



Harborough District Council

Employment Land Availability Assessment (ELAA)

May 2012

Contents

1.0	Introduction	
1.1	Background to this report	5
1.2	Purpose of this report	5
1.3	Approach to this report	5
1.4	How to use this report	6
2.0	Methodology for the Assessment	
2.1	Employment Land Review Stages	6
2.2	Planning the ERTCAA (ELAA - Employment only).....	7
2.3	Determining which sources of sites will be included in ELAA.....	8
2.4	Desktop review of existing information	8
2.5	Determining which sites and areas will be surveyed	8
2.6	The Nature of Harborough’s Economic Challenge	9
2.7	Carrying out the Survey	9
2.8	Assessing Whether, When and If Sites are Likely to be Developed.....	10
2.9	Assessing Suitability for Employment Uses.....	10
2.10	Degrees of Suitability for Employment Uses.....	11
2.11	Assessing Availability & Degrees of Availability for Employment Uses...	12
2.12	Assessing Achievability for Employment Uses.....	13
2.13	Degrees of Achievability for Employment Uses.....	14
2.14	Estimating the Employment Potential of Each Site	14
3.0	Outcomes of the Employment Land Availability Assessment (ELAA)	
3.1	Assessment Outcomes.....	15
3.2	Summary of Initial Assessment	19
3.3	Summary of Second Assessment	19

List of Figures

Figure 1: Steps Involved in Employment Land Reviews.....	7
Figure 2: Categories of Suitability	12
Figure 3: Categories of Availability	13
Figure 4: Categories of Achievability	14

List of Tables

Table 1: ELAA Initial Assessment Outcome Summary Stage.....	15
Table 2: ELAA Second Assessment Outcome	16
(Sites with Potential for Employment Use)	
Table 3: ELAA Second Assessment	17
(Sites without Potential for Employment Use)	
Table 4: Overview of ELAA Sites by Settlement.....	18
Table 5: Sites with Potential for Employment – Capacity by Settlement	19
Table 6: Sites with Potential for Employment – Use Breakdown by Settlement.....	20

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Minutes of Developer Panel.....	21
Appendix 2 – Sites Proposed for Employment Development: Assessment Criteria.....	26

Companion Guide

Appendix A:	Sites Ineligible / Excluded from ELAA
Appendix B:	Site Maps & Summary Information (Table 2 & 3 Sites)
Appendix C:	Site Maps & Summary Information (Table 1 Failed Sites)
Appendix D:	Settlement Maps

Map 1: Market Harborough
Map 2: Lutterworth
Map 3: Broughton Astley

Map 4: Kibworth
Map 5: Fleckney
Map 6: Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground

1 Introduction

1.1 Background to this report

- 1.1.1 The Employment Land Availability Assessment (ELAA) is the employment element of the Employment, Retail & Town Centre uses Availability Assessment (ERTCAA). The ERTCAA forms part of the technical evidence base for the Local Plan, particularly the Allocations DPD, and will inform the delivery of sufficient and suitable land for employment¹, retail and town centre² uses within Harborough District.
- 1.1.2 The approach taken to ERTCAA, of which the ELAA is part, accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 161 and superseded national planning policy & best practice guidance³ in place at the time it was undertaken. In accordance with the requirements of the NPPF; it assesses the opportunities that exist to meet Harborough's employment, retail & town centre uses requirement in the period to 2028, was undertaken at the same time as the 2011 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Update, and includes a re-appraisal of previously allocated sites.
- 1.1.3 An ERTCAA has not previously been undertaken. This report, the ELAA, deals with and reports on the employment element of ERTCAA only. A report covering the Retail & Town Centre Uses aspect of ERTCAA will be prepared separately.

1.2 Purpose of this report

- 1.2.1 All local authorities are required to use evidence to plan positively to help achieve sustainable economic growth and meet the development needs of their area. In accordance with former national guidance set out in ODPM Employment Land Review Guidance the ELAA will:
- Identify sites with potential for employment development
 - Assess their employment potential; and
 - Assess when they are likely to be developed

Together with other evidence (including; an assessment of the future demand for employment / retail & town centre land, and an Existing Employment Areas Review) this report will help to inform the preparation of the Local Plan Allocations DPD. The NPPF suggests that Local Planning Authorities (LPA's) should set criteria or identify sufficient sites within their development plans to meet anticipated needs over the plan period.

