Harborough.</p> <p>Agricultural and rural activities are important to Harborough's economy.</p> <p>Retail provision is forecast to increase to support an expanding population and economy (including tourism). Much of the available floorspace is in Market Harborough.</p> <p>The development of high-speed broadband could have positive impacts for Harborough's socio-economic development. However, currently parts of the district are extremely poorly served.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> The Local Plan to facilitate provision of local jobs at various skill levels. .</p> <p><b>IN:</b> The Local Plan should seek to support rural economic activity.</p> <p><b>IN:</b> The Local Plan should seek to support the delivery of appropriate retail provision to meet the needs of a growing population.</p> <p><b>IN:</b> The Local Plan should help to facilitate the development of superfast broadband.</p>
<p><i>Housing</i></p> <p>Increased housing pressures resulting from increasing population.</p> <p>There is a deficiency in affordable housing provision.</p> <p>The majority of land available for housing is Greenfield.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> The Local Plan should seek to meet the housing requirements of a growing and ageing population.</p>

## 8.6 Sustainability objectives

The key issues and opportunities that have been 'scoped-in' to the appraisal for 'housing and economy' have been used to establish the following sustainability objectives and criteria as part of the overall SA Framework (see section 11 for further detail).

Sustainability Objectives	Guiding Questions / Criteria	Potential Monitoring Indicators
7. Provide affordable, sustainable, good-quality housing for all.	7.1) How could proposals affect levels of house building? 7.2) How could proposals affect the ability to deliver affordable housing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Net additional dwellings.</li> <li>- Gross affordable housing completions.</li> </ul>
8. Support investment to grow the local economy.	8.1) Would proposals help to create job opportunities for local residents? 8.2) Would the proposals support the rural economy? 8.3) Would the proposals help to support the vitality of town centres and their retail offer? 8.4) Would the proposals help to secure improvements in telecommunications infrastructure? ( <i>For example high speed broadband connectivity</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Total amount of additional floor space by type.</li> <li>- Employment land available.</li> <li>- Jobs created / retained in rural areas.</li> <li>- Total number of visitors and spend on tourism</li> <li>- Broadband coverage and speed.</li> </ul>

## 9 RESOURCE USE

### 9.1 Introduction

This section sets out the relevant policy framework and baseline position for the following sustainability factors that have been grouped under the theme of 'resource use':

- Water availability;
- Waste & recycling;
- Minerals; and
- Energy and carbon emissions.

Information has then assembled to establish the key issues and opportunities that relate to 'resource use' and which provide a focus for the SA. The chapter concludes by establishing the objectives and indicators that will form the SA Framework.

### 9.2 Water Availability

#### *Contextual review*

**The NPPF** states that local planning authorities should produce strategic policies to deliver the provision of a variety of infrastructure, including that necessary for water supply.

**The White Paper, Water for Life** says that authorities should encourage and incentivise water efficiency measures at the demand side<sup>165</sup>.

The Anglian Water, **Water Resources Management Plan**, 2014 sets out how water will be made available for the next 25 years. These documents are reviewed on a five yearly basis, and are subject to extensive consultation and the Local Authorities have an opportunity to input into them.

#### *The current and projected baseline*

Harborough District is served by two water companies. Severn Trent Water (STW) provides potable water distribution for the Harborough administrative area and wastewater collection for the urban centres of Broughton Astley and Lutterworth. Anglian Water provides wastewater collection and management for the south and western region of the Harborough administrative area including the main population centre, Market Harborough<sup>166</sup>.

The Welland Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS)<sup>167</sup>, which covers much of the eastern part of Harborough, including Market Harborough, records that there is no water available for abstraction on the River Welland and its tributaries except at extremely high flows. The Soar CAMS<sup>168</sup>, which covers the north western part of Harborough, suggests that water is available for further abstraction.

The River Welland and its tributaries are already reaching maximum abstraction levels. Stress on water resources is likely to further increase due to increased demand from a growing population and potential lower river flows during dry periods as a result of climate change<sup>169</sup>.

However it is important to recognise that water for supply is managed on a large scale in water resource zones. In this way the source of water does not need to be local to the point of supply as water can also be moved between water resource zones over long distances.

<sup>165</sup> Defra (2011) Water for life (The Water White Paper) [online] available at:

<http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm82/8230/8230.pdf>

<sup>166</sup> Scott Wilson (2009) Harborough District Council Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment [online] available at

[http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/Harborough\\_SFRA\\_Level\\_1\\_Report.pdf](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/Harborough_SFRA_Level_1_Report.pdf)

<sup>167</sup> Environment Agency (2013) Welland Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy – A licensing strategy to manage water resources sustainably [online] available at [http://a0768b4a8a31e106d8b0-50dc802554eb38a24458b98ff72d550b.r19.cf3.rackcdn.com/LIT7778\\_660701.pdf](http://a0768b4a8a31e106d8b0-50dc802554eb38a24458b98ff72d550b.r19.cf3.rackcdn.com/LIT7778_660701.pdf)

<sup>168</sup> Environment Agency (2013) Soar Abstraction licensing strategy – A licensing strategy to manage water resources sustainably [online] available at [http://a0768b4a8a31e106d8b0-50dc802554eb38a24458b98ff72d550b.r19.cf3.rackcdn.com/LIT\\_2646\\_3c9ca3.pdf](http://a0768b4a8a31e106d8b0-50dc802554eb38a24458b98ff72d550b.r19.cf3.rackcdn.com/LIT_2646_3c9ca3.pdf)

<sup>169</sup> STW (2013) Revised Draft Water Resources Management Plan 2013 – Our proposals for the next 25 years [online] available at <http://www.severntrent.com/future/future-plans-and-strategy/water-resources-management-plan/draft-WRMP-consultation-documents>

Therefore, local water issues as identified in the Catchment Abstraction Management plans are no necessarily relevant for water for supply. On this basis, the Environment Agency considers that it is unlikely that development will impact on water resources in the river Welland.

### 9.3 Waste and Recycling

#### *Contextual review*

The **Government's Review of Waste Policy in England' (2011)** recognises that environmental benefits and economic growth can be the result of a more sustainable approach to the use of materials. As such, it sets out a vision to move beyond our current 'throwaway society' to a 'zero waste economy'. The report recognises that planning will play a critical role in delivering this ambition.

**The Waste Management Plan for England (2013)** concludes that from the 2011 review, further policy measures are not needed to meet the key objectives of the revised Waste Framework Directive.

The Government announced in November 2013 that it is to reduce its policy development in areas such as commercial and industrial waste and construction and demolition waste, as well as energy from waste policy development. Continued support will however continue on the EU waste agreements as the European Commission brings forward proposals on waste and resource efficiency. In addition, the Materials Recovery Facility regulations will be progressed to drive up the quality of recycled material and help support growth and the economy by maximising the economic value of the waste material collected<sup>170</sup>.

The Government's December 2013 statement on waste, (**Prevention is Better than Cure**<sup>171</sup>) the agenda to move towards resource efficiency is presented. The aim of the Programme is to improve the environment and protect human health by supporting a resource efficient economy, reducing the quantity and impact of waste produced whilst promoting sustainable economic growth. The Government wants to '*encourage businesses to contribute to a more sustainable economy by building waste reduction into design, offering alternative business models and delivering new and improved products and services*'.

While much of the document focuses upon the consumer rather than infrastructure sector, the Government seeks to assess progress against the aim of this programme, by measuring changes in overall waste arisings, the environmental impacts of waste and also by considering how these factors relate to changes in the resource efficiency of the economy.

The Waste Management Plan for England (2013) also notes that **Planning Policy Statement 10** (Planning for Sustainable Waste Management<sup>172</sup>) is in the process of being replaced by a National Planning Policy for sustainable waste management.

**Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Core Strategy (2009)**<sup>173</sup> contains the following spatial vision:

To provide Leicestershire and Leicester with an efficient, safe and sustainable range of waste facilities with capacity equal to the amount of waste generated and requiring management within Leicestershire and Leicester in locations that minimise environmental impact, provide community benefit and help improve quality of life by:

- Encouraging waste reduction;
- Increasing the reuse and recycling of waste; and
- Less reliance on landfill by increased energy recovery

**Leicestershire Municipal Waste Management Strategy (2011)**<sup>174</sup> sets a local target of 58% recycling and composting of Local Authority Waste by 2017.

<sup>170</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/255508/waste-stakeholder-letter-131106.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/255508/waste-stakeholder-letter-131106.pdf)

<sup>171</sup> HM Government, (2013): Prevention is Better than Cure: The Role of Waste Prevention in Moving to a More Resource Efficient Economy, [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/265022/pb14091-waste-prevention-20131211.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/265022/pb14091-waste-prevention-20131211.pdf)

<sup>172</sup> Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, [www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-for-sustainable-waste-management-planning-policy-statement-10](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-for-sustainable-waste-management-planning-policy-statement-10)

<sup>173</sup> LCC & Leicester City Council (2009) Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework – Core Strategy and Development Control Policies [online] available at [http://www.leics.gov.uk/adopted\\_wdf\\_core\\_strategy-for\\_web.pdf](http://www.leics.gov.uk/adopted_wdf_core_strategy-for_web.pdf)

<sup>174</sup> LCC (2012) Leicestershire Municipal Waste Management Strategy – Strategy Update 2011 [online] available at <http://politics.leics.gov.uk/documents/s70269/Appendix%203%20-%20LMWMS%20Strategy%20Update%202011%20Final%20Draft.pdf>



*The current and projected baseline*

Harborough's waste arisings have decreased by 6.8% since 2008/09. In parallel, recycling, composting and reuse rates have continuously increased reaching up to 57% for household waste, which is significantly above the regional and national averages, respectively at 47% and 43%. This average falls down to 53% when considering all municipal waste, which remains significantly better than the regional and national averages<sup>175</sup>.

Data on the proportion of municipal waste going to landfill, being incinerated or sent to energy from waste facilities was not available at the district level.

Whilst household numbers are predicted to increase, drivers for reduction in waste arising are likely to counter the effect that this might have on arisings and thus a zero growth rate is predicted<sup>176</sup>. The trend data in **Table 9.1** suggests that recycling, composting and reuse rates are likely to further increase in order to meet the proposed targets.

**Table 9.1: Waste Arisings and Recycling Rates in Harborough Wards**

Feature	2012/13 (tonnes)	(thousand tonnes)		Trends (2008/09)
		East Midlands	England	
Household waste arisings per person	0.4	-	0.42	0.44
Total household waste arisings	34,154	2,015	22,643	35,977
Municipal waste arisings	37,555	2,180	25,021	40,283
% household waste sent for recycling, composting & reuse (RCR)	57%	47%	43%	48%
% municipal sent for recycling, composting & reuse	53%	48%	45%	49%

Source: Defra (2013)<sup>177</sup>

There are three Household Waste Recycling Facilities in Harborough and others located in neighbouring authorities (see **Figure 9.1**).

Biennial surveys at the Council's Civic Amenity (CA) sites record that Harborough residents predominantly use the following sites: Market Harborough, Lutterworth, Kibworth, Oadby and Somerby. In addition, it is considered likely that residents in or immediately around the village of Great Easton may use the Corby site.

There are no new civic amenity sites expected or being planned for in Harborough, but this would be reviewed on an individual application basis especially with regards to large developments (for example applications for greater than 1,000 residential dwellings).

