

Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review

Sustainability Appraisal
incorporating
Strategic Environmental
Assessment

Scoping Report

October 2013

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
WASTE AND MINERALS LOCAL PLAN.....	1
REQUIREMENT FOR STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.....	2
REQUIREMENT FOR SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL	2
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL PROCESS AND CONSULTATION	2
DEVELOPING THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OBJECTIVES	3
REQUIREMENTS OF THE SCOPING REPORT	3
DEVELOPING THE SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES.....	3
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY.....	9
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	12
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL MONITORING	13
APPENDICES	14
APPENDIX TABLE A: BASELINE DATA, INDICATORS, TRENDS FOR AIR, WATER, SOIL AND MINERALS.....	14
APPENDIX TABLE B: BASELINE DATA, INDICATORS, TRENDS FOR BIODIVERSITY, GEODIVERSITY, FLORA AND FAUNA.....	19
APPENDIX TABLE C: BASELINE DATA, INDICATORS, TRENDS FOR CLIMATIC FACTORS, MINERALS PRODUCTION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT	23
APPENDIX TABLE D: BASELINE DATA, INDICATORS, TRENDS FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE/LANDSCAPE.....	29
APPENDIX TABLE E: BASELINE DATA, INDICATORS, TRENDS FOR POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH	31

List of Tables

TABLE 1 THE MAIN TASKS OF THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL (SA) SCOPING REPORT.....	3
TABLE 2 DEVELOPMENT OF SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES FROM PLANS, PROGRAMMES, STRATEGIES AND BASELINE DATA	4
TABLE 3 CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS.....	10
TABLE 4 PRINCIPLES OF ASSESSMENT FOR PREDICTING THE EFFECTS OF A POLICY OR SITE UPON EACH SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OBJECTIVE.....	11
TABLE 5 LIKELY CUMULATIVE EFFECTS IN LEICESTERSHIRE AND THEIR CAUSES	13

Introduction

WASTE AND MINERALS LOCAL PLAN

- 1.1 Leicestershire County Council is undertaking a review of the Leicestershire Minerals Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and the Leicestershire & Leicester Waste Core Strategy and Development Control Policies documents. To this end an issues document has been produced and is currently out for consultation – The Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Issues Document 2013. The intent of the review is fourfold:
1. to produce a set of waste policies which relate solely to Leicestershire, as Leicester City has decided to move its waste policies into its local plan;
 2. to amalgamate the minerals and waste documents to produce a single minerals and waste local plan;
 3. to update the policies, in particular, following the revocation of the East Midlands Regional Plan and the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); and
 4. to extend the duration of the policy document to 2031.
- 1.2 The Core Strategy documents were adopted on 8th October 2009 and cover the period up to 2021. The Strategies provide the Councils' vision and objectives for delivering minerals and waste infrastructure, as well as direction to where new minerals and waste sites should go and the policies for determining minerals and waste applications. Following adoption of the Core Strategy it remained for the Authority to produce a Minerals Site Allocations document and a Waste Site Allocations document.
- 1.3 No work was undertaken on producing a Minerals Site Allocations document. The Waste Site Allocations document was submitted to the Secretary of State on 31st May 2011. However, following the decision of the County Council's Cabinet to halt work on the long term treatment procurement project the document was withdrawn by the Secretary of State. Following this, no further work has been carried out on producing a new Waste Sites Allocations document and instead the focus has moved to reviewing the adopted plans. Whether or not the review will include the allocation of sites is an issue the current consultation will seek views on.

REQUIREMENT FOR STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

- 1.4 The EU Directive 2001/42/EC on assessment of effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive) came into force in the UK on 20 July 2004 through the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. Given its likely significant effects on the environment, the review document will require a Strategic Environmental Assessment.

REQUIREMENT FOR SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

- 1.5 Under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 a sustainability appraisal (SA) is required for all local plans, including waste and minerals. The purpose of sustainability appraisal is to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainability considerations in the preparation and adoption of plans. Sustainability appraisal helps local planning authorities to fulfil the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in preparing their plans.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL PROCESS AND CONSULTATION

- 1.6 The requirements to carry out sustainability appraisal and strategic environmental assessment are distinct. However, sustainability appraisal fully incorporates the requirements of the European Directive on SEA. Therefore, this report will refer to both processes as a sustainability appraisal (SA).
- 1.7 This Scoping Report sets out the methodology to be used for the sustainability appraisal of the draft and final versions of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The sustainability appraisal will be structured in the following manner:
- key sustainability issues and targets derived from relevant plans, programmes and the baseline information;
 - using these key sustainability issues to develop the sustainability objectives;
 - the method and principles used to assess the likely significant effects of the Plan.

Developing the sustainability appraisal objectives

REQUIREMENTS OF THE SCOPING REPORT

2.1 To meet the requirements of both the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive and the 2004 Town and Country Planning Regulations, in terms of sustainability appraisal, there are a number of tasks which the Scoping Report must cover. These are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1 The main tasks of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping Report

Main tasks and stages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify other relevant plans/programmes/ sustainability objectives • Collect baseline information • Identify sustainability issues and environmental problems • Develop SA framework / SEA objectives • Consult on the scope of the sustainability appraisal

DEVELOPING THE SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES

2.2 The first step in developing the sustainability objectives was to identify all relevant plans, programmes, strategies and environmental protection objectives and from these a set of key issues and targets was derived to which the sustainability appraisal would have regard; these are listed in the first two columns of Table 2. The SEA Regulations stipulate that a SEA must consider: biodiversity; population; human health; flora and fauna; soil; water; air; climate; material assets; cultural heritage; and landscape. Therefore, Table 2 is split by broad topic area reflecting, in part, the requirements of the SEA Regulations.