1.3 Approach to this report

- 1.3.1 The approach to the ELAA has been devised with regard to the methodologies used in the Harborough Employment Land Study (2006) and recommended in the Leicester & Leicestershire HMA Employment Land Study (2008). The 'Call for Sites' part of the process was combined with, and

¹ Includes development within the B Use Classes (Town & Country Planning (Uses Classes) Order 1987 as amended 6/4/06.

² Includes main town centre uses as stated in National Planning Policy Framework Annex 2: Glossary (i.e. Retail, Leisure, Entertainment facilities and more intensive sport & recreation uses, Offices and Arts/Culture & Tourism development).

³ (Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth, ODPM Employment Land Review – Guidance Note)

undertaken at the same time as, the Council's 2011 SHLAA Update in May 2011.

1.3.2 The 'Call for Sites' on which the ELAA is based covered the whole of the district. However, for employment uses the focus was on encouraging submissions for sites within current centres set out for employment growth within the Harborough Core Strategy (adopted Nov 2011) namely; Market Harborough, and the key centres of Lutterworth and Broughton Astley and the Rural Centres of; Kibworth, Fleckney, Great Glen, Billesdon, Ullesthorpe and Husbands Bosworth.

1.3.3 In a similar manner to the SHLAA the ELAA:

- Has defined of a series of criterion to test a site's potential level of suitability, availability and achievability for employment development
- Has assessed the level of development progress being made on sites already within the planning system

1.3.4 The Council's approach to ELAA has been formulated and implemented locally and independently. The draft methodology, classifications and criterion were subject to refinement following consideration by a SHLAA / ERTCAA Developer Panel in May 2011.

1.3.5 It is anticipated that the information gathered through the 2011 ELAA will be used to inform specific policy decisions taken as part of the Local Plan Allocations process. The scope of the assessment, and the methodology used, will be reviewed before any subsequent updates are undertaken to ensure that it remains as robust as possible.

1.4 How to use this report

1.4.1 The findings of this assessment will form an important evidence source to inform future plan making. However, this document does not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for employment development. The ELAA does not confirm sites to be retained or released or take decisions on additional sites - all evidence gathered will only inform the preparation of the Allocations DPD via which such decisions will be taken. All sites listed within the assessment will be subject to the standard Development Control process. **The purpose of this study is to assess employment potential only.** Any mention or reference to the potential for other uses (e.g. housing, retail & other town centre uses) is subject to separate assessment for that use via the SHLAA or the Retail & Town Centre Uses element of the ERTCAA.

1.4.2 A separate Companion Guide has been published to accompany this Report containing Appendices A, B, C, and D. The document provides maps for each site included in ELAA. Accompanying each map is a summary of the assessment evidence used to inform the development potential (i.e. suitability, availability, achievability) of each site. The full document is available on the Council's website at: www.harborough.gov.uk/planning.

2 Methodology for the Assessment

2.1 Employment Land Review Stages

2.1.1 Figure 1 below outlines the three main stages of an Employment Land Review, and the component parts of each stage. The flow chart is taken from ODPM's Employment Land Review Guidance (2004).

Figure 2.2: The Steps Involved in the Three Stages of Employment Land Reviews	
Stage 1: Taking stock of the existing situation	Step 1: Devise brief for Stage 1 Step 2: Collate data on land stock and revealed demand Step 3: Devise and apply site appraisal criteria Step 4: Undertake preliminary site appraisal Step 5: Confirming the brief for Stages 2 and 3
Stage 2: Creating a picture of future requirements	Step 6: Understand market areas and segments Step 7: Select and apply suitable forecast model/demand analysis Step 8: Quantify employment land supply Step 9: Translate employment forecasts to land requirements Step 10: Scenario testing
Stage 3: Identifying a 'New' Portfolio of Sites	Step 11: Devise qualitative site appraisal criteria Step 12: Confirm existing sites to be retained or released and define gaps in portfolio Step 13: Identify additional sites to be brought forward Step 14: Complete and present the employment land review