All residential developments are likely to result in increased use of the CA sites and either; a reduction in available capacity; or, an increase in capacity shortfall. However, a 100% offsetting policy is applied when requesting S106 contributions from new development to deal with increases in waste. Therefore, in the long term pressure on particular waste sites and access should remain consistent<sup>178</sup>.

<sup>175</sup> Defra (2013) ENV18 – Local authority collected waste: annual results tables [online] available at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/env18-local-authority-collected-waste-annual-results-tables>

<sup>176</sup> LCC (2012) Leicestershire Municipal Waste Management Strategy – Strategy Update 2011 [online] available at


<http://politics.leics.gov.uk/documents/s70269/Appendix%203%20-%20LMWMS%20Strategy%20Update%202011%20Final%20Draft.pdf>

<sup>177</sup> Defra (2013) ENV18 – Local authority collected waste: annual results tables [online] available at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/env18-local-authority-collected-waste-annual-results-tables>

<sup>178</sup> Pers. com. Leicestershire County Council February 2013.

Figure 9.1: Household Waste Recycling Centres in Harborough and surrounding districts.



<b>LEGEND</b>							
◻ Districts		● Waste Sites					
<small>                 NB: Locations correct as of October 2013                  Contains Ordnance Survey Data                  © Crown Copyright and database right 2013             </small>							
<table border="1"> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </table>							
Version Details Drafts: 0    Issues: 0    Comments: 0    Approved: 0							
Project Title <b>HARBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL</b>							
Project Title <b>HARBOROUGH SCOPING REPORT</b>							
Project Title <b>WASTE SITES</b>							
Title Draft	Issued M	Approved M	Date 14/02/2014				
URS Internal Project No. Project No.		Scale @ A3 1:250,000					
<small>                 This document has been prepared in accordance with the terms of a URS agreement with the Harborough District Council. It is not intended to be a contract and should not be relied upon for any purpose. It is the property of URS and shall remain the property of URS. It is not to be distributed outside the project team without the prior written consent of URS.             </small>							
URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited 2001 15th Floor 15 Abchurch Lane London EC4N 3DF Tel: 020 7485 4000 www.urscorp.com			<b>URS</b>				
Figure Number <b>FIGURE 9.1</b>							

## 9.4

## Minerals

*Contextual review*

The **NPPF states that minerals** are essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life. It is therefore important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long-term conservation.

**Leicestershire Minerals Core Strategy (2009)**<sup>179</sup> vision for minerals is “*to manage mineral extraction in Leicestershire in a way which meets the social and economic needs of the County and makes an appropriate contribution to the national and regional need for minerals in ways which seek to protect and enhance the character and quality of the environment and the quality of life for existing and future generations, in accordance with the principles of sustainability*”.

*The current and projected baseline*

Leicestershire contains extensive mineral resources and is one of the country’s principal producers of minerals. As outlined in the geodiversity section of this Scoping Report, extensive deposits of sand and gravel occur throughout Harborough. Currently there are two operational mineral sites: Husbands Bosworth Quarry and Shawell Quarry. There is one other permitted site at Slip Inn Quarry, which is currently inactive<sup>180</sup>.

Leicestershire County Council is seeking to review its adopted policies which deal with mineral extraction and waste management to produce a new Minerals and Waste Local Plan. An Issues document was published for consultation in November 2013.

Leicestershire’s current Mineral and Waste Local Plan (MWLP) proposes to extend operations at Husbands Bosworth and Shawell Quarries to meet current and future needs. Part of the proposals at Shawell Quarry has received planning permission. However, resources are gradually becoming depleted in the vicinity of these sites. The MWLP suggests that there would be a shortfall of sand and gravel reserves over the period to 2031. Hence, new potential sites are currently under investigation across the County.

Deposits of sand and gravel are considered of economic importance and thus Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) have been identified in the MWLP. Incompatible development close to a MSA may lead to sterilisation of the resource.


**Figure 9.2** (reproduced from the Adopted Leicestershire Minerals Core Strategy, 2011), illustrates the location of important aggregate resources across the County. This shows that there are significant sand and gravel resources throughout Harborough with particular concentrations to the North West and South of Lutterworth. There are two active sand and gravel sites south of Lutterworth and one inactive site to the north that could potentially become operational again in the future.

<sup>179</sup> LCC (2009) Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework – Core Strategy and Development Control Policies up to 2021 [online] available at [http://www.leics.gov.uk/adopted\\_mdf\\_core\\_strategy-for\\_web-2.pdf](http://www.leics.gov.uk/adopted_mdf_core_strategy-for_web-2.pdf)

<sup>180</sup> LCC (2013) Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan [online] available at [http://www.leics.gov.uk/adopted\\_mdf\\_core\\_strategy-for\\_web.pdf](http://www.leics.gov.uk/adopted_mdf_core_strategy-for_web.pdf)



Figure 9.2: Aggregates resources in Harborough



## 9.5 Energy and Carbon Emissions

### *Contextual review*

According to the **NPPF**, the need to 'support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate' is a 'core planning principle'.

Planning should play a key role in securing 'radical reductions' in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions planning for new development in locations and ways which reduce GHG emissions in order to meet the targets set out in the Climate Change Act 2008.

Local plans should also support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings and extensions<sup>181</sup>.

Local plans should positively promote renewable energy technologies and consider identifying suitable areas for their construction; working with developers to make renewable energy projects acceptable to local communities.

The **UK Renewable Energy Strategy (2009)**<sup>182</sup> sets the target to achieve a 15% share of energy from renewable sources by 2020. The **National Renewable Energy Action Plan for the United Kingdom (2009)**<sup>183</sup> sets out a framework to achieve this target, with the following three key components:

- Financial support for renewables;
- Unblocking barriers to delivery; and
- Developing emerging technologies.

**Leicestershire's Draft Carbon Reduction Strategy 2013-2020**<sup>184</sup> sets the target to reduce average annual carbon emissions by 23% by 2020 compared to levels in 2005, which is considered comparable to the national target set in the Climate Change Act (2008). This would mean that carbon emissions in Leicestershire would be 4,4000kt in 2020. Priorities related to energy include:

- To exceed county wide pro-rata allocation of capital funding available from existing national initiatives for energy improvement activities in the residential housing stock; and
- Create the demand from business for carbon reduction.

Harborough District Council is also committed to producing a **Climate Local Plan**. Once finalised, the key messages from this document will be reflected in future updates to the Scope of the SA.

<sup>181</sup> Committee on Climate Change (2012) How local authorities can reduce emissions and manage climate risk [online] available at: [http://hmccc.s3.amazonaws.com/Local%20Authorities/1584\\_CCC\\_LA%20Report\\_bookmarked\\_1b.pdf](http://hmccc.s3.amazonaws.com/Local%20Authorities/1584_CCC_LA%20Report_bookmarked_1b.pdf)

<sup>182</sup> Available online at <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm76/7686/7686.pdf>

<sup>183</sup> Available online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/47871/25-nat-ren-energy-action-plan.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/47871/25-nat-ren-energy-action-plan.pdf)

<sup>184</sup> LCC (2013) Leicestershire Together - Draft Carbon Reduction Strategy 2013-2020 [online] available at [http://www.leicestershiretogether.org/crs\\_consultation\\_draft\\_vfinal.pdf](http://www.leicestershiretogether.org/crs_consultation_draft_vfinal.pdf)



*The current and projected baseline*

Across Harborough road transport is by far the largest source of carbon dioxide emissions contributing almost half (48%) of the District's total emissions<sup>185</sup> reflecting the relative affluence of Harborough, the rural nature of the District and high car dependence (see Accessibility & Transport). This contrasts with national trends, where road transport contributes to 28% of total emissions, but is broadly similar to the 40% figure for the county<sup>186</sup>.

Overall, per capita emissions are higher in Harborough than in Leicestershire and the UK. This is particularly significant considering the lack of industry and power generation in the District.

As shown in **Figure 9.1**, carbon emissions decreased by 15% between 2005 and 2011 in Harborough, which is similar to the 17% decrease experienced in Leicestershire and the UK. Further reductions are required to meet the 2020 targets.


**Table 9.1: Harborough CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions Estimates**

Year	Sector				Total Emissions (kt CO <sub>2</sub> )	Per Capita Emissions (t CO <sub>2</sub> )
	Industry and Commercial (kt CO <sub>2</sub> )	Domestic (kt CO <sub>2</sub> )	Transport (kt CO <sub>2</sub> )	Land Use & Land Use Change (kt CO <sub>2</sub> )		
2005	216.2	208.2	371.5	14.3	810.1	10.1
2006	212.1	208.5	366.0	13.2	799.7	9.8
2007	199.5	206.2	371.9	12.3	789.9	9.6
2008	206.6	205.1	348.7	10.7	771.1	9.2
2009	185.3	185.0	335.7	10.5	716.4	8.5
2010	193.1	199.3	333.6	9.5	735.5	8.7
2011	172.9 (25%)	176.4 (26%)	329.2 (48%)	8.9 (1%)	687.5	8.0
<b>Leicestershire</b>						
2011	1,516.5 (32%)	1,294.6 (27%)	1,914.7 (40%)	18.8 (1%)	4,744.6	7.3
<b>England</b>						
2011	185,795.8 (42%)	128,780.6 (29%)	124,058.0 (28%)	3,835.6 (1%)	434,798.8	6.9

Source: DECC (2013) Local and Regional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions estimates for 2005-2011: Full Dataset

<sup>185</sup> DECC (2013) Local and Regional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions estimates for 2005-2011: Full Dataset [online] available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-authority-emissions-estimates>

<sup>186</sup> DECC (2013) Local and Regional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions estimates for 2005-2011: Full Dataset [online] available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-authority-emissions-estimates> (

**Figure 9.1:** CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions since 2005 in Harborough

Source: DECC (2013) Local and Regional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions estimates for 2005-2011: Full Dataset

The trends data illustrated in **Figure 9.1** above suggest that carbon emissions are likely to continue to decrease in order to meet set targets. Increased investments in renewable energy are also expected (see section below) combined with advances in renewable energy technologies. However, it may become increasingly difficult to continue to reduce carbon emissions once the most cost effective measures have already been taken advantage of. Therefore, the reduction in carbon emissions might decline.

### Renewable Energy

There have been thirty two planning applications for wind turbines between 2006 and 2013 of which:

- 15 have been implemented; principally at Swinford [11 turbines / installed capacity 22 megawatts] and Low Spinney near Ashby Magna [4 turbines / installed capacity 8 mega watts])
- 9 have been consented but not yet implemented; and
- 8 have been refused<sup>187</sup>.

The Renewable Energy Assessment undertaken for Leicestershire<sup>188</sup> reveals that Harborough offers the greatest potential for wind energy out of Leicestershire's seven districts. **Table 9.2** lists the eight potential sites, which were identified for large wind turbines. In total these sites could provide up to an estimated 65,700MWh per year, sufficient for 13,980 homes.

The information concerning low carbon energy generation within Harborough is not currently collated. However, operator information on Swinford & Low Spinney wind farms indicates that they are expected to produce enough electricity to supply 12,300 & 6,936 homes annually, respectively.