Table 2 Development of sustainability objectives from plans, programmes, strategies and baseline data

Plans, programmes and strategies	Key issues and targets derived from relevant plans, programmes and strategies	Key sustainability issues and problems derived from the baseline data (contained in the Appendices)	Source of baseline data	SA Objectives
Air, Water, Soil and Minerals				
EU Air Quality & Management Directive (96/62/EC), EU Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC), Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Local Transport Plan, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, Securing the Future – UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy	Promoting improvements to air quality	16 Air Quality Management Areas in County, in the main due to traffic. Possible need to expand existing or designate new ones. All waste transported via road. Anticipated growth of road traffic volumes. Much of the County's minerals are transported by road. Hard rock quarries move at least 25% of their product by rail.	Local Air Quality Management Plans, Stage 4 Review and Regional Plan Annual Monitoring Report. Leicestershire County Council.	To protect the natural resources of the County – including water, air, soil and minerals (potential cumulative effect)
Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management	Protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land	In last 3 years no waste sites permitted on this land type. Agricultural land is subject to loss due to competition from developments especially around peripheral urban areas. Waste Core Strategy seeks to avoid locating new waste sites on the best agricultural land. Minerals Core Strategy sets a strict list of criteria to be met if there is an impact on the best agricultural land.	Annual Monitoring Reports.	
Borough and District Local Plans and Local Development Frameworks, Leicestershire Municipal Waste Management Strategy, Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Local Economic Regeneration Strategies, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	Reusing previously developed land	In 2011/12 83%, in 2010/11 66% and in 2009/10 50% of new waste sites were on brownfield sites. No minerals development on brownfield land in last three years.	Annual Monitoring Reports.	
Anglian River Basin Management Plan, Catchment Abstraction Management Strategies (Soar, Tame Anker, & Mease, and Welland), EU Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC), EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice (GPP3), Humber River Basin Management Plan, Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Nitrate Pollution Prevention Regulations 2008, Water Resources Strategy Regional Action Plan for Midlands Region, Water Resources Strategy for England and Wales	Protecting the quality of inland waters	Trend of increasing biological and chemical quality of England's rivers and reduction in those with high nitrate and/or phosphate concentrations. All of Leicestershire designated as a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone.	Environment Agency. Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment.	
EU Landfill Directive (1999/31/EC), EU Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC), Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Mines Waste Directive, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	Protecting soil quality	In 2011/12 83%, in 2010/11 66% and in 2009/10 50% of new waste sites were on brownfield sites. No minerals development on brownfield land in last three years. No new waste sites permitted on best and most versatile agricultural land. No data for minerals developments.	Leicestershire County Council's Annual Monitoring Report.	

Plans, programmes and strategies	Key issues and targets derived from relevant plans, programmes and strategies	Key sustainability issues and problems derived from the baseline data (contained in the Appendices)	Source of baseline data	SA Objectives
		In 2008 waste management and sewage and water industries the most frequent polluters.	Environment Agency's web site.	
Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	Protecting mineral resources from sterilisation	In recent history, no new waste sites have sterilised minerals.	Leicestershire County Council's Annual Monitoring Reports.	
Borough and District Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), River Welland Catchment Flood Management Plan	Reducing flood risk	Development pressures may lead to increased pressure to build on floodplains. Flood zones expanded to take into account climate change.	Flood zones mapped on Council's GIS systems.	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals and waste development (potential cumulative effect)
Biodiversity, Geodiversity, Flora and Fauna				
Borough and District Local Plans and Local Development Frameworks, Borough and District Biodiversity Strategies, Central Leicestershire Local Transport Plan, Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the Conservation of Wild Birds, EC Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC), EU Air Quality & Management Directive (96/62/EC), EU Biodiversity Action Plan, EU Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC), Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire and Rutland Landscape and Woodland Strategy, Leicestershire Biodiversity Action Plan, Leicestershire Local Transport Plan, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Sustainable Community Strategy, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, Updated National Waste Planning Policy: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management	Safeguarding & enhancing the natural environment	River Mease designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). 91 SSSIs in Leicestershire and Rutland. SSSIs' quality increasing. Number of species and habitats prioritised for Action Plans. Number of locally designated sites in framework area which do not benefit from statutory protection and there has been a net loss of these sites. Increased pressure upon existing Local Nature Reserves.	Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment. Natural England's web site. Regional Plan Annual Monitoring Report. Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Biodiversity Action Plan. Locations and type of designation held on Council's GIS systems.	To conserve biodiversity and geodiversity conservation interests, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora (potential cumulative effect)
Borough and District Local Plans and Local Development Frameworks, Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Landscape & Woodland Strategy, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, National Forest Biodiversity Action Plan, National Forest Strategy	Increasing woodland cover	County is one of the least wooded in the Country. Particular emphasis to increase woodland cover in the National Forest. Reduction in targets for tree planting in the National Forest by the National Forest Company.	Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment. National Forest Annual Report.	
Climatic Factors, Minerals Development and Waste Management				
Climate Change Act 2008, draft Waste Management Plan 2013, EU Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC), EU Hazardous Waste Directive (91/689/EEC amended by Directive 94/31/EC), EU Landfill Directive (1999/31/EC), Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Municipal Waste Management Strategy, PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, UK Climate Change Risk Assessment, Updated National Waste Planning Policy: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, Waste Strategy for England 2007 (and its review)	Minimising quantities of waste landfilled	Increased recycling and composting rates for municipal waste. Net increases in C&I waste recycling capacity in the County.	Leicestershire County Council's Annual Monitoring Reports.	To minimise minerals and waste management's contribution to climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions by less reliance on primary minerals, and increased reuse, recovery, recovery and recycling (potential cumulative effect)
Draft Waste Management Plan 2013, Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies,	Maximising the value recovered from			

Plans, programmes and strategies	Key issues and targets derived from relevant plans, programmes and strategies	Key sustainability issues and problems derived from the baseline data (contained in the Appendices)	Source of baseline data	SA Objectives
Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Municipal Waste Management Strategy, Updated National Waste Planning Policy: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, Waste Strategy for England 2007 (and its review)	waste			
Draft Waste Management Plan 2013, Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Updated National Waste Planning Policy: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, Waste Strategy for England 2007 (and its review)	Contributing to a reduction in greenhouse gases	Total CO ₂ emissions in the Region have decreased. Leicestershire unlikely to meet renewable targets.	Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment. Regional Plan Annual Monitoring Report.	
Borough and District Local Plans and Local Development Frameworks, Central Leicestershire Local Transport Plan, Leicestershire Local Transport Plan, Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Sustainable Community Strategy, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	Promoting sustainable transport	Waste Core Strategy seeks to locate new waste sites close to the waste arisings. See above – on air quality. Minerals Core Strategy seeks to provide new minerals through extensions to existing sites where the transport infrastructure already exists and, where possible, to use rail to transport minerals.	Minerals and Waste Core Strategies	To maximise the sustainable transportation of minerals and waste, through the use of non-road alternatives and the reduction of the distance travelled by untreated waste (potential cumulative effect)
Cultural Heritage and Landscape				
Borough and District Local Plans and Local Development Frameworks, European Landscape Convention, Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Landscape & Woodland Strategy, Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Securing the Future – UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy	Ensuring sustainable countryside management	County has landscape character areas and the historic characterisation has been completed. Pressures of increasing development, particularly around the urban areas. Also, links to reuse of previously developed land.	Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Landscape and Woodland Strategy. Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment.	To conserve the quality of the countryside and landscape (potential cumulative effect)
Borough and District Local Plans and Local Development Frameworks, European Landscape Convention, Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Local and Regional Landscape Character Assessments, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	Protecting the historic environment	In Leicestershire 10 Conservation Areas, 9 Scheduled Monuments, 8 Grade I and II* buildings and 1 park & garden on Heritage at Risk Register. There also 10,000 entries on local lists of which very few are afforded any statutory protection.	Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment. Regional Plan Annual Monitoring Report.	To protect the character of heritage assets of archaeological, cultural and historic value
Population and Human Health				
British Standard BS4142, Borough and District Local Plans and Local Development Frameworks, Central Leicestershire Local Transport Plan, Circular 1/2003: Safeguarding, Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Stores, EU Air Quality & Management Directive (96/62/EC), EU End of Life Vehicles Directive (2000/53/EC), EU Hazardous Waste Directive 91/689/EEC (Amended by Directive 94/31/EC), EU Integrated Pollution and Prevention and Control (IPPC) Directive (96/61/EC), EU Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Directive (2002/96/EC), EU Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC), Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire	Reducing the impact of waste developments upon residents of and visitors to the area	Waste complaints in 2011/12 dropped from the 2005 baseline. Increased chance of conflict with residents and for new waste sites in built-up areas. In 2008 the waste management and the sewage and water industry were the most frequent polluters (30% of	Leicestershire County Council's Annual Monitoring Report. Environment Agency web site.	To protect people and local communities from the effects of minerals development and waste management