Figure 1: Steps Involved in Employment Land Reviews

2.1.2 Steps 1-13 of the process have previously been addressed by the Harborough Employment Land Study (2006) and steps 6-12 were addressed again by the Leicester & Leicestershire HMA Employment Land Study (2008). Steps 3-4 are being supplemented by an Existing Employment Area Review (for publication 2012). This report which identifies and assesses the employment potential of previously allocated land and prospective additional sites will update and add to this collective body of evidence, particularly with respect to steps 11-13 as detailed in Figure 1 above.

2.1.3 The next section of this report explains the process & methodology of the ELAA.

2.2 Planning the ERTCAA (ELAA - Employment only)

2.2.1 As this is the first ELAA there is no established methodology. The draft methodology has been developed using; best practice guidance, guidance provided in the HELS and L&L HMA ELS, and experience from the SHLAA.

2.2.3 In light of the above, to ensure that the methodology is appropriate and robust, a Developer Panel was formed. A letter of invitation was sent to all parties who were consulted during past employment studies and to agents / developers covering Harborough District. The panel, the same as that used for the SHLAA, was made up of representatives from the following organisations:

- Mather Jamie (Land Agent)
- William Davis Ltd (Developer)
- Peveril Homes (Developer)
- Sworders
- Marrons (Agent)

- Andrew Granger & Co (Land Agents)
- Barratt Homes (Developer)
- SRR Planning
- Landmark Planning
- Strutt & Parker (Surveyor / Commercial Agent)
- CJC Development
- Sugar Hill Homes

Members of Harborough District Council's Planning Policy Team were also in attendance.

2.2.4 The panel discussed the draft methodology. Key to the discussions was consideration of assessment criterion, particularly market attractiveness aspects, and the proposed classifications used to assess the degree of a site's suitability, availability and achievability. Panel members were given the opportunity to raise their own concerns and to put forward any further recommendations or suggestions. Minutes of the Developer Panel meeting are available in Appendix 1.

2.2.5 Finally, all aspects of the ELAA were carried out 'in-house' by the Planning Policy Team. The only exception was the input of Leicestershire County Council Highways Team regarding site access on selected individual sites.

2.3 Determining which sources of sites will be included in the ELAA

2.3.1 The ELAA has assessed sites from the following sources:

- remaining Local Plan employment land allocations;
- new site suggestions submitted via the 'Call for Sites' issued 8 April 2011

2.3.2 Sites already within the planning system (i.e. undeveloped allocations / sites with planning permission) have been assessed using the same criteria as newly submitted sites. For sites with current planning permission for employment uses it has been concluded that issues, such as access, have been assessed and adequately evidenced through the Development Management process.

2.3.3 The inclusion of sites with planning permission within the ELAA aims to test whether a site is still suitable, available and achievable for development. Such evidence is important for considering the inclusion of sites within the Local Plan Allocations DPD to ensure it is as robust and deliverable as possible.

2.4 Desktop review of existing information

2.4.1 The 'Call for Sites' undertaken in April 2011 (through the local press and on the Council's website) resulted in 26 sites being submitted for potential employment use. These sites, plus 6 remaining allocations, were subject to a desk top review to establish planning history and identify planning constraints.

2.4.2 Information from the desktop review stage has contributed to the creation of a comprehensive database for continuing use, to aid future monitoring and to enable any subsequent update of the ELAA.

2.5 Determining which sites and areas will be surveyed

2.5.1 To determine the comprehensiveness (in terms of geographic coverage) and intensiveness (in terms of the minimum size of site to be surveyed) of the ELAA, the following factors were taken into account:

- the nature of the economic challenge;
- the nature of the area;
- the nature of the land supply; and
- the resources available.