<sup>187</sup> HDC (2013) Strategic Planning Monitoring Report Oct 2012 – Mar 2013

<sup>188</sup> IT Power (2008) Planning for Climate Change – Renewable Energy Opportunities for Blaby, Harborough, Hinckley and Bosworth, Melton, North West Leicestershire, Oadby and Wigston and Rutland [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/445/renewable\\_energy\\_assessment](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/445/renewable_energy_assessment)

**Table 9.2:** Potential Sites for Large Wind Turbines in Harborough


Location	Wind resource	Potential	Capacity	Comment
Hovel Hill	6.3m/s	Medium	6 – 8 MW	This site, located around 2 km from South Kilworth, offers an area for 3-4 large turbines. Site access could present a problem. Falls within the 30 km advisory zone around from Coventry Airport.
Theddingworth	6.5m/s	Low	4 – 6 MW	This site's relative proximity to Husbands Bosworth could present a problem. Grand Union canal could also make access more difficult. Suitable for 2-3 turbines.
Laughton	6.7m/s	High	2 MW	Small site could be considered for a large single turbine.
Foxton	6.1m/s	Medium	6 – 8 MW	Site located between Foxton and the A6 road and suitable for 3-4 wind turbines. Footpaths could be an issue for planning and reduce the available area for wind turbines.
Saddington	6.3m/s	Medium	2 – 4 MW	Site suitable for 1-2 large wind turbines. Footpaths could present a problem for this site.
Thorpe Langton	6.1m/s	Medium	4 MW	Site suitable for 2 large wind turbines, spoiled by irregular topography features.
Glooston	6.3m/s	Low	6 MW	Located around 1,5km from Foxton. Suitable for up to 3 wind turbines. Layout for the turbines should take into account Stonton Wood, which could shelter the site from south west winds.
Hallaton	6.2m/s	Medium	2 – 4 MW	Site suitable for 2-3 wind turbines, marred only by possible access problems.

Source: IT Power (2008) Planning for Climate Change Report – Renewable Energy Assessment

**Figure 9.2** presents the renewable energy opportunities in Harborough, using the most optimistic scenario. Building integrated technologies represents the greatest potential but is highly dependent on local planning policies. Currently, there is little incentive for installing micro-generation on existing and new buildings. Harborough also has some potential for short rotation coppice and other energy crops. On the other hand, there is no potential for hydro and anaerobic digestion of cattle and pig slurry<sup>189</sup>.

<sup>189</sup> IT Power (2008) Planning for Climate Change – Renewable Energy Opportunities for Blaby, Harborough, Hinckley and Bosworth, Melton, North West Leicestershire, Oadby and Wigston and Rutland [online] available at [http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/445/renewable\\_energy\\_assessment](http://www.harborough.gov.uk/downloads/file/445/renewable_energy_assessment)

Figure 9.2 Summary of Opportunities for Renewable Energy in Harborough (High Scenario)



Source: IT Power (2008) Planning for Climate Change Report – Renewable Energy Assessment

## 9.6

### Key Issues for Resource Use

This table draws together the issues and opportunities for 'resource use'; established from the contextual review and baseline information presented above. For those factors where it is considered that significant impacts could occur - these will be the focus of the appraisal and have therefore been 'scoped-in'. Conversely, those factors that the Plan is unlikely to have a significant impact on have been 'scoped out'.

Issues and Opportunities	Scoping Decision
<p><i>Water Availability</i></p> <p>Current levels of stress on water resources, in particular on the River Welland and its tributaries.</p>	<p><b>OUT:</b> Cumulative impacts of development could affect demand for water. However, the EA considers that the impacts upon the River Welland are unlikely to be significant in terms of water supply.</p>
<p><i>Waste and Recycling</i></p> <p>Waste reduction is a key objective at national and local level, with specific targets set for recovery, recycling and composting.</p>	<p><b>OUT:</b> Locally, levels of recycling, reuse and composting of municipal waste are relatively high compared to the national average. Policies for waste are also contained within Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Core Strategy (2009).</p>
<p><i>Minerals</i></p> <p>Harborough's deposits of sands and gravel are considered important to current and future economic activity.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> Incompatible development close to a Mineral Safeguarded Area may lead to sterilisation of the resource.</p>

<p><i>Energy and Carbon Emissions</i></p> <p>Reducing energy use and emissions related to road transport is a key issue in the District.</p> <p>Reduction of carbon emissions is a key objective at the national and local level. The evidence suggests that Harborough has the potential to increase its installed capacity of renewable/low carbon energy sources.</p>	<p><b>IN:</b> The Local Plan has a role to play in reducing carbon emissions by supporting development that encourages sustainable modes of transport and improved accessibility.</p> <p><b>OUT:</b> Although Local Plans have a part to play in promoting low carbon energy infrastructure, policy CS9 'Addressing Climate Change' in the Adopted Core Strategy will be carried forward to the new Local Plan and this has already been appraised. National targets and measures to improve the efficiency of new development will drive the improvements in this area.</p>
--	--

### 9.7 Sustainability objectives

The key issues and opportunities that have been 'scoped-in' to the appraisal for 'resource use' have been used to establish the following sustainability objectives and criteria as part of the overall SA Framework (see **Section 11** for further detail).

Sustainability Objectives	Guiding Questions / Criteria	Potential Monitoring Indicators
<p>9) Use and manage resources efficiently, whilst minimising Harborough's emissions of greenhouse gases.</p>	<p>9.1) To what extent would proposals lead to an increase or decrease in the use of energy and / or water?</p> <p>9.2) Do proposals help to achieve / support a reduction in carbon emissions?</p> <p>9.3) Do proposals encourage the efficient use of minerals?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Percentage of developments achieving a higher CFSH homes water efficiency rating than required by building regulations.</li> <li>- Carbon emissions from road transport.</li> </ul>



## 10 KEY THEMES ON WHICH TO FOCUS THE APPRAISAL

The SA Report must include...

- Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan.

### 10.1 Introduction

Drawing upon the review of the policy framework (contextual review) and baseline data, a range of sustainability issues and opportunities have been identified as a focus for the SA. These are brought together in **Table 10.1** below.

*Table 10.1: Sustainability themes and issues 'scoped-in'*

Theme	Key sustainability issues and opportunities
<b>Natural Environment</b>	<p><b>Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is only a small amount of land within the District formally designated for its nature conservation value. However, locally important wildlife habitats and species have been recorded across the District.</li> <li>• Protecting, maintaining and enhancing wildlife habitats are key objectives at national and local level, with a specific goal to enhance wildlife value and connectivity in the countryside. The Local Plan presents an opportunity to enhance wildlife habitats if development is appropriately located and designed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Water quality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At a strategic level, the effects of increased development could have significant effects on water quality if required upgrades to the network are not secured in-phase with development and increased demands.</li> </ul> <p><b>Land Quality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield development may affect the best and most versatile land.</li> </ul>
<b>Built and Natural Heritage</b>	<p><b>Landscape and Settlement Character</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The District's eastern countryside is recognised as being of high quality and particularly attractive.</li> <li>• Local landscape features such as hedgerows, open space, trees and field boundaries make certain parts of some settlement edges more sensitive to development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Heritage Assets</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are over 1,400 designated heritage assets located across the District and further features of local value (i.e. non-designated heritage assets). Development has the potential to affect the condition, setting, and access to these assets either positively or negatively.</li> </ul>

Theme	Key sustainability issues and opportunities
<b>Healthy &amp; Wellbeing</b>	<p><b>Health and Wellbeing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A lack of health service provision in rural areas exists, which could be exacerbated by population growth and an ageing population and challenges of rural transport.</li> </ul> <p><b>Accessibility &amp; Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst Harborough has good road, rail and air links, accessibility is a critical issue in the rural areas of the District.</li> </ul> <p><b>Air quality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the District has generally good air quality, an AQMA has been designated in Lutterworth. Monitoring indicates that there are on-going air quality concerns in this area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Green Infrastructure and recreation.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a deficiency in the provision of certain types of green infrastructure. (<i>Parks &amp; gardens, provision for children and young people and allotments</i>).</li> </ul>
<b>Resilience</b>	<p><b>Climate Change</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate change is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events such as heat waves, flooding and drought.</li> </ul> <p><b>Flood risk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Watercourse and surface water flooding causing damage to property and infrastructure represents the priority risk for Harborough.</li> </ul>
<b>Economy and Housing</b>	<p><b>Population</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An increasing and ageing population could put pressure on health services, housing provision and employment opportunities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Economy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harborough has a highly skilled workforce, with an increasingly important service sector. There are also strong links with surrounding authorities with over 50% of the population commuting out of the District for work.</li> <li>Agricultural and rural economic activities are important to Harborough's economy.</li> <li>Retail provision is forecast to increase to support an expanding population and economy (including tourism). Much of the available floorspace is in Market Harborough.</li> <li>The development of high-speed broadband could have positive impacts for Harborough's socio-economic development. However, currently parts of the district are extremely poorly served.</li> </ul> <p><b>Housing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased housing pressures resulting from increasing population.</li> <li>There is a deficiency in affordable housing provision.</li> <li>The majority of land available for housing is Greenfield.</li> </ul>
<b>Resource use</b>	<p><b>Minerals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harborough contains sand and gravel resources that are to be protected from sterilisation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Energy and carbon emissions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction of carbon emissions is a key objective at the national and local level. Reducing the impact of traffic emissions is a particular challenge for rural areas.</li> </ul>

### *Summary*

Together, the sustainability topics highlight that the main challenges for Harborough are to:

- Ensure that its growing population and highly skilled workforce can benefit from continued access to employment and affordable housing;
- Ensure that rural areas benefit from economic growth without eroding the character of settlements and exacerbating accessibility issues;
- Support environmental quality to maintain the attractiveness of the District for economic development, health and wellbeing and the natural environment;
- Protect and enhance the historic character of Harborough's settlements.
- Support the viability of rural community services and improve transport links to facilities and services in urban areas;
- Become more resilient to the impacts of climate change.

11 APPRAISAL METHODS

11.1 The SA Framework

An SA framework is a methodological approach to guide sustainability appraisals that is drawn together from a consideration of the key issues and opportunities identified through scoping.

An SA Framework was first established in the SA Scoping Report that was prepared in 2008 to support preparation of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework Documents (*as per the previous plan-making process*). This framework was updated in response to consultation feedback and new evidence. The finalised framework was then presented in the SA Report that accompanied the Core Strategy in 2010.

In response to the 2012 changes to the plan-making process, the Council resolved to prepare a new Local Plan the scope of which was agreed following a consultation exercise in March 2013. Whilst much of the Core Strategy will remain, the Local Plan will include site allocations and amendments to various policies. As a result the scope of the sustainability appraisal has been updated and some minor amendments to the SA Framework have been made to reflect the Local Plan and changes in the evidence base that have occurred since 2010.

As illustrated in **Table 11.1** below, the SA Framework now consists of nine sustainability objectives that are grouped in the six sustainability themes used in this report. Supporting each objective is a series of guiding criteria when undertaking policy appraisals.

As a result, the number of objectives and criteria has been reduced from 12 to 9 and 59 to 23 respectively since the 2010 Scoping Report. This will assist in making the appraisal process more focused and easier to engage with. Despite this change, much of the 2010 SA Framework has been retained. **Appendix 2** documents the changes that have been made to the SA framework and the rationale for these changes.