Plans, programmes and strategies	Key issues and targets derived from relevant plans, programmes and strategies	Key sustainability issues and problems derived from the baseline data (contained in the Appendices)	Source of baseline data	SA Objectives
Local Transport Plan, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Municipal Waste Management Strategy, Leicestershire Sustainable Community Strategy, PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, Updated National Waste Planning Policy: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management		the total in 2008).		
British Standard BS4142, Borough and District Local Plans and Local Development Frameworks, Circular 1/2003: Safeguarding, Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Stores, East Midlands Integrated Regional Strategy – Our Sustainable Development Framework, EU Air Quality & Management Directive (96/62/EC), EU Integrated Pollution and Prevention and Control (IPPC) Directive (96/61/EC), Leicestershire Local Transport Plan, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Sustainable Community Strategy, The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland	Reducing the impact of minerals developments upon residents of and visitors to the area	<p>Leicestershire is an important County for igneous rock and much of this mineral is exported hence annualised apportionment levels are high commensurate with many counties.</p> <p>No enforcement action taken in last 3 years against minerals development due to adverse environmental or amenity effects.</p> <p>Strategy for extensions to existing sites may encroach nearer to residential areas leading to a greater potential for a change in the impact upon amenity.</p> <p>Large landbanks, necessary for some minerals, and priority for extensions, protract the time communities are affected by mineral extraction – phased restoration</p>	Minerals Core Strategy and Leicestershire County Council's Annual Monitoring Reports.	
Borough and District Local Plans and Local Development Frameworks, Central Leicestershire Local Transport Plan, Leicestershire Local Transport Plan, Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Leicestershire Minerals Development Framework: Core Strategy & Development Control Policies, Local Economic Strategies, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, Updated National Waste Planning Policy: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management	Promoting economic growth and employment	<p>Between April 2012 and March 2013 78.6% of the working age population of Leicestershire was in employment</p> <p>Employment levels have decreased nationally, regionally and locally, and hence, increasing unemployment levels.</p>	Office for National Statistics web site	To promote sustainable economic growth and employment

2.3 Once a suite of key targets and issues was derived from an analysis of other relevant plans, programmes and strategies, baseline tables were collated presenting information on the County. The key issues and problems derived from the baseline data are summarised in columns 3 and 4 of Table 2; the baseline information is presented in full in the appendices to this report, grouped by the same broad topics as Table 2. Table 2 shows the key issues and problems identified marry with the issues which arose from the analysis of the relevant plans, programmes and strategies to create a set of nine sustainability objectives. These sustainability objectives will be used to assess the effects of adopting the minerals and waste local plan, including any policies or sites put forward for allocation (although it should be noted that objective 9 will not be used in assessing sites). The sustainability objectives are as follows:

1. To protect the natural resources of the County – including water, air, soil and minerals;
2. To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals and waste development;
3. To conserve biodiversity and geodiversity conservation interests, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora;
4. To minimise minerals and waste management's contribution to climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions by less reliance on primary minerals, and increased reuse, recovery, recovery and recycling;
5. To maximise the sustainable transportation of minerals and waste, through the use of non-road alternatives and the reduction of the distance travelled by untreated waste;
6. To conserve the quality of the countryside and landscape;
7. To protect the character of heritage assets of archaeological, cultural and historic value;
8. To protect people and local communities from the effects of minerals development and waste management; and
9. To promote sustainable economic growth and employment.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

- 2.4 In simple terms, to assess the effects of the Local Plan the strategic alternatives, the policies and any sites will be scored against the relevant sustainability objectives. It is not known at this stage if sites will be allocated but the methodology set out in this Scoping Report can be used to assess those sites put forward for allocation.
- 2.5 Essentially, the assessment is a matter of professional judgement to the likely significance of adopting a policy or allocating a site, both singularly and cumulatively. The predicted effects will be described in terms of their nature and magnitude using the following parameters:
- Geographical scale;
 - Probability of the effect occurring;
 - Timing of effect – short, medium, long term;
 - Duration of effect – temporary or permanent;
 - Nature of effect – positive, negative or neutral (see paragraph below); and
 - Secondary, cumulative and/or synergistic effects.
- 2.6 The assessment of the effects is a qualitative assessment of whether or not the predicted effects would be environmentally, socially, and/or economically significant. A qualitative five point scale set out in Table 3 will be used as the basis for the assessment which ranks the effect from strongly positive to neutral through to strongly negative and degrees between. Significant is an effect assessed as strongly positive or strongly negative. Where the effect is unclear or cannot be assessed a '?' shall be utilized.