2.6 The Nature of the Harborough's Economic Challenge

2.6.1 The adopted Harborough Core Strategy supports employment development which strengthens Market Harborough's role as the principal town and reinforces the strategy for settlements in policy CS1 (e.g. Lutterworth, Broughton Astley and the Rural Centres). Policy CS7 focuses on; reviewing supply to inform retaining or releasing sites, identifying & protecting existing Key Employment Areas (as recommended in Existing Employment Areas Review, HDC 2012) and establishing a portfolio of sustainable sites of the right quality and at the right time to meet any identified shortfalls in future need.

2.6.2 **The nature of the area:** Harborough District is predominately rural and has a large number of smaller settlements. The vast majority of these, below Rural Centre level, and areas of countryside within the District (with the exception of conversions) are considered unsuitable for future employment development in sustainability terms. However, to ensure that all possible alternatives have been considered this first ELAA has assessed sites;

- in Market Harborough / Lutterworth / Broughton Astley within settlements limits⁴
- in Market Harborough / Lutterworth / Broughton Astley adjacent⁵ to settlement limits
- in Rural Centres within or adjacent to settlement limits
- situated elsewhere within the district

Sites within the latter category are generally excluded early, but where progressed assessment outcomes deal accordingly.

2.6.3 **The nature of land supply:** Site visits were undertaken on sites of 0.5ha or sites capable of delivering a minimum of 400m² of employment floor-space. Desk based research is relied upon for sites below the stated size thresholds.

2.6.4 **The resources available:** In accordance with best practice guidance all sites which passed the Initial Assessment stage were visited during this first ELAA.

2.7 Carrying out the Survey

2.7.1 The site visits carried out for the ELAA used a Site Assessment Pro-Forma to record general information such as:

- site size;

⁴ Limits to development as set out in saved Local Plan policy HS/8

⁵ In certain circumstances sites that are not directly adjacent to the settlement boundary, but still well related to the built up area, are included where they have the potential to deliver significant sustainability or community benefits.

- current land use(s);
- environmental constraints to development;

The surveys were used to check desk based information and to undertake an assessment of each site using criterion developed by HDC for the ELAA (see section 2.8 below)

2.7.2 Photographs were taken during site visits, and if relevant, the level of development progress was recorded.

2.8 Assessing Whether, When and If Sites are Likely to be Developed

- 2.8.1 This part of the ELAA process comprises the detailed assessment of a proposed sites potential for employment development. In order to test potential the sites; suitability, availability and achievability is considered.
- 2.8.2 Each site has been assessed against a set of factors (or criterion) grouped into 4 general categories; constraint factors, market attractiveness factors, sustainability factors and strategic planning factors. These groupings and the criterion within them are based largely on the recommendations of the L&L HMA ELS (2008). A copy of the assessment criteria is provided in Appendix 2.
- 2.8.3 Each criterion is assigned a sliding scale representing the circumstances in terms of a site being brought forward for employment development and that development contributing to sustainability and local / strategic policy objectives, as set out in the Core Strategy. The assessment is split into 2 stages an 'Initial' and 'Second' assessment. The initial assessment focuses on key environmental constraints. All sites that passed the 'Initial' assessment stage were progressed to the 'Second' assessment stage.
- 2.8.4 The outcome of the assessments along with information from the desktop review and information from the 'Call for Sites' submission forms has been taken into consideration to inform a judgement, in the plan making context, about the degree to which an individual site may be suitable, available and achievable for employment development. This outcome is presented in the form of a summary classification for each site of its; **suitability, availability and achievability**. The approach to testing the degree of suitability, availability and achievability of sites for ELAA is similar to that used in the SHLAA.
- 2.8.6 The remainder of this part of the report outlines the summary classifications in more detail which were initially discussed with the Developer Panel and refined.

2.9 Assessing Suitability for Employment Uses

2.9.1 Each site was assessed against the criteria set out in Appendix 2. In addition, as with the Council's SHLAA methodology, the following factors have been considered;

2.9.2 *Policy restrictions* (Harborough District Local Plan, 2001): All sites have been tested for their suitability against the following 'saved' policies:

- EV/2 Green Wedges;

- EV/3 Separation of Settlements;
- HS/8 Limits to development; and
- HS/9 Important Open Land.