*Table 11.1: The SA Framework*

Sustainability Theme	SA Objectives	Guiding Criteria	Potential Monitoring Indicators
Natural Environment	1) Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity.  2) Protect, enhance and manage environmental resources.	1.1) Would biodiversity interests be affected?  2.1) What could be the effects on the quality of water environments?  2.2) What could be the effects on land quality?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Net contribution towards habitat creation / improvement (hectares).</li> <li>- Net loss of Best and Most versatile Agricultural land.</li> <li>- Effect on condition of SSSIs and overall percentage of SSSI in favourable or unfavourable recovering condition.</li> <li>- Net effect on number and area of Local Wildlife Sites.</li> <li>- Impact on Water Framework Development compliance.</li> <li>- Hectares of contaminated land brought back into productive use.</li> <li>- The number of new systems or area of land covered by Sustainable Drainage Systems.</li> </ul>

Sustainability Theme	SA Objectives	Guiding Criteria	Potential Monitoring Indicators
Built and natural heritage	3) Protect, enhance and manage the historic character and distinctiveness of the District's settlements and their surrounding landscapes.	3.1) How could proposals affect the historic value and character of settlements and/or surrounding landscapes?  3.2) Could proposals hinder or assist efforts to maintain and enhance features (designated and non-designated) of historic, cultural or archaeological interest?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of heritage features 'at risk'.</li> <li>- Development granted contrary to heritage policies.</li> <li>- Percentage of people that think the character of their neighbourhood has improved / stayed the same / declined.</li> </ul>
Health and Wellbeing	4) Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing.  5) Improve accessibility to employment, retail, business, health and community services, supporting health and well-being in the district.	4.1) How could proposals affect standards of open space, recreation and leisure provision?  4.2) Could proposals have an effect on efforts to maintain and strengthen local identity and community cohesion?  4.3) Could proposals have different impacts on certain social groups ( <i>age, gender, social class for example</i> )?  4.4) How could proposals impact upon air quality (particularly in Lutterworth)?  5.1) What impact could there be on local service provision, particularly in rural areas?  5.2) What modes of transport would most likely be encouraged and how would these affect greenhouse gas emissions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Average healthy life expectancy.</li> <li>- Participation levels in sport and recreation.</li> <li>- Area of green infrastructure provided in conjunction with new housing.</li> <li>- Amount of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard.</li> <li>- Number of properties experiencing pollutant concentrations in excess of the standard.</li> <li>- Percentage of completed non-residential development complying with car-parking standards.</li> <li>- Length of new/improved cycleway and pedestrian routes.</li> </ul>



Sustainability Theme	SA Objectives	Guiding Criteria	Potential Monitoring Indicators
Resilience (to climate change)	6) Reduce the risks from local and global climate change upon economic activity, delivery of essential services and the natural environment.	<p>6.1) What would be the effect in terms of flood risk?</p> <p>6.2) How would the resilience of local businesses be affected?</p> <p>6.3) How would the proposal affect the delivery of essential services?</p> <p>6.4) What will be the effects on green infrastructure and its ability to contribute to climate change resilience?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding.</li> <li>- Annual local authority expenditure on flood management measures.</li> </ul>
Housing and Economy	7) Provide affordable, sustainable, good-quality housing for all.	<p>7.1) How could proposals affect levels of house building?</p> <p>7.2) How could proposals affect the ability to deliver affordable housing?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Net additional dwellings.</li> <li>- Gross affordable housing completions.</li> </ul>
	8) Support investment to grow the local economy.	<p>8.1) Would proposals help to create job opportunities for local residents?</p> <p>8.2) Would the proposals support the rural economy?</p> <p>8.3) Would the proposals help to support the vitality of town centres and their retail offer?</p> <p>8.4) Would the proposals help to secure improvements in telecommunications infrastructure? (<i>For example high speed broadband connectivity</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Total amount of additional floor space by type.</li> <li>- Employment land available.</li> <li>- Jobs created / retained in rural areas.</li> <li>- Total number of visitors and spend on tourism.</li> <li>- Broadband coverage and speed.</li> </ul>

Sustainability Theme	SA Objectives	Guiding Criteria	Potential Monitoring Indicators
Resource use	9) Use and manage resources efficiently, whilst and minimising Harborough's emissions of greenhouse gases.	9.1) To what extent would proposals lead to an increase or decrease in the use of energy and / or water? 9.2) Do proposals help to achieve / support a reduction in carbon emissions? 9.3) Do proposals encourage the efficient use of minerals?	- % of developments achieving a higher CFSH homes water efficiency rating than required by building regulations. - Carbon emissions from road transport.

## 11.2 Appraising strategic alternatives and policies

There are numerous different ways that the objectives of the Local Plan could be achieved. As such; the Council is currently identifying the reasonable alternatives for the following key issues to be addressed by the Local Plan:

### *Broad spatial distribution of development*

The Council will consider what reasonable alternatives there are for distributing housing and employment development across the District. An updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the L&L HMA (expected Spring 2014) will inform the scale of housing growth for Leicestershire County and an apportionment will be set to each Local Authority, taking into account the Duty to Co-operate. The scale of growth for Harborough District is anticipated to be greater than the level set out in the Adopted Core Strategy. It may therefore be necessary to consider different patterns of distribution, or revisit the spatial strategy as set-out in the Core Strategy (Policy CS1) to determine if it is still appropriate to the new scale of housing required.

### *Alternative strategies for settlements / Place-Based Policies*

The Council is also identifying reasonable alternative approaches for the scale and pattern of growth at the settlement scale. This will link to the overall spatial strategy and be informed by settlement profiles and site options appraisals. Essentially a 'top down' and 'bottom up' approach will be taken to identify the most appropriate strategy for each settlement and the district as a whole.

This will help to shape the revision of 'place-based' policies that were set out in the Core Strategy (Policies CS13-CS17). This process will also help to revise the Saved Local Plan Policy HS8 'Limits to Development'.

### *Other Local Plan Policies*

Most of the 'thematic' policies that have already been appraised will be brought forward from the Core Strategy. It is anticipated that most of the findings presented in the Core Strategy appraisal will remain relevant. However, where changes are made that could alter the earlier appraisal findings; then these differences will be highlighted.

Although the preferred policy appraisals will be refreshed, it is considered that alternatives will **not need to be considered** for the majority of policies; including the following; (as set out in the Core Strategy):

- CS3: Delivering Housing Choice;
- CS5: Providing Sustainable Transport;
- CS6: Improving Town Centres and Retailing;
- CS7: Enabling Employment and Business Development;
- CS8: Protecting and Enhancing Green Infrastructure;
- CS9: Addressing Climate Change;
- CS10: Addressing Flood Risk;
- CS11: Promoting Design and Built Heritage;
- CS12: Delivering Development and Supporting Infrastructure.

‘New’ policies will also be included in the Local Plan addressing:

- Refreshing the Saved Local Plan policy for ‘*Limits to Development*’.
- Protecting and improving local services and facilities.
- Delivery of Development through Neighbourhood Development Plans.

Whilst an appraisal of the impacts associated with these policies will be necessary, it is not envisaged *at this stage* that there will be any reasonable alternatives for the latter two policies.

It may be appropriate to look at alternative approaches for the ‘*Limits to Development Policy*’ as this policy will set a framework for managing development within and around settlements. For example, an alternative could be to maintain the ‘limits to development’ rather than adopt a criteria based policy.

#### *Appraising strategic / policy alternatives*

The SA Framework presented in **Table 11.1** will be used to appraise the impacts of these strategic alternatives and the findings will be presented in an Interim SA Report published alongside a Reg18 options consultation.

The SA will identify and evaluate ‘*likely significant effects*’ on the baseline / likely future baseline associated with each sustainability objective in the SA Framework. A series of guiding questions or ‘criteria’ are included in the SA Framework to focus the appraisal further.

Effects will be forecast taking into account the criteria presented within Schedule 2 of the Regs.<sup>190</sup> and current levels of knowledge. Hence account will be taken of the probability, duration, scale, frequency and reversibility of effects as far as possible.

These factors will help to form an opinion on how significant the impacts would be ranging from:

- Major positive            ✓✓✓
- Moderate positive        ✓✓
- Minor positive            ✓
- Insignificant impacts    -
- Minor negative            ✗
- Moderate negative        ✗✗
- Major negative            ✗✗✗

The ability to forecast effects is limited by understanding of the baseline and (in particular) the future baseline and also the challenge of relating policy to the ultimate effects that result from

<sup>190</sup> Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004

development. In light of this, where likely significant effects are forecast this will be supported by explanation of the assumptions made<sup>191</sup>.

In some instances it may not be possible to forecast significant effects, but it may still be possible to comment on the merits of the policy. This is particularly helpful for alternatives comparison, as it enables a distinction to be made between alternatives even when it is not possible to distinguish between them in terms of ‘significant effects’.

*Presenting findings of alternatives appraisals.*

The appraisal findings could be presented in a number of ways. Key to any approach taken is the need to clearly demonstrate why impacts have been determined as ‘significant’ or not as the case may be. It is also important to present the findings in a reader-friendly format. The example below illustrates our proposed approach to summarising the impact findings when comparing alternative approaches / policies.

**Table 11.2:** Presenting appraisals for alternative strategic approaches / policies

Sustainability Objective	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> (and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3
Housing	<p><b>This section will present a discussion of the impacts associated with each alternative.</b></p> <p>Where it is considered that there will be a significant impact, this would be highlighted in the text and the corresponding box would be scored accordingly. If it is considered that there would be no significant impacts associated with any of the alternatives the general merits may also be discussed.</p> <p><b>For example:</b> Alternative 1 is likely to have a <b>major significant positive impact</b> on the baseline as it helps to meet the required housing need and provides sufficient affordable housing in areas of need. Although alternative 2 would have some positive implications, it would not have a significant impact on the baseline. Alternative 3 would not meet the required housing need and would therefore have a <b>moderate significant negative impact</b> on the baseline.</p>	✓✓✓	-	xx

**11.3 Appraisal of site options**

In order to deliver the desired strategy for each settlement, it could be necessary to allocate strategic sites in the Local Plan at certain locations. To inform this process, a site appraisal process will be undertaken to identify the sustainability credentials of a range of site options. This process will provide an appreciation of the issues from the ‘bottom up’, whilst the appraisal of spatial alternatives at the District and settlement level will provide the strategic direction from the ‘top down’.

The Council has been notified or identified approximately 330 possible sites for housing, employment, and retail uses. A sieving process will be applied to arrive at a list of potential strategic sites to be taken forward as allocations in the new Local Plan and assessed. The Council is currently developing this sieving process.

The following draft criteria have been developed to identify strategic allocations:

<sup>191</sup> As stated by Government Guidance (The Plan Making Manual, see <http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pagelD=156210>): "Ultimately, the significance of an effect is a matter of judgment and should require no more than a clear and reasonable justification."

- Sites with outstanding relevant planning permission – **exclude**
- Sites assessed as suitable, achievable and available as evidenced by the SHLAA, ELAA, Retail Study Update (Green Wedge or Area of separation Review) – **include**
- In addition, sites must require allocation (rather than delivery as windfall) because:
  - the site will deliver an important element of the district’s or settlements required growth (size);
  - the site represents a significant change for the community;
  - the site (size);
  - the site will deliver significant infrastructure or another important element of the overall District strategy or the strategy for that place; or
  - the site forms a broader development area made up of more than 1 site, which requires comprehensive planning & delivery.