Table 3 Criteria for Assessing Significance of Effects

Assessment Scale	Significance of Effect/Appraisal Category
++	Strongly positive
+	Slightly or moderately positive
0	Neutral or no obvious effect
-	Slightly or moderately negative
--	Strongly negative

2.7 Using the criteria of Table 3 the intention is to produce one assessment table for each strategic alternative, policy or site assessed. The assessment of significance should also include information on how the effect may be avoided or its severity reduced, though, the assessment is undertaken on the premise that there is no mitigation. Any mitigation known to be possible is included in the final summation for each alternative, policy, and site. Such mitigation may have the effect of making that assessed acceptable. Table 4 explains, in general, the principles of assessment for each sustainability appraisal objective. Principally, the sustainability appraisal objectives seek to protect or conserve areas of interest from negative effects and because of this it has been decided that where a sustainability objective is seeking to protect or to conserve an area of interest and there is no effect (i.e. protection or conservation would be achieved) then a score of 'slightly positive' will be assigned.

Table 4 Principles of assessment for predicting the effects of an alternative, policy or site upon each sustainability appraisal objective

	Sustainability appraisal objectives	Principles of assessment (done without mitigation)
01	To protect the natural resources of the County – including water, air, soil and minerals	Effects will be assessed on the potential to affect natural resources. No impact or enhancement will score positively.
02	To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals and waste development	Effects will be scored positively or negatively based upon the flood zone affected and the compatibility with the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework. Therefore, in general terms, effects in flood zone 1 are more likely to be scored positively whilst those in flood zones 2 or 3 will be scored negatively. Continuation of the <i>status quo</i> will be neutral.
03	To conserve biodiversity and geodiversity conservation interests, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora	Policies/sites which would affect designated wildlife or geological sites or sites which have protected species present will attract negative scores, the level commensurate with the designation and, the scale and type of the impact. No impact or enhancement of the biodiversity/geological interest will score positively. Any effects within the catchment of the River Mease will need to be assessed under the Habitats Regulations.
04	To minimise minerals and waste management's contribution to climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions by less reliance on primary minerals, and increased reuse, recovery, recovery and recycling	Movement of waste up the waste hierarchy will be scored positively by virtue of the reduction of waste going to landfill and hence a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions through the reduced need for primary resources. The ability to recover energy would be assessed favourably. This objective does not assess the effects of transporting waste and minerals.
05	To maximise the sustainable transportation of minerals and waste, through the use of non-road alternatives and the reduction of the distance travelled by untreated waste	Moving minerals and waste via non-road means will score positively. Locating new waste sites close to waste arisings as per Policies WCS2 and WCS3 will also score positively.

06	To conserve the quality of the countryside and landscape	The effects of policies/sites on the countryside and landscape will be scored using the sequential approach of Policy WCS4 (where appropriate), local landscape character areas, the county historic landscape characterisation and agricultural land quality. So, in broad terms, effects on greenfield land within the countryside will be scored negatively, with effects on Green Wedges and Charnwood Forest scored as strongly negative. No impact or enhancement will score positively.
07	To protect the character of heritage assets of archaeological, cultural and historic value	Policies/sites which would affect designated sites, including their setting, will attract negative scores, the level commensurate with the designation. No impact or enhancement will score positively.
08	To protect people and local communities from the effects of minerals development and waste management	The potential to cause nuisance/harm will be used in any assessment. Any assessment will also take into account the potential impact upon highway and aviation safety. No impact or an improvement will score positively.
09	To promote sustainable economic growth and employment	Policies which diversify the local economy through providing long term employment opportunities will score positively.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

- 2.8 Paragraph 2.2 lists those topic areas which the SEA Regulations require to be considered, and as explained in paragraph 2.5 there is a requirement not to look at each topic and each objective in isolation but also to consider the interrelationship between them. These interrelationships or cumulative effects, includes not only 'true' cumulative effects but also those effects which would be secondary and synergistic. Table 5 presents the cumulative effects the Council believes could be caused by adoption of the Local Plan and the receptors which could be affected. Any cumulative effects will be presented at the bottom of each assessment table.

Table 5 Likely cumulative effects in Leicestershire and their causes

Cumulative Effect	Affected Receptor	Causes
Decrease in greenhouse gas emissions	Local communities (people), local wildlife habitats, local wildlife species	Increased move away from use of primary minerals and landfilling of waste
Deterioration in landscape character	Local communities (people), local wildlife habitats, local wildlife species	Development of greenfield mineral and waste sites
Increased conflict between waste facilities and residential properties	Local communities (people),	Drive to locate new waste facilities in close proximity to arisings
Increased risk of flooding	Local communities (people), local wildlife habitats, local wildlife species	Development of new waste facilities, particularly on greenfield sites and an associated increase in impermeable surfaces
Increased visitor pressure on Nature Reserves in Leicestershire	Local wildlife habitats, local wildlife species	Increasing population
Reduction in biodiversity	Local wildlife habitats, local wildlife species	Poor water quality

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL MONITORING

- 2.9 No monitoring indicators and targets for the sustainability objectives are provided in this scoping report – they will be published in the sustainability report which would accompany the next draft of the Local Plan. However, it can be assumed that any indicators used to monitor sustainability objectives would be, where possible, the same indicators used to monitor the Local Plan. The benefits of this are twofold: one, it reduces the number of indicators to monitor and makes it more manageable; and two, it uses data the Authorities can collect themselves and removes the prospect of having ‘blanks’ where data is not available.

Appendices

APPENDIX TABLE A: BASELINE DATA, INDICATORS, TRENDS FOR AIR, WATER, SOIL AND MINERALS

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Number of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)	16 AQMAs Blaby: 5 Charnwood: 4 Harborough: 1 Hinckley & Bosworth: 0 Melton: 0 NW Leics: 2 Oadby & Wigston: 4 (2010 SA Scoping Report).	To achieve national air quality objectives as set out in the UK Air Quality Strategy, 1999.	Blaby: 2004 review shows worsening. Possible extension of AQMAs. Charnwood: new AQMA designated in Mountsorrel in 2011. Further monitoring of area in Thurmaston. Harborough: worsening. AQMA may be extended. Hinckley & Bosworth: reduced from 2 following review in 2004. Melton: no data at present. NW Leics: reduced from 6 following review 2003. Oadby & Wigston: no data at present. (Local Air Quality Management Plans, Stage 4 Review)	Majority of the AQMAs due to traffic (the exception in Mountsorrel which is particulate matter (dust)). Limited potential to reduce road traffic in AQMAs.

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Traffic volumes	<p>In 2007 traffic levels in the East Midlands were 41.7 million vehicle kilometres, a 1 per cent increase on the 2006 figure. In the East Midlands between 2001 and 2007 minor rural roads saw the greatest increase, with traffic levels rising 15 per cent with urban A roads remaining static (Regional Plan AMR 2007/08).</p> <p>Total vehicle kilometres travelled on County roads grew from 3672m v.kms in 2003 to 3862kms in 2007/08 (LTP2 Progress Report 2008).</p>	Local Transport Plan set target of 4,160m v.kms.	Further growth anticipated but traffic growth rates and congestion rates have decreased (Regional Plan AMR 08/09).	Predicted increase in traffic volumes.

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Contaminated land	<p>Charnwood : 27 sites which may be contaminated.</p> <p>Melton – no sites designated</p> <p>Other Local Authorities – no data identified.</p> <p>No comprehensive register of contaminated sites exists.</p>	No targets identified.	New contamination less likely than previously due to environmental controls.	<p>Historical land use in Leicestershire has resulted in the potential for further contamination, although the identification of sites is dependent on the development control process.</p> <p>All the districts and boroughs have contaminated land strategies. Lack of data on sites (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire’s Environment, ENABLE).</p>
Percentage of minerals developments on previously developed land (PDL)	No new minerals sites proposed on brownfield sites in last three years (LCC AMRs (Leicestershire County Council Annual Monitoring Reports).	No targets.	None.	Opportunities for development of a mineral extraction site upon a brownfield site extremely limited in the County.
Percentage of waste developments on previously developed land (PDL)	83% of new waste sites were on brownfield locations (AMR 2011/12, LCC).	Target of Core Strategy to have 90% of new waste sites on brownfield land.	75% of new waste sites in Leicestershire on brownfield sites in 2008/09, 50% in 2009/10, 66% in 2010/11 and 83% in 2011/12 (LCC AMRs).	Pressure for development on greenfield sites. Competition on industrial sites with B2 and B8 uses.
Percentage of best and most versatile agricultural land occupied by waste development	80% of land use in Leicestershire is agriculture (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire’s Environment, ENABLE). In last 3 years no waste sites permitted on best	No targets identified.	No new waste developments leading to a loss of this type of agricultural land.	Agricultural land is subject to loss due to competition from developments especially around peripheral urban areas. Waste Core Strategy seeks to avoid locating new waste sites

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
	and most versatile agricultural land (LCC AMRs).			on the best agricultural land. No similar data is collected for minerals developments.
Water quality (biological and chemical)	In 2008, 51% of English rivers had high concentrations of phosphate and 32% high concentrations of nitrate. In England, in 2008, 72 % of river lengths were of excellent or good biological quality and 79% of rivers were of excellent or good chemical quality (Environment Agency web site, accessed 06/12/09).	To reduce the number of rivers with high concentrations of nitrate and phosphate and increase the number of rivers classified as excellent or good in biological and chemical quality (Humber and Anglian River Basin Management Plans).	In 1990, 69% of English rivers had high concentrations of phosphate and in 1995 36% had high nitrate concentrations In 1990, 55% of England's river lengths were of excellent or good biological quality, and 55% of excellent or good chemical quality (Environment Agency web site, accessed 06/12/09).	The sewage and water industry caused 15% of serious water pollution incidents (Environment Agency web site, accessed 06/12/09). No more recent data available in comparable format. Potential cumulative impact with biodiversity.
Nitrate Vulnerable Zones (NVZ)	All of Leicestershire declared NVZ in 2002 (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment, ENABLE).	55% of England designated NVZ in 2002 (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment, ENABLE).	In 1996 only 2 NVZs in Leicestershire (one in the south and one in the north east) (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment, ENABLE).	Farmers in NVZs are required to adhere to an Action Programme to reduce nitrate loss from land. Potential cumulative impact with biodiversity.
Flood Zones	Flood zones for Leicestershire and Leicester mapped on Councils' GIS. Strategic Flood Risk Assessments are available for all areas of Leicestershire.	No targets identified.	Flood zones updated by Environment Agency to reflect the possible effects of climate change, i.e. areas increased. Through improved flood control systems effects minimised, e.g. improved flood alleviation system near Melton Mowbray	Development pressures on floodplain. The River Soar valley in particular has suffered significant flooding since late 18th Century (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
			completed 2002/3.	Environment, ENABLE). Potential cumulative impact with human health and biodiversity.
Pollution incidents investigated by Environment Agency	146 waste-management related incidents recorded by EA in 2008, in England and Wales (Environment Agency web site, accessed 06/12/09).	No targets identified.	230 incidents in 2000 (Environment Agency web site, accessed 06/12/09).	The waste management and the sewage and water industry were the most frequent polluters in 2008 (30% of the total in 2008) (Environment Agency web site, accessed 06/12/09). No newer data available on Environment Agency web site.
Percentage of new waste development which sterilised minerals	In last 3 years no waste sites permitted which sterilised known mineral reserves (LCC AMRs). Mineral Consultation Areas shown on Councils' GIS systems.	None.	No minerals sterilised by new waste developments.	Pressure for development on greenfield sites.

APPENDIX TABLE B: BASELINE DATA, INDICATORS, TRENDS FOR BIODIVERSITY, GEODIVERSITY, FLORA AND FAUNA

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
<p>Number of designated & non-statutory locally designated sites</p>	<p>2 SPAs or SACs, 91 SSSIs and Nature Reserves, 12 Local Nature Reserves and 2,564 Local Wildlife Sites in Leicestershire (including Rutland) (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire’s Environment, ENABLE). 15 RIGS (Regionally Important Geological Sites) of which one is in Rutland (Clipsham Quarry) (LCC Website, 15/07/13)</p> <p>0.24ha of Local Nature Reserve per 1000 population (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire’s Environment, ENABLE).</p> <p>Location and designations held in County’s GIS.</p>		<p>Number of SSSIs has remained constant between 2002/03 and 2005 but coverage has increased from 4500ha to 4971ha yet between 2002/03 and 2006, hectares of Local Nature Reserve per 1000 population decreased from 0.4ha to 0.24ha (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire’s Environment, ENABLE).</p>	<p>Leicestershire is one of the ‘poorest’ counties in terms of the biodiversity it supports. Appears that increase in population has led to a reduction in Local Nature Reserves area available per person and may lead to increased pressures upon existing Reserves with a continued population increase (potential cumulative impact with population increase).</p>

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Quality of designated sites	91.16% of the area covered by SSSIs (Sites of Special Scientific Interest) in Leicestershire (including Rutland) meeting Public Service Agreement (PSA) target (Natural England, 15/07/13).	<p>Nationally 96.11% of SSSIs' area meeting PSA target (Natural England, 15/07/13).</p> <p>In the East Midlands region 98.54% of SSSIs' area met PSA target (Natural England, 15/07/13).</p>	<p>Leicestershire does not meet the national or regional averages.</p> <p>SSSI condition in Leicestershire (including Rutland) increased from 70.59% of SSSI area meeting PSA targets in 2007 to 77.08% in 2008 to 81.91% in 2009. Slight drop between 2012 and 2013 from 91.19% to 91.16% (Regional Plan AMR 2007/08 and Natural England, 01/11/09).</p>	Condition of existing SSSIs' area has markedly increased in 4 years between 2007 and 2012. However, the condition remains short of the national and regional averages.