A site appraisal framework has been developed to assess the constraints and opportunities associated with each of the site options (see **Appendix 3** for the detailed framework). This framework consists of a series of site appraisal criteria that reflect the SA framework (see **Table 11.1**).

The SA site appraisal framework largely utilises GIS data to identify constraints and opportunities as this introduces a degree of objectivity into the appraisal process when comparing site options. It is recognised that the GIS also introduces other aspects that affect the appraisal. Where appropriate, this data is supported by qualitative assessments as it is recognised that distance-based criteria do not always present the full picture.

It is intended that the appraisal will make use of data from neighbouring authorities to reflect cross-boundary relationships. However, this may be limited by compatibility and availability of data.

The site appraisal framework does not seek to rank sites; rather it will help to identify those sites that may require mitigation to deliver sustainable development / avoid negative impacts. Conversely, where sites are well placed to support sustainable growth, this will also be highlighted. It is also important to note the limitations and assumptions made for the site appraisal framework and these are provided in **Appendix 3**.

*Determining the sustainability performance of site options*

Each site presented for appraisal will be identified as falling into one of the following categories against a range of site appraisal criteria (as listed in **Appendix 3**).

<b>Promotes sustainable growth</b>	Development of the site could have a positive impact by supporting sustainable behaviours. For example, sites located within 400m of multiple facilities and services encouraging walking, reduce the need to travel and potentially support public transport.
<b>Unlikely to have a major impact on trends:</b>	Whilst development of the site is unlikely to have a significant negative impact, it is unlikely to lead to changes in the status quo.
<b>Mitigation may be required / unavoidable impacts:</b>	Some uncertainty exists whether development would have negative impacts. Mitigation measures could be deployed, but these could potentially affect viability. If no mitigation measures are secured, then negative impacts are likely to occur. For example, development of the site could lead to the loss of some undesignated open space that has value for wildlife. It may be possible to mitigate or compensate for this loss. However, if the loss is unavoidable and is not mitigated/compensated then there would be a negative effect.



<p><b>Mitigation expected to be required / unavoidable impacts:</b></p>	<p>Constraints to development are anticipated to require mitigation or could still lead to negative impacts even where mitigation is deployed. For example, the site and surrounding communities may have poor access to services. Developing the site would compound these issues unless facilities were upgraded. Mitigation measures are also generally likely to be costly and could affect viability. It should also be noted that while sites may appear constrained they could present an opportunity to improve the settlement/environment.</p>
---	---

*Presentation of site appraisal findings*

A site proforma will be completed for each site that is considered as part of the SA. These proformas will present the scores and commentary against the site appraisal framework for each site and then be drawn together for each settlement. All the appraisal proformas will be presented as a technical appendix to the SA Report(s).

A summary table will also be produced and presented in the SA Report to aid in the comparison of sites and to highlight the potential cumulative impacts of allocating a number of different sites together. This table would look similar to the example provided in **Figure 11.1**.

*Figure 11.1: Example of a site options appraisal summary table*

Site	Access to a GP	Proximity to primary school	Proximity to secondary school	Access to open space	Access to community facilities 1	Access to community facilities 2	Access to food shops	Access to train station	Bus services	Impact on SSSI	Local Wildlife Sites	Severance of wildlife habitats / corridors	TPOs	Green Wedge / Areas of Separation	Air quality	Contamination	Groundwater	Agricultural land	Flood Risk	Heritage Assets	Setting of the built environment	Landscape character	Etc.....	Commentary
1)	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Red	Grey	Grey	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Grey	Grey	Grey	Yellow	Grey	Site would result in the loss of 20 ha of agricultural land and would affect the character of a green wedge. There are also concerns about impacts on wildlife and fairly poor access to some facilities...
2)	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Green	Grey	Site generally performs well against environmental aspects and would present no major constraints. However, there are very poor links to services and public transport.
3)																							Etc.....	

**11.4 Appraising the draft plan**

Once the preferred approaches / policies and site allocations have been decided upon, the SA will consider the implications of the draft plan policies and site allocations ‘as a whole’ against each sustainability objective identified in the SA framework.

The SA framework guiding criteria /questions (**Table 11.1**) would be ‘answered’ to guide the appraisal. This would take account of the criteria presented within Schedule 2 of the Environmental Assessment Regulations.

The SA findings could be presented in a number of ways. An example of how the findings may be presented is provided below in **Figure 11.2**.

In this example, the SA findings would not be structured rigidly in a table to answer every sub-question for every policy. Rather, each sustainability theme would be accompanied by a detailed discussion that sets out the key impacts in greater detail and identifies where any effects are considered to be significant (and why). This would also include a discussion about cumulative impacts for each sustainability theme.

*Figure 11.2: Example of how policy appraisal findings could be presented.*

IMPACTS ON COMMUNITY SAFETY AND COHESION	
<b>Sustainability Objectives</b>	
Help to reduce crime and reduce anti-social behaviour	
Promote social and ethnic equality	
<b>Relevant Policies:</b>	
Policy 8: Development and people	✓
Policy 11: Design	✓
Policy 13: Employment land allocations	✓
Policy 16: Housing land allocations	✓
Policy 18: Housing mix	✓ ?
Policy 19: Apartment development and HMOs	
Policy 20: Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers	✓
Policy 26: Town Centre Framework	✓
Policy 35: Protection of local facilities	✓

*Cumulative impacts*

It will be important to determine the cumulative impacts of the new Local Plan by considering:

- The impacts of the new Local Plan viewed as a ‘whole’.
- The impacts of the new Local Plan in the context of other relevant plans and programmes. Of particular importance would be plans for any urban extensions close to the border with Harborough.

These factors will be taken into account as much as possible, for example by:

- Using GIS data from neighbouring authorities where possible to reflect cross-boundary relationships between settlements;
- Reviewing the SA findings from appraisals undertaken for the Local Plans / Core Strategies of Neighbouring Authorities;
- Examining patterns of movement between authorities and how these may be affected by new development across the region;
- Collaborating with neighbouring authorities to identify shared issues.

## 12 NEXT STEPS

### 12.1 Consultation on the scope of the SA

The Regulations require that: *'When deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information that must be included in the report, the responsible authority shall consult the consultation bodies'. In England, the consultation bodies are Natural England, The Environment Agency and English Heritage.*<sup>192</sup>

As discussed in **Section 2**, these authorities (*and other stakeholders*) were consulted on the scope of the SA (in relation to the Core Strategy) in 2008, 2009 and 2010. At each of these stages, comments were taken into consideration when finalising the scope and methodology of the SA.

Now that the scope of the SA has been updated to reflect the issues relevant to the new Local Plan (rather than the Core Strategy), it is necessary to (re)consult with the statutory bodies. In addition the Council is planning to publish this report on its website to enable other interested parties to contribute comments. This will help to ensure that the correct issues have been identified and the proposed appraisal methodologies are appropriate.

Following consultation, the comments received will be taken into consideration and the Scoping Report will be finalised and published on the Council's website in April 2014.

As SA is an iterative process, further updates to the scope may be undertaken as the new Local Plan progresses. Any changes will be highlighted in the subsequent SA Report.

### 12.2 Alternatives Appraisal

Once the scope of the SA has been agreed, a series of options and alternatives will be appraised to compare the sustainability implications of different approaches to achieving the objectives of the new Local Plan.

The findings of the appraisals will be presented in the SA Report. However, Interim SA Reports will be prepared to inform the plan preparation process with the findings of the alternatives appraisal.

### 12.3 Producing the SA Report


An SA Report must be prepared and published for consultation alongside the draft Local Plan (i.e. at Publication stage). The SA Report must include a range of information to comply with the Regulations. In a nutshell, it must set out:

- A description of the Local Plan;
- The Scope of the SA;
- Outline reasons for selecting the alternatives;
- An appraisal of reasonable alternatives;
- An appraisal of the draft Local Plan;
- Suggestions to mitigate negative impacts or enhance positive impacts of the draft Local Plan; *and*
- Measures envisaged to monitor the significant impacts.

<sup>192</sup> In-line with Article 6(3) of the SEA Directive, these consultation bodies were selected because *'by reason of their specific environmental responsibilities, [they] are likely to be concerned by the environmental effects of implementing plans and programme.'*

## APPENDIX I: REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Annex I of the SEA Directive prescribes the information that must be contained in the SA Report; however, interpretation of Annex I is not straightforward. The figure below explains how we (URS) interpret Annex I requirements.



## APPENDIX 2: CHANGES TO THE SA FRAMEWORK

SA objectives (SA Report, 2010)	Previous sub criteria (SA Report, 2010)	Changes made
1. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity.	1a) Will it lead to habitat creation matching BAP priorities? 1b) Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their biodiversity interest? 1c) Will it increase the area of sites designated for their geodiversity interest 1d) Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their geodiversity interest? 1e) Will it link up areas of habitat fragmentation 1f) Will it increase awareness of biodiversity and geodiversity assets? 1g) Will it lead to loss of ancient woodland	Geodiversity scoped out. Reflected in objective.  Sub criteria have been changed, but the principles remain the same.
2. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.	2a) Will it safeguard and enhance the character of the landscape and local distinctiveness and identity? 2b) Will it safeguard and enhance the character of the townscape and local distinctiveness and identity? 2c) Will it preserve or enhance the setting of cultural heritage assets? 2d) Will it ensure that new built development is of high quality and locally distinctive	Objectives 2 and 3 have been combined to reflect the relationship between character and heritage assets. This also helps to reduce appraisal against two similar objectives.
3. Protect, enhance and manage sites, features, and areas of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.	3a) Will it preserve buildings of architectural or historic interest and where necessary encourage conservation and renewal? 3b) Will it preserve or enhance archaeological sites or remains 3c) Will it improve and broaden access to, understanding of and enjoyment of the historic environment 3d) Will it preserve or enhance the setting of cultural assets?	
4. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing.	4a) Will it improve access to services and facilities from rural areas 4b) Will it provide sufficient areas of open space for all? 4c) Will it improve long term health? 4d) Will it encourage healthy and active lifestyles? 4e) Will it reduce obesity? 4f) Does it consider the needs of Harborough's growing elderly population? 4e) Will it improve road safety	Objective remains unchanged.

<p>5. Improve accessibility in the district, including from rural areas?</p>	<p>5a) Will it reduce the need to travel?                      5b) Will it encourage walking and cycling                      5c) Will it reduce car use?                      5d) Will it encourage use of public transport?                      5e) Will it improve access to services and facilities from rural areas?                      5f) Will it increase provision of local services and facilities and reduce centralisation</p>	<p>Wording to the objective has been amended slightly to reflect the links between accessibility and health.</p>
<p>6. Reduce waste and maximise opportunities for innovative environmental technologies in waste management.</p>	<p>6a) Will it provide an increased variety and capacity of recycling facilities?                      6b) Will it reduce the proportion of waste landfilled?                      6c) Will it increase the proportion of waste recycled?                      6d) Will it reduce waste from construction?</p>	<p>Objective has been removed to avoid duplication in appraisal. Waste management is also considered under resource efficiency.</p>
<p>7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change.</p>	<p>7a) Will it increase the risk of flooding?                      7b) Will it reduce the risk of damage to property from storm events?                      7c) Will it facilitate landscape change for climate change adaptation                      7d) Will it encourage the development of buildings prepared for the impacts of climate change?</p>	<p>Objective has been re-worded, but the principles remain the same.</p>
<p>8. Minimise Harborough's contribution to climate change.</p>	<p>8a) Will it help to reduce Harborough's carbon footprint                      8b) Will it generate significant amounts of Greenhouse gas?                      8c) Will it help to raise awareness of climate change mitigation?</p>	<p>Objective has been removed to avoid duplication in appraisals. Greenhouse gas reduction is considered as a part of several new objectives including resource efficiency.</p>
<p>9. Provide affordable, environmentally sound and good quality housing for all.</p>	<p>9a) Will it ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing?                      9b) Will it ensure that all new development contributes to local distinctiveness and improve the local environment?                      9c) Will it meet the building specification guidance in the Code for Sustainable Homes?                      9d) Will it reduce the amount of vacant housing?</p>	<p>Objective has been re-worded slightly, but the principles remain the same.</p>
<p>10. Encourage investment in order to grow the economy.</p>	<p>10a) Will it ensure that new employment, office, retail and leisure developments are in locations that are accessible to those that use public transport.                      10b) Will it support the districts visitor economy                      10c) Will it support or encourage social enterprise and the development of environmental technologies?                      10d) Will it provide adequate green space and environmental capital (Green infrastructure)?</p>	<p>Objective has been re-worded slightly, but the principles remain the same.</p>



<p>11. Use and manage land, energy, soil, mineral and water resources prudently and efficiently, and increase energy generated from renewables.</p>	<p>11a) Will it exacerbate water abstraction levels?            11b) Will it increase water consumption?            11c) Will it include energy efficiency measures?            11d) Will it encourage energy production from sustainable sources?            11e) Will it safeguard Harborough's material resources for future use?            11f) Will it utilise derelict, degraded and under-used land?            11g) Will it lead to reduced consumption of materials and resources?            11h) Will it lead to higher density development?</p>	<p>Objective has been re-worded to include consideration for waste and climate change. The principles remain the same.</p>
<p>12. Maintain and where necessary improve environmental quality with regard to water, air, soil and pollution.</p>	<p>12a) Will it lead to improved water quality?            12b) Will it lead to improved air quality?            12c) Will it maintain and enhance soil quality?            12e) Will it reduce land contamination?</p>	<p>Objective has been re-worded, but the principles remain the same.</p>

## APPENDIX 3: SITE APPRAISAL CRITERIA

Stage 2 Site appraisal criteria	Use	Promotes sustainable growth	Unlikely to have a major impact on trends	Mitigation <u>may</u> be required / unavoidable impacts	Mitigation <u>likely</u> to be required / unavoidable impacts	Rationale, assumptions and limitations
Health and Wellbeing						
<b>Access to jobs:</b> <b>H1:</b> How close is the site/settlement to key employment sites?	Housing	<1200m away	1.2km – 3km away	3km-5km	>5km away	<p>&lt;800m is considered a reasonable walking distance, which could encourage less car use or shorter journeys by other forms of transport<sup>193</sup>. It is considered reasonable to extend this distance to 1200m for rural areas.</p> <p>Distance is measured from site boundary. Whilst this does not reflect the fact that access to services can differ throughout a site, this is more of an issue for larger strategic sites.</p> <p>400m is considered to be a desirable walking distance to a primary school.</p>
<b>Access to health services</b> <b>H2:</b> What is the overall distance to a GP service or health centre?	Housing	<1200m away	1.2km – 3km away	3km-5km	>5km away	
<b>Access to education</b> <b>H3:</b> How accessible is the site to the nearest primary school on foot?	Housing	0-5min walk (0-400m)	10-15 min walk (400-800m)	15-20 min walk (1200 - 1600m)	> 20 min walk (1600m)	
<b>H4:</b> How accessible is the site to the nearest Secondary school?	Housing	<1200m away	1.2km – 3km away	3km-5km	>5km away	
<b>Access to open space</b> <b>H5:</b> Access to local natural greenspace (ANGST). To what extent do the sites meet the following ANGST standards? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural greenspace at least 2 hectares in size, no more than 300 metres from home;</li> <li>At least one accessible 20 hectare greenspace site within two kilometre of home;</li> </ol>	Housing	Standards met for both criteria.	Standards met for 1 criteria only	Standards not met for either criteria.	N/A	

<sup>193</sup> Sport England (2007), Active Design: Promoting opportunities for sport and physical activities through good design.

Stage 2 Site appraisal criteria	Use	Promotes sustainable growth	Unlikely to have a major impact on trends	Mitigation <u>may be</u> required / unavoidable impacts	Mitigation <u>likely to be</u> required / unavoidable impacts	Rationale, assumptions and limitations
<p><b>Access to community facilities</b></p> <p><b>H6:</b> How far is the site to any of the following community facilities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leisure centre</li> <li>Library</li> </ul>	Housing	<1200m away	1.2km – 3km away	3km-5km	>5km away	These facilities have wider catchment areas it is considered that the reasonable travel time/distance should be higher than for local facilities such as primary schools. This criterion does not account for mode of travel. Access by any mode is considered positive for health and wellbeing. Access via sustainable modes is considered in a different criterion.
<p><b>H7:</b> How far is the site to local community facilities?</p>	Housing	<800m away	800m – 1200m away	1200m-3km away	>3km away	Local community centres / parish halls etc.
<p><b>H8:</b> Distance to the nearest local food shop or post office?</p>	Housing	0-800m	800-1200m	>1200m-3km	>3km	With the introduction of online services and the amalgamation of post offices into shops and supermarkets it is considered that proximity of a post office does not warrant a separate appraisal criteria. 'Local food shop' is defined as a supermarket, minimarket or local convenience store as listed in the Settlement Profiles Study.
<p><b>Sustainable modes of travel</b></p> <p><b>H9:</b> How accessible is the site to the nearest train station</p>	Housing and Jobs	<1200m away	1.2km – 3km away	3km-5km	>5km away	<1200m is considered a reasonable walking distance, which could encourage less car use or shorter journeys by other forms of transport.
<p><b>H10:</b> How well served is the site by a bus service?</p>	Housing and jobs	Regular bus service within 800m	Low frequency bus service within 800m Regular bus service within 800m-1200m	Low frequency bus service within 800m-1200m Regular bus service within 1200m-1600m	Low frequency bus service more than 1200m away Regular bus service more than 1600m away	400m is considered a <u>desirable</u> walking distance to encourage use of public transport. However, the Manual for Streets <sup>194</sup> suggest that 800m is a more appropriate for rural areas. Regular is considered more than 3 stops per hour. Low frequency is considered less than 3 stops per hour.

<sup>194</sup> HMSO (2007) Manual for Streets. [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/7734/322449.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7734/322449.pdf)

Stage 2 Site appraisal criteria	Use	Promotes sustainable growth	Unlikely to have a major impact on trends	Mitigation <u>may be required</u> / unavoidable impacts	Mitigation <u>likely to be required</u> / unavoidable impacts	Rationale, assumptions and limitations
<b>Natural environment</b>						
<b>NE1:</b> Could allocation of the site have a potential impact on a SSSI?	Housing and jobs	N/A	>400m	<400m	Within or adjacent to a designated site (<50m from site boundary)	It is Natural England's view (based on recent research into access onto heathland) and other factors) that the area within 400m* of a SSSI is where additional development could have a substantial impact.  It is assumed that sites within or adjacent to (<50m) a wildlife site are more likely to have a direct impact.
<b>NE2:</b> Could allocation of the site have a potential adverse impact on designated Local Wildlife Sites, Local Nature Reserve, Potential Wildlife Sites or any other site of wildlife value such as Ancient Woodland (including where BAP species have been recorded)?	Housing and jobs	N/A	<200m No BAP species recorded	Contains or is adjacent to (50m) a local wildlife site / BAP species have been recorded within 50m of the site. Suitable for biodiversity offsetting.	Contains a locally important site not suitable for biodiversity offsetting	The thresholds used are greater for SSSIs to reflect their national significance.  It is recognized that proximity does not necessarily equate to impacts as this is dependent upon the scheme design and type/condition of wildlife sites, *Measured from site boundaries
<b>NE3:</b> Would allocation of the site result in the severance/partial severance of a designated wildlife corridor	Housing and jobs	N/A	Wildlife corridor unaffected	Partial severance of wildlife corridor	Total severance of wildlife corridor	Involves a degree of subjectivity as to what constitutes 'partial' or 'total'. This depends on the nature of the corridor.
<b>NE4:</b> What is the potential impact on TPOs	Housing and jobs	N/A	No TPOs on site	TPOs present that could potentially be protected (i.e. confined to boundaries)	Multiple TPOs that would be difficult to protect (i.e. scattered throughout)	Development on a site containing multiple TPOs that are not confined to one area would be likely to result in unavoidable loss of these assets.
<b>NE5:</b> Could the site have an adverse effect on Green Wedge or Areas of Separation (AoS)?	Housing and jobs	N/A	Development outside of Green Wedge or AoS	Site partially in Green Wedge or AoS	Site fully in Green Wedge or AoS	It is acknowledged that development in or adjacent may or may not have a negative / positive impact and that this is also dependent upon layout/ design and sensitivity. Where possible qualitative data will be used to add context.
<b>NE6:</b> What are the potential impacts on air quality in Lutterworth?	Housing and jobs	N/A	Industrial / warehousing /retail development >2km from AQMA  Other sites >1km from AQMA	Industrial / warehousing / retail site within 2km of AQMA  Other site within 1km of AQMA	N/A	Sites within and surrounding Lutterworth are the only areas that have the potential to register constraints against this criteria.