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
<p>Population of species and areas of priority habitat</p>	<p>Biodiversity Action Plan lists 19 Habitat Action Plans and 15 Species Action Plans.</p> <p>Biodiversity Action Plans produced for National Forest and Charnwood Forest (Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Biodiversity Action Plan)</p>	<p>To meet 100% of the objectives set out in the Leicestershire, Leicester & Rutland Biodiversity Action Plan.</p>	<p>New priority habitat creation, particularly in the National Forest area (National Forest BAP).</p> <p>County's AMRs (Annual Monitoring Reports) show a trend of permissions requiring habitat creation, particularly post mineral extraction (LCC AMRs).</p> <p>In the East Midlands, between 1994 and 2007, the largest population decline was seen in the Yellow Wagtail (declined by 78 per cent). And, between 1994 and 2007, the largest population decline in a woodland bird species was seen in Willow Tit (declined by 80 per cent) (East Midlands Regional Sustainable Development Indicators: Factsheet, February 2010, DEFRA).</p>	<p>Objectives in BAP are not quantified, there is a lack of a baseline.</p> <p>Estimates of change not readily available.</p> <p>Local Wildlife sites do not benefit from statutory protection (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment, ENABLE).</p> <p>A total of 77 hectares of local wildlife sites were lost through planning decisions and a further 2,307 hectares were lost through other means whilst 467 hectares were enhanced by planning decisions in 2007/08 (Regional Plan AMR 2007/08).</p> <p>No newer data on loss of local wildlife sites.</p>
<p>Area of woodland cover</p>	<p>Leicestershire & Rutland have 3.8% woodland cover and 256km² of Leicestershire is within the National Forest (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment, ENABLE). Location and designations, where there are</p>	<p>The county is one of the least wooded areas of England (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment, ENABLE).</p>	<p>Total non-deciduous area of woodland has increased in recent years, particularly in the National Forest.</p>	<p>The county is one of the least wooded areas of England.</p>

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
	any, are held in County GIS.			
Amount of new woodland planted	At the outset National Forest area had about 6% woodland coverage (Waste Core Strategy)	National Forest area target of 1/3 woodland cover and is now at almost 19% (National Forest Annual Report 2010-11).	National Forest annual targets have been dropped to 200-250ha per annum. In the National Forest woodland cover has increased from 6% to 18.8% (National Forest Annual Report 2010-11)	<p>As above.</p> <p>Annual rate of creating new woodland cover in the National Forest has decreased.</p> <p>Reduction in demand for landfill may reduce the land available to restore to woodland via increased restoration to lower levels, in particular water bodies.</p>

APPENDIX TABLE C: BASELINE DATA, INDICATORS, TRENDS FOR CLIMATIC FACTORS, MINERALS PRODUCTION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Carbon Dioxide (CO ₂) emissions	The East Midlands emitted 39 million tonnes of carbon dioxide (CO ₂) in 2007 which equates to 8.9 tonnes per resident (East Midlands Regional Sustainable Development Indicators: Factsheet, February 2010, DEFRA).	<p>Regional CO₂ emissions were the second lowest in comparison with other regions but per resident were the third highest rate in comparison with other regions (East Midlands Regional Sustainable Development Indicators: Fact sheet 31, March 2009, DEFRA).</p> <p>Commitment to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases to 22% below 1990 levels by 2008-12 and 28% by 2013-17 (DEFRA website accessed on 30/07/13 http://sd.defra.gov.uk/2010/03/first-carbon-budget-report-card-shows-uk-on-track/).</p>	<p>The East Midlands emitted 41 million tonnes of carbon dioxide (CO₂) in 2006 which equates to 9.3 tonnes per resident (East Midlands Regional Sustainable Development Indicators: Fact sheet 31, March 2009, DEFRA). Total carbon dioxide emissions in the East Midlands in 2006 were 41 million tonnes, down from 43 million tonnes in 2004. (Regional Plan AMR 2007/08). CO₂ emissions in East Midlands down to 39 million tonnes in 2007 (Regional Plan AMR 2008/09).</p> <p>On target to meet first carbon budget required by 2008 Climate Change Act (DEFRA website accessed on 30/07/13 http://sd.defra.gov.uk/2010/03/first-carbon-budget-report-card-shows-uk-on-track/).</p>	<p>To continue to reduce emissions without impacting upon economic growth.</p> <p>No new data from Region (Regional Plan AMR 2009/10).</p>

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Energy consumption	<p><u>Gas</u> Between 2005 and 2006 consumption by commercial and industrial consumers grew in Leicestershire by 0.7% (Regional Plan AMR 2007/08).</p> <p>Between 2005/06 and 2006/07 consumption by commercial and industrial consumers dropped in Leicestershire by 1.3% (Regional Plan AMR 2008/09).</p> <p><u>Electricity</u> Between 2005 and 2006 consumption by commercial and industrial users increased in Leicestershire by 4.3% (Regional Plan AMR 2007/08).</p> <p>Between 2006 and 2007 consumption by commercial and industrial consumers dropped in Leicestershire by 7.2% (Regional Plan AMR 2008/09).</p>	<p>In the East Midlands, between 2005 and 2006, commercial and industrial use of gas dropped by 2.3% and electricity increased by 3.6% (Regional Plan AMR 2007/08).</p> <p>In the East Midlands, between 2005/06 and 2006/07, commercial and industrial use of gas increased by 2.6% (Regional Plan AMR 2008/09).</p> <p>In the East Midlands, between 2006 and 2007, commercial and industrial use of electricity decreased by 5.8% (Regional Plan AMR 2008/09).</p>	Fluctuating electricity and gas consumption within the East Midlands and Leicestershire (Regional Plan AMRs).	Fluctuating energy use.

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Modal split for minerals transport	100% of coal, gypsum, limestone, oil, and sand & gravel transported by road. 4 igneous rock quarries rail linked: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bardon – 30% by rail; • Cliffe Hill – 25% by rail; • Croft – 30% by rail; and • Mountsorrel – 60% by rail (LCC data). 	No target identified.	Very little opportunity to move further away from road based transport at most mineral sites.	Other than for igneous rock quarries, limited infrastructure potential for non-road transport of minerals. Minerals Core Strategy seeks to favour extensions of existing sites and use non-road based transport.
Modal split for waste transport	100% road (LCC data).	No target identified.	No movement away from road based transport.	Limited infrastructure potential for non-road transport of waste. Strategy seeks to locate new waste facilities closer to their arisings. Potential cumulative impact with human health.