Stage 2 Site appraisal criteria	Use	Promotes sustainable growth	Unlikely to have a major impact on trends	Mitigation <u>may be required</u> / unavoidable impacts	Mitigation <u>likely to be required</u> / unavoidable impacts	Rationale, assumptions and limitations
<b>NE7:</b> Could development of the site lead to the remediation of land potentially affected by contamination?	Housing and Jobs	Site is potentially contaminated and could be remediated.	Site is not thought to be contaminated	Site is potentially contaminated but may be difficult to remediate.	-	Most contaminated land is unlikely to be remediated without development funding. The presence of contamination could therefore be viewed positively where viability is not adversely affected.
<b>NE8:</b> Does the site fall within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone, as identified by the Environment Agency?	Housing and jobs	N/A	Falls outside	Site falls within Zone 2 or 3	Site falls within zone 1 (inner protection zone)	Potential for negative impacts in zones 1-3. However, type of use would be important and mitigation would be possible.
<b>NE9:</b> Would allocation of the site result in the loss of High Quality Agricultural Land?	Housing and jobs	Does not contain any agricultural land grade 1-3b	Contains less than 10hectares of agricultural land 1-3	Contains more than 10 hectares of agricultural land class 1-2 or a total of 20 hectares1-3	Contains more than 20 hectares of agricultural land class 1-2	Although there is little guidance, the loss of 20 hectares triggers consultation with DEFRA/Natural England, which can be considered significant.
<b>Resilience</b>						
<b>R1:</b> Is the site (or part of) within an identified flood zone?	Housing and Jobs	N/A	Site predominantly within flood zone 1 (>80%)	Contains areas of flood zone 2/3	Site predominantly in flood zone 2/3	Provided that a site is not wholly within a flood zone 2/3 it should be possible to avoid and/or mitigate impacts. However, proximity to zone 1 is preferable as it reduces the risk and potential cost of mitigation. Sites wholly within zones 2 and 3 should be sieved out. However, for those sites where it is considered mitigation could still be implemented a 'red' categorization is given.
<b>Built and Natural Heritage</b>						
<b>BH1:</b> Potential for direct impacts upon heritage assets. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Conservation Area</li><li>• Nationally listed buildings</li><li>• Scheduled Ancient Monuments</li><li>• Registered Park or Garden.</li></ul>	Housing and Jobs	N/A	No heritage assets within or adjacent (50m) to the sites	Site contains or is within 50m from: Grade II heritage features Conservation area Ancient park or garden	Site contains or is within 50m from: Grade 1 heritage features Ancient park or garden	The criteria combine a consideration of various heritage features to avoid potential duplication. E.g. an asset could be listed, in a consideration area and also a SAM.  Proximity to heritage assets does not necessarily mean that impacts will occur, but it is assumed that they may be more likely. Criteria BH2 will seek to provide a qualitative assessment.

Stage 2 Site appraisal criteria	Use	Promotes sustainable growth	Unlikely to have a major impact on trends	Mitigation <u>may be</u> required / unavoidable impacts	Mitigation <u>likely to be</u> required / unavoidable impacts	Rationale, assumptions and limitations
<b>BH2:</b> Impacts on the setting of the built environment?	Housing and Jobs	<i>Site contains vacant buildings / buildings at risk / derelict land that could be enhanced</i>	Setting not likely to be affected	The setting and significance of a heritage asset may be affected.	The setting and significance of a heritage asset will be harmed by the site.	Reliant upon professional opinion. Impacts likely to be determined utilizing Conservation Area Statements and Settlement Profiles.
<b>BH3:</b> Capacity of the landscape to accommodate development, while respecting its character.	Housing and Jobs	High	Medium-high Medium.	Medium-low	Low	Relies upon the findings of Landscape Character Assessments and capacity studies.
<b>Resource use</b>						
<b>RU1:</b> Would allocation of the site result in the use of previously developed land?	Housing and Jobs	Predominantly brownfield (>70%)	Partial Brownfield (>30%)	Site is predominantly Greenfield (>70%)	NA	The majority of available land is not brownfield, so criteria need to reflect that impacts are likely.
<b>RU2:</b> Is there good access to a Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC)?	Housing	<3miles	3-7miles	>7miles	-	Use of HWRCs is by car. Access by foot is typically prohibited and unlikely.  Travel distances are typically longer for rural areas. For example Husbands Bosworth is approximately 6 miles from the nearest Civic Amenity site in Market Harborough. It is also necessary to include sites that are close by in neighboring authorities.
<b>Housing and economy</b>						
<b>EH1:</b> Would site development lead to the loss of employment land?	Housing / Mixed use	Employment development proposed	Not allocated for employment	Yes – low quality	Yes – High quality	Quality defined in existing Employment Area Review 2012.



Stage 2 Site appraisal criteria	Use	Promotes sustainable growth	Unlikely to have a major impact on trends	Mitigation <u>may be</u> required / unavoidable impacts	Mitigation <u>likely to be</u> required / unavoidable impacts	Rationale, assumptions and limitations
<p><b>EH2:</b> Will the site help to stimulate housing development? <i>Deliverability and scale</i></p>	Housing	Site is available for development within the next 5 years and could provide over <b>50</b> dwellings	<p>Site is available for development within the next 5 years but would provide <u>less than</u> 50 dwellings</p> <p>Site is available for development in the plan period and could provide <u>over</u> 50 dwellings</p>	Availability is uncertain	N/A	<p>Provision of a higher level of development would contribute more significantly to the Borough's housing targets and would achieve economies of scale. Availability may change over time.</p> <p>Does not consider viability.</p>
<p><b>EH3:</b> Distance to Principal Road Network by vehicle.</p>	Jobs	<1mile	<3miles	>3miles	>4miles	Assumes that employment and housing sites with better access to the road network are more attractive for development.
<b>Infrastructure</b>						
<p><b>I4:</b> Is the site within: a) 150m of a high pressure gas pipeline? b) 100m of overhead electricity cables</p>	Housing	N/A	No constraints	Yes but mitigation unlikely to be difficult	Yes, mitigation anticipated to be difficult / costly	Sites intersected by such constraints (particularly smaller sites with less room to provide a buffer) would not be feasible and / or mitigation would be costly.
<p><b>I5:</b> Electricity substation capacity constraints? Waste water constraints?</p>	Housing and Jobs	N/A	No constraints	Constraints	N/A	Involves a degree of subjectivity, reliant upon input from utilities.
<p><b>I6:</b> Access to the Highway network</p>	Housing and Jobs	N/A	Satisfactory access to the highway network exists or could be provided	N/A	Satisfactory access to the highway network is unlikely without major investment	Information to be sourced from SHLAA 2013 update. Expected in spring 2014.

# APPENDIX 4: SCOPING REPORT CONSULTATION RESPONSES

## English Heritage

Comments	Response
<p><u>Scoping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference the NPPF as part of the contextual review.</li> <li>Historic environment baseline is very brief. There needs to be more local information.</li> <li>Make reference to non-designated heritage assets.</li> </ul>	<p>The contextual review has been updated to include reference to the NPPF.</p> <p>The baseline section has been updated to make explicit reference to non-designated heritage assets.</p>
<p><u>Key issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Table 10.1, reference is only made to designated heritage assets and fails to include non-designated heritage assets. Whilst development could negatively affect the setting of assets, it could also make positive enhancements and this should be recognised. The summary fails to make reference to the historic environment as a main challenge. Again given the significant historic environment resource in the Borough (made up of both designated and non-designated heritage assets) we are surprised at this and do not consider that this is reflective of the true issues here.</li> </ul>	<p>The text in Table 10.1 relating to the historic and natural environment has been amended as follows:</p> <p>There are over 1,400 designated heritage assets located across the District and further features of local value (<a href="#">i.e. non-designated heritage assets</a>). Development has the potential to affect the <a href="#">condition</a>, setting, <a href="#">and access to</a> these assets <a href="#">either positively or negatively</a>.</p> <p>Under the key challenges summary add in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Protect and/or enhance the historic character of Harborough's settlements.</a></li> </ul>
<p><u>Sustainability framework</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at the proposed objective which states 'Protect, enhance and manage the character and distinctiveness of the District's settlements and their surrounding landscapes'. This makes no reference to the historic environment at all and is not fit for purpose, particularly given the significant resource of heritage assets within the Borough.</li> <li>An additional objective is essential. Following wording suggested "conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings".</li> </ul>	<p>It is considered that SA objective 3 is adequate to appraise impacts on the historic environment at a plan level. The SA is to focus on defining how strategic decisions could impact upon the character of Harborough, including consideration of impacts on heritage assets, their setting and landscapes. However, the following amendment to objective 3 is made.</p> <p>'Protect, enhance and manage the <a href="#">historic</a> character and distinctiveness of the District's settlements and their surrounding landscapes'.</p> <p>The guiding criteria in the SA framework also help to differentiate historic assets from the wider impacts on settlement character. Again, to make the links with the historic environment more explicit the following changes are made.</p> <p>3.1) How could proposals affect the <a href="#">historic value and</a> character of settlements and/or surrounding landscapes?</p> <p>3.2) Could proposals hinder or assist efforts to maintain and enhance features (<a href="#">designated and non-designated</a>) of historic, cultural or archaeological interest?</p> <p>Adding an additional objective would lead to unnecessary duplication in appraisal and reporting. It would also encroach upon matters better addressed at a project planning level where design considerations are addressed.</p>

Comments	Response
<p><u>Alternatives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have provided comments on CS11: Promoting Design and Built Heritage in our response to the Local Plan Scoping in 2013. We consider that an alternative approach to this policy from that in the existing Core Strategy may be required in order to comply with the relevant legislation and NPPF.</li> </ul>	<p>The appraisal will examine the impacts of policy CS11. The outcome of the appraisal is anticipated to be the same regardless of whether a policy for design and historic environment was presented as one combined or two separate policies.</p>
<p><u>Site appraisal</u></p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the site appraisal methodology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-designated heritage assets are not referenced in BH1 or BH2.</li> <li>Distance is used as a measure under BH1. This fails to take into account the definition of setting of heritage assets and how it contributes to significance. This is a very arbitrary methodology and is not appropriate for an SA.</li> <li>It is considered that 50m is particularly small distance – site allocations can have a major impact from far greater distances for a variety of reasons, dependent upon the significance of an asset.</li> <li>BM2 does not relate specifically to heritage assets and we are concerned that this would be limited in providing the qualitative assessment required for all types of heritage asset.</li> <li>The table fails to recognise opportunities to enhance the historic environment.</li> </ul> <p>Suggestions for amending the site criteria have been made in response to these concerns.</p>	<p>With regards to BH1. It is difficult to assess the impacts on non-designated heritage assets utilising a distance-based methodology as these features are not digitally mapped. It is considered that BH2 will however allow consideration of non-designated assets.</p> <p>Criterion BH1 is retained as resource constraints preclude a qualitative assessment of each site and is in line with regulations.</p> <p>At a Plan level, the proximity of heritage assets serves to highlight potential constraints and this aids the relative performance of sites rather than their absolute impact which is usually assessed at a project level. It is acknowledged that the distance threshold cannot address all facets of potential impact. Given the ability of developers to design out impacts, the 50m threshold has been selected since it identifies where this potential is more likely to be severely constrained and thus give rise to impacts that may be a material consideration.</p> <p>With regards to BH2, it is considered that identifying impacts on the setting of heritage assets require resources that are disproportionate to this stage of the planning process particularly as such impacts are dependent upon the design solutions that are unknown at this stage.</p> <p>At this level of appraisal, it is considered that the SA is most beneficial in identifying cumulative impacts on heritage assets and their settings at the settlement level. It is not considered a proportionate approach to assess detailed site level impacts.</p> <p>Regarding consideration of opportunities for enhancement, while these again are matters for project level resolution, HBC would welcome views on which aspects are capable of being addressed in the SA within the available resources. In particular, we would welcome advice on how to make the best use of resources to identify enhancement measures at the settlement level.</p>