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues																												
Renewable energy	<p>In 2008, for Leicestershire:</p> <p>Wind power – 0.006MW</p> <p>Biomass - 3.008MW</p> <p>Landfill gas – 15.37MW</p> <p>Anaerobic Digestion - 1.43MW</p> <p>Photovoltaics - 0.044MW</p> <p>Total renewable energy 19.858MW</p> <p>(Strategic Overview of Leicestershire’s Environment, ENABLE).</p>	<p>2010 targets:</p> <p>Wind power – 22MW</p> <p>Biomass - 11.2MW</p> <p>Landfill gas – 18MW</p> <p>Anaerobic Digestion – 3.4MW</p> <p>Photovoltaics – 0.4MW</p> <p>Total renewable energy 55MW</p> <p>(Strategic Overview of Leicestershire’s Environment, ENABLE).</p>	<p>Leicestershire unlikely to meet targets.</p> <p>Renewable energy generation increased from 645 GWh in 2005 to 1,594 GWh in 2009 (Regional Plan AMR 2009/10).</p>	<p>Lack of renewable energy sources developed within the county but trend of increasing contribution from renewable energy sources.</p> <p>Growing timber economy – potential for wood heating.</p>																												
Production of primary won minerals	<p>Sales of primary won minerals with an annualised sub-regional apportionment in brackets:</p> <p>2010</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Igneous Rock</td> <td>11.097 Mt</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(14.807 Mt)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Limestone*</td> <td>1.133 Mt</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(1.6Mt) * includes Rutland</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sand & Gravel</td> <td>0.906 Mt</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(1.25 Mt)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(AMR 2011/12, LCC).</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Igneous Rock	11.097 Mt	(14.807 Mt)		Limestone*	1.133 Mt	(1.6Mt) * includes Rutland		Sand & Gravel	0.906 Mt	(1.25 Mt)		(AMR 2011/12, LCC).		<p>Sales at sub-regional apportionment levels.</p>	<p>Sales are below sub-regional apportionment levels.</p> <p>Sales of primary won minerals with an annualised sub-regional apportionment in brackets:</p> <p>2009</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Igneous Rock</td> <td>10.677 Mt</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(14.807 Mt)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Limestone*</td> <td>1.092 Mt</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(1.6Mt) * includes Rutland</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sand & Gravel</td> <td>0.835 Mt</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(1.25 Mt)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(AMR 2010/11, LCC).</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Igneous Rock	10.677 Mt	(14.807 Mt)		Limestone*	1.092 Mt	(1.6Mt) * includes Rutland		Sand & Gravel	0.835 Mt	(1.25 Mt)		(AMR 2010/11, LCC).		<p>Leicestershire is an important County for igneous rock and much of this mineral is exported hence annualised apportionment levels are high commensurate with many counties.</p> <p>National figures assume 25% of the Nation’s need for aggregates will be met by secondary/recycled aggregates (Chief Planning Officer Letter dated 29 June 2009).</p>
Igneous Rock	11.097 Mt																															
(14.807 Mt)																																
Limestone*	1.133 Mt																															
(1.6Mt) * includes Rutland																																
Sand & Gravel	0.906 Mt																															
(1.25 Mt)																																
(AMR 2011/12, LCC).																																
Igneous Rock	10.677 Mt																															
(14.807 Mt)																																
Limestone*	1.092 Mt																															
(1.6Mt) * includes Rutland																																
Sand & Gravel	0.835 Mt																															
(1.25 Mt)																																
(AMR 2010/11, LCC).																																

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Landbank for non-energy minerals	Landbank as of 31/12/2010, based on apportionment, as follows: Igneous Rock 19.9 years Limestone^ 27.4 years Sand & Gravel 9 years ^ includes Rutland (AMR 2011/12, LCC).	Minimum landbank of 7 years for aggregate minerals. Appropriate landbank for other non-energy minerals.	Landbanks at minimum levels. Landbank as of 31/12/2009, based on apportionment, as follows: Igneous Rock 20.75 years Limestone^ 21.53 years Sand & Gravel 10.25 years ^ includes Rutland (AMR 2010/11, LCC).	Maintenance of landbank requires planning permission to be sought many years in advance of minerals being extracted. Priority for extensions means that the infrastructure is already present but the same communities experience mineral extraction for a prolonged period (phased restoration reduces this problem).
Waste recycling and recovery (municipal)	<u>Leicestershire municipal waste management 2011/12:</u> 51.2% recycled, reused and composted; 32.3% landfilled (AMR 2011/12, LCC).	Leicestershire Municipal Waste Strategy set a minimum target of 50% recycling and composting by 2010. This target was met. The next target is to recycle and compost 53% by 2014/15.	Year-on-year increases in recycling and composting rates. <u>Leicestershire 10/11:</u> 51.1% recycled, reused and composted; 41.9% landfilled (AMR 2010/11, LCC). <u>Leicestershire 08/09:</u> 46.03% recycled and composted; 1.92% recovered; 50.54% landfilled (AMR 2008/09, LCC).	Currently, municipal recycling targets are being met within existing waste sites but to meet recovery targets there may be a demand for additional facilities. Increased recycling rates have been achieved, in the latter years, largely through changes to household collections rather than by new sites.

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
<p>Waste data (commercial & industrial and construction & demolition)</p>	<p>Indicative shortfall of 89,404tpa for the recycling of C&I and municipal waste in 2009/10 published in adopted Waste Core Strategy.</p> <p>Indicative shortfall of 632,700tpa in 2014/15 for the recycling of C&D waste published in adopted Waste Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Sufficient capacity permitted to manage the predicted arising of C&I waste (WNA 2011, LCC).</p> <p>Remaining shortfall of 591,200 to recycle C&D waste (AMR 2010/11, LCC).</p>	<p>Year-on-year increases in new waste sites permitted for handling and recovering C&I waste.</p>	<p>Demand for new sites.</p> <p>Greater drive to move waste away from disposal.</p> <p>Large predicted shortfall for the provision of C&D recycling facilities but little activity at existing sites and no demand for new sites (in terms of applications being made). Need to reappraise the C&D waste figures.</p>

APPENDIX TABLE D: BASELINE DATA, INDICATORS, TRENDS FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE/LANDSCAPE

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
<p>Number of listed buildings/scheduled ancient monument/historic parks/historic landscapes and proportion at risk</p>	<p>In Leicestershire:</p> <p>186 Scheduled Monuments;</p> <p>15 parks & gardens on English Register of Historic Parks & Gardens;</p> <p>1 battlefield on English Heritage Battlefields Register; and</p> <p>3,945 buildings listed for special architectural or historic interest (English Heritage).</p> <p>229 historic townscapes or villages; and</p> <p>212 Conservation Areas (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire’s Environment, ENABLE).</p>	<p>In Leicestershire 10 Conservation Areas, 9 Scheduled Monuments, 8 Grade I and II* buildings and 1 park & garden on Heritage at Risk Register.</p>	<p>4337 listed buildings in Leicestershire in 2004 (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire’s Environment, ENABLE). 10,000 entries listed on local lists, up from 4143 in 2004 (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire’s Environment, ENABLE).</p> <p>Number of Conservation Areas in Leicestershire increased from 209 in 2007/08 to 212 in 2008/09 (Regional Plan AMR 2008/09).</p>	<p>Very few entries on local lists are afforded statutory protection (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire’s Environment, ENABLE).</p> <p>No improvement to number of Grade I and II* buildings at risk.</p> <p>Archaeological remains, including those undesignated, most likely to be affected by mineral extraction.</p>

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Landscape character areas	<p>43.8% of Leicestershire is tilled agricultural land</p> <p>35% of Leicestershire is managed grassland (Climate Change Strategy for Leicestershire, ENABLE).</p> <p>18 character areas of which 2 are found solely in Rutland (Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Landscape and Woodland Strategy).</p>	<p>None identified.</p> <p>County historic landscape characterisation mapping has been completed and attempts to characterise the historic dimension of the existing landscape (final report available from: http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/leisure_tourism/local_history/archaeology/historic_landscape_characterisation.htm).</p>	<p>Continued pressure from residential, industrial, power generation, mineral workings and transportation around margins of urban areas and development pressure associated with East Midlands Airport (Strategic Overview of Leicestershire's Environment, ENABLE).</p>	<p>Ensure new development does not adversely affect the area's landscape.</p> <p>Potential cumulative effect through the loss of greenfield sites and biodiversity.</p>

APPENDIX TABLE E: BASELINE DATA, INDICATORS, TRENDS FOR POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Employment activity	Between April 2012 and March 2013 78.6% of the working age population of Leicestershire was in employment (Office for National Statistics web site (NOMIS) accessed 30/07/13).	<p>Between July 2010 and June 2011 73% of the working age population of Leicestershire was in employment (Office for National Statistics web site (NOMIS) accessed 10/02/12).</p> <p>Between April 2008 and March 2009 79.5% of the working age population of Leicestershire was in employment (Office for National Statistics web site (NOMIS) accessed 06/12/09).</p> <p>Between March 2013 and May 2013 77.8% of the working population of England was in employment (Office for National Statistics web site (NOMIS) accessed 30/07/13).</p>	Employment levels have decreased nationally, regionally and locally but most recent data seems to show a small uplift in Leicestershire, from 73% to 78.6%.	<p>Figures disguise considerable differences throughout the area, that is, specific communities have very high unemployment.</p> <p>Minerals industry has contracted significantly due to its direct connection to the construction industry.</p>

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Unemployment rate	Between April 2012 and March 2013 5.2% unemployed in Leicestershire (Office for National Statistics web site (NOMIS) accessed 30/07/13).	<p>Between July 2010 and June 2011 5.6% unemployed in Leicestershire (Office for National Statistics web site (NOMIS) accessed 10/02/12).</p> <p>Between April 2008 and March 2009 4.9% unemployed in Leicestershire (Office for National Statistics web site (NOMIS) accessed 06/12/09).</p> <p>At September 2004 unemployment was as follows: Leicestershire 1.2% (SA/SEA Scoping Report for waste development framework 2005).</p> <p>In East Midlands 6.4% unemployed and 6.2% in Great Britain (Office for National Statistics web site (NOMIS) accessed 06/12/09).</p> <p>In East Midlands 7.6% unemployed and 7.7% in Great Britain (Office for National Statistics web site (NOMIS) accessed 10/02/12).</p>	Leicestershire's unemployment levels have risen from 1.2% in 2004 to 5.6% in 2011 but recent data shows a slight drop to 5.2%. Leicestershire tends to have lower rates of unemployment than the East Midlands region and nationally.	Increasing unemployment was driven by national economic conditions.

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
Deprivation	Using the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010 Leicestershire County was 137th most deprived of 149 local authorities (DCLG web site, accessed 10/02/12).	<p>Using the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007 Leicestershire County was 138th most deprived of 149 local authorities (DCLG web site, accessed 06/12/09).</p> <p>2004 data had Leicestershire as the 136th most deprived of 149 local authorities (DCLG web site, accessed 06/12/09).</p> <p>The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 showed that within the County, Harborough District ranks within the least deprived 10% of districts nationally, with Blaby, Melton and Oadby & Wigston ranking within the least 20% (SA/SEA Scoping Report for waste development framework 2005).</p>	County's ranking has stayed almost constant between 2004 and 2010.	Large difference within the County such as NW Leicestershire and Harborough.
Statistics on enforcement upon mineral sites	No enforcement notices served due to adverse amenity or environmental effects on mineral site in last three years (LCC AMRs).	One served in 2008/09.	No trends identified as very few notices served.	Strategy for extensions to existing sites may encroach nearer to residential areas leading to a greater potential for a change in the impact upon amenity. See comments made on mineral sales and landbanks in Appendix Table C.

General Indicator	Quantified Data and Source	Comparators and Targets (if applicable)	Trends	Issues
<p>Statistics on complaints about waste sites</p>	<p>During 2011/12 in Leicestershire 1 substantiated complaint received (AMR 2011/12, LCC).</p>	<p>During 2010/11 in Leicestershire 5 substantiated complaints received (AMR 2010/11, LCC).</p> <p>During 2009/10 in Leicestershire 9 substantiated complaints received (AMR 2009/10, LCC).</p> <p>During 2008/09 in Leicestershire 2 substantiated complaints received (AMR 2008/09, LCC).</p> <p>Baseline of 24 complaints received in 2005 (AMR 2008/09, LCC).</p>	<p>Overall trend of declining since 2005 but with a slight upsurge 2009-2011.</p>	<p>A need for more waste sites to avoid disposal to landfill and to locate them in urban areas increases the chance of conflict with residential areas.</p>