## Natural England

Comments	URS Comments
<p><u>Scoping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural England generally welcomes the 'Natural Environment' section and considers that it has covered their interests in the natural environment comprehensively. They would however have expected to see Green Infrastructure (GI) featured more strongly in this section.</li> <li>We acknowledge that Green Infrastructure has been included in the Health and Well Being chapter but we would suggest that green infrastructure should be more broadly considered within the Sustainability Appraisal within both the Natural Environment (4) and Climate Change (7) chapters to emphasise the multifunctional benefits of GI.</li> </ul> <p>Two further indicators are proposed with regards to monitoring biodiversity. (para 4.6) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Effect on condition of SSSIs, and overall percentage of SSSI in favourable or unfavourable recovering condition.</li> <li>- Net effect on number and area of Local Wildlife Sites.</li> <li>• Pleased to see that green infrastructure is recognised as a potential measure for improving resilience to climate change. Follow this through into the SA objectives.</li> <li>• Supportive of the Use of ANGST.</li> <li>• Welcome the reference to the Leicester, Leicestershire &amp; Rutland Landscape and Woodland Strategy. Suggest that the relevant National Character Areas (NCAs) are also referenced.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments welcomed. Baseline information relating to Green Infrastructure has been presented across several different topic areas to reflect the multifunctional benefits that GI can create. More specific reference to green infrastructure has been included in chapters 4 and 7.</p> <p>Indicators added to the appraisal framework. These indicators are intended to be used to monitor the significant effects of the plan.</p> <p>Comments welcomed. See comments below with regards to the SA framework and recognition of green infrastructure as a potential measure for improving resilience to climate change.</p> <p>Section added to reference NCAs.</p>
<p><u>Sustainability framework</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that there is a specific sustainability objective on Green Infrastructure within the framework which reflects its importance in achieving multi-functional benefits.</li> </ul>	<p>While it is considered that green infrastructure should be a cross cutting theme across several sustainability objectives, the following changes to the guiding criteria are proposed.</p> <p>4.1) How could proposals affect standards of open space green infrastructure, recreation and leisure provision?</p> <p><a href="#">NEW: 6.4) What will be the effects on green infrastructure and its ability to contribute to climate change resilience?</a></p>

## Burton Overy Parish Council

Comments	Response
<p>St Andrews Church is identified as 'at risk' in the scoping report (section 5:3). This does not make reference to the significant fundraising and repair work that is underway to ensure the church is in good condition.</p>	<p>English Heritage classifies historic assets 'at risk' according to their condition and potential threats. In the case of St Andrews Church, the 'risk register entry recognises that repair works are underway to address identified issues. When the building is reassessed it may no longer be classified as at risk, but this is a matter for English Heritage to determine.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the SA Scoping Report has been updated to highlight the investment that has occurred in St Andrews Church (<i>and the likely effect this will have on the future baseline – i.e. that this heritage asset should be at a lower risk</i>).</p>

## Billesdon Parish Council

Comments	Response
<p>It appears that the 'Rural Centres' in the old 'Core Strategy' (and to appear in the revised Local Plan?) are not to be examined as a separate category under the SA. Since all other categories of settlement type are to be given their own separate appraisals, the PC considers that the villages within the 'Rural Centres' category should be similarly treated.</p>	<p>The SA will examine the implications of the draft plan across the District at a range of different scales. This will include consideration of the impacts on 'villages' as a result of the spatial strategy, allocations and plan policies.</p> <p>The appraisal will also examine alternative approaches to the delivery of development at a strategic level. For example, identifying where there are opportunities and constraints to development at and between the larger settlements and rural centres. At this scale, there may be important decisions to make about the scale and location of development.</p> <p>It is not deemed necessary or proportionate to examine alternative strategies for each village.</p>

## The Environment Agency

Comments	Response
<p><u>4.4 water quality</u></p> <p>We would like to see the information on watercourses in the plan area set out in a map. This would show clearly the extent of the water environment and how it links to other themes within the SA.</p>	<p>This information is already shown in figure 7.1</p>
<p>The data referred in table 4.5 and 4.6 goes back to 2006. We are not sure why such old data has been used as the latest water quality information is readily available to Harborough council through the Environment Agency 'Datashare' web site. There is some further information in the text that refers to data from 2012, but we consider it is important for the base line data to provide as clear, comprehensive and up to date view of water quality as possible. We therefore propose that the data in 4.5 and 4.6 is replaced with more up to date information.</p>	<p>Tables 4.5 and 4.6 have been replaced with a new table 4.5 that represents the ecological status of each water body in Harborough. Data was provided by the Environment Agency.</p>
<p>The Harborough plan sets out areas of new development and housing. All these will have to be serviced with sewerage and sewage disposal. This SA has not raised the issues of the impact of development on the current sewerage and sewage disposal</p>	<p>These issues will be considered at the next stage of the SA process.</p>

Comments	Response
<p>.. or the capacity in the river system to accept an increase volume of treated sewage effluent. We would expect this information with a Water Cycle study, there does not appear to be one.</p>	
<p>We encourage all LA's to carry out a Water Cycle Study to help identify water related issues at an early stage. No Water Cycle Study has been referred to in this report so we are assuming there is no current study for Harborough. If there has been no water infrastructure planning for Harborough we consider the SA should highlight this as an issue or raise it for further consideration.</p>	
<p>Both Anglian Water and Severn Trent Water have assets in the Harborough district. Each company will have a 5 year Asset Management Plans that will direct investment in water infrastructure including the Harborough plan area. These documents are clearly very relevant and should be part or the evidence base for this SA</p>	<p>Reference to the Water Resources Management Plans has been included within the contextual review at 4.4</p>
<p>We consider the SA should be assessing whether the local plan has policies that 'makes space for water' and supports an improved water environment. We would like the SA to consider whether there are polices which ensure new development includes good sustainable drainage solutions in well planned green space.</p>	<p>The SEA will address these issues when appraisals are undertaken.</p>
<p><u>Issues and opportunities water quality</u></p> <p>We consider it important that water issues are considered at a <u>strategic scale</u> rather than a <u>project scale</u>. The SA should therefore be asking for a strategic overview, whether this is in the form of a Water Cycle Study or working groups of key players such as the Local Authorities, Water Companies and the Environment Agency.</p> <p>New development can increase contaminated run-off into water courses. The use of Sustainable Drainage Systems however can greatly mitigate this pollution and help improve water quality, particularly in urban areas. The SA should be assessing the local plan for its contribution to reducing diffuse pollution through water management in new development.</p>	<p>The SEA will consider these issues at the appropriate stages.</p> <p>The following key issue has been identified to reflect these comments.</p> <p><i>At a strategic level, the effects of increased development could have significant effects on water quality if required upgrades to the network are not secured in-phase with development and increased demands.</i></p>
<p><u>Soil quality</u></p> <p>The Environment Agency along with Local Authorities has a defined role in supporting the remediation of contaminated land. The redevelopment of contaminated sites can remove or stabilise soil pollutants and bring these sites back into productive use. It is true there are risks to receptors such as ground water and implications for public heath when sites are being redeveloped, but there is considerable guidance and experience in the UK in redeveloping contaminated land. There are many examples of significant environmental improvements due to contaminated land redevelopment. We therefore consider the section has overplayed the risks and underplayed the benefits of Brownfield land redevelopment.</p>	<p>Further text to reflect EA comments has been added to the soil quality section.</p>



Comments	Response
<p>4.6 Sustainability objectives</p> <p>We would like 2.1 and 2.2 replaced with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would be the impact on water quality of the development?</li> <li>• What is the impact on air quality?</li> <li>• What would be the impact on land quality?</li> <li>• Indicators</li> <li>• Impact on WFD compliance</li> <li>• HA of contaminated land brought back into productive use</li> <li>• Number of new systems or area of land covered by Sustainable Drainage Systems</li> <li>• Air quality data</li> </ul>	<p>Guiding criteria 2.1 and 2.2 have been amended in line with the suggested text to cover a wider range of land quality issues than only best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to specifically refer to air quality separately as this is inherent in the overall objective to enhance 'environmental resources'. Air quality is also covered by other criteria. For example, under 'Human Health and Wellbeing.</p> <p>Water quality has been scoped in to reflect strategic issues of planning for increased demand for waste water and drainage.</p>
<p><u>7. Resilience (To climate change)</u></p> <p>Flooding is a natural phenomenon which needs to be managed and would be an issue with or without climate change. The report highlights a number of flood events in towns in the Harborough plan area. These reflect the current trend of increased surface water flooding in urban areas. However the text does not identify one of the main causes which is the increase in impermeable surface in urban areas. Many flood events are the result of heavy rain running off impermeable surfaces which then over whelms drainage systems or small water courses resulting in fast rising flood water. Climate change is likely to cause more extreme weather events so the only way to reduce the risks of surface water flooding in urban areas is to reduce the percentage of impermeable surface. There are many ways this can be done-car parks can be made of permeable material and roads can have rain gardens to help water soak away. These sustainable drainage systems are not mentioned in the scoping report and this in our opinion is a significant omission.</p>	<p>Whilst this is not strictly baseline information and these issues would be brought out in the appraisal stage a paragraph has been included to cover this issue.</p>
<p><u>7.5 sustainability objectives</u></p> <p>We think this sustainability criteria needs to be made clearer and include people and property.</p> <p>Replace</p> <p><i>6. Reduce the risks from local and global climate change upon economic activity, delivery of essential services and the natural environment.</i></p> <p>With:</p> <p>6 .Make the natural environment, people, property, business and essential services more resilient to a changing climate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the proposal affect the risk of flooding to business?</li> <li>• How would the proposal affect the risk of flooding to private dwelling?</li> <li>• How would the proposal affect the delivery of essential services?</li> </ul>	<p>These proposed changes have been made to the SEA Framework.</p>

Comments	Response
<p><u>9.2 Water Availability</u></p> <p>The availability of water for supply is clearly an important issue for the SA. Water companies are responsible for providing potable water and they set out how this is to be achieved in Water Resource Plans. Managing water for supply is complex and needs to factor in variables such as leakage, storage, climate change and population among other things. It is also important to recognise that water for supply is managed on a large scale in water resource zones. In this way the source of water does not need to be local to the point of supply. Water can also be moved between water resource zones over long distances. Local water issues as identified in the Catchment Abstraction Management plans are therefore not relevant in terms of water for supply. On this basis it is unlikely that development will impact on water resources in the river Welland.</p>	<p>Text has been added to the water resources section to reflect comments. i.e. That it is unlikely that development will impact upon the availability of water resources in the River Welland.</p>
<p>Water companies' plans are reviewed on a five yearly basis, but set out how water will be made available for the next 25 years. There has been extensive consultation on these documents and so Local Authorities should have inputted to them and identified their future water needs. The 2014 plan has recently been published and will be an important document to reference in this scoping report.</p>	<p>Reference to the Anglian Water Resources Management Plan has been included within the contextual review.</p>
<p><u>9.7 Sustainability objectives</u></p> <p>A third of all the energy used in this country is in the home. It is much more efficient to reduce the use of energy than it is to produce it –even from renewable sources. Energy efficiency is referred to in the report but we consider the SA should be more explicate about how this can be achieved and the value of efficiency measures such as thermal insulation.</p>	<p>The SEA will consider these issues at the appropriate stages.</p>
<p>The report sets out potential monitoring indicators based on the Code of Sustainable Homes. It is good to have a standard to aim for, but of course there is considerable uncertainty about the future of the code.</p>	<p>Whilst there is uncertainty about the future of the code there are no other comparative measures to determine success.</p> <p>This indicator has been kept in for now, as these indicators are only envisaged at this stage and not formally determined.</p>



Harborough District Council  
Council Offices  
Adam and Eve Street  
Market Harborough  
Leicestershire  
LE16 7AG



URS Infrastructure and Environment  
The McLaren Building  
46, The Prioory  
Queensway  
Birmingham  
B4 7LR