2.9.3 Sites that are outside of the current limits to development (HS/8) were tested against the adopted Core Strategy. Hence any sites that adjoin the limits to development for Market Harborough, Broughton Astley and Lutterworth and Rural Centres; are deemed to be 'potentially suitable' in the future. Sites within locations identified as Areas of Separation (EV/2, EV/3) were also tested against the Areas of Separation Review (2011) and the Green Wedge Review (2011).

2.9.4 *Physical problems or limitations:* The Harborough District Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (April 2009) was used to identify areas of land which are located within particular flood zones. For the purposes of ELAA, sites containing any areas of flood zone 2 (Medium Probability) or 3a/b (High Probability / Functional Floodplain) are deemed to fail the 'Initial' assessment stage, as supported by the Core Strategy policy CS10a).

2.9.5 Analysis of site access and highways issues on selected individual sites has been obtained from Leicestershire County Council. Where the County identified access and / or highways issues without a possible means of mitigation, the site in question is deemed to be 'not suitable'.

2.9.6 *Potential impacts:* To assess the effect of potential sites upon landscape features, the findings of the following evidence documents were used:

- Lutterworth and Broughton Astley Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study (Nov 2011);
- Market Harborough Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study (April 2009);
- Leicester Principal Urban Area Character Assessment and Landscape Capacity Study (Sept 2009)

2.9.7 For consistency with the SHLAA, sites which were found to have 'low' or 'medium low' landscape capacity for development within the above studies were recorded as 'not suitable' within the ELAA.

2.9.8 Where sites are located in a Conservation Area, the appropriateness of the scale and impact was assessed, if considered inappropriate the site failed the initial assessment.

2.10 Degrees of Suitability for Employment Uses

2.10.1 A combination of selected assessment criteria and the factors detailed within section 2.9 above have been incorporated into the following categories or classifications of 'suitability'. (All sites with an existing / current planning permission for employment uses are deemed to be suitable, as they have been assessed through the Development Control process).

Is the Site Suitable?	A site is suitable if it offers a suitable location for employment development and would contribute to sustainable economic growth
Suitable	The site is located within an area which is consistent with adopted Core Strategy / retained Local Plan policies as a sustainable location for development: has no physical or environmental constraints that would prevent employment development being provided early in the plan period, will contribute to sustainable economic growth and is able to respond to market needs and would not have a significant negative impact on existing landscape or conservation features.
Potentially Suitable	The site meets the 'suitable criteria' but conflicts with another adopted Core Strategy / retained Local Plan policy which could prevent employment development within the next 5 yrs. Or the site has an environmental or physical constraint which has a reasonable prospect of being mitigated to allow employment development at some point during the next 5-10yrs (early part of the plan period?) or would be in accordance with emerging local land use policy that has not yet been adopted.
Not Currently Suitable	The site meets the 'suitable criteria' but has a physical constraint which could be overcome to allow employment development at some point during the plan period.
Not Suitable	The site does not conform with adopted or emerging local policy on sustainable locations for development; has physical constraints which would prevent employment development now or in the future, or would have a significant negative impact on existing landscape.
<p>Site suitability will be assessed against a list of criteria reflecting guidance and local circumstances covering;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site characteristics • Environmental Constraints • Location / Sustainability Development factors • Sustainable Economic Development factors • Strategic Planning factors 	

Figure 2: Categories of Suitability

2.10.2 This approach has been taken to provide a more accurate picture of a site's current and future potential suitability for employment development. The definitions for each classification were discussed at the May 2011 Developer Panel. The separation of sites into degrees of suitability enables a picture of capacity to be drawn to inform the potential phasing of delivery via the Allocation DPD.

2.11 Assessing Availability & Degrees of Availability for Employment Uses

2.11.1 A combination of selected assessment criteria and 'best information available' from the site submission pro-forma used for the SHLAA / ERTCAA Call for Sites provides clarity as to whether a site is available for employment use. These factors have been incorporated within the following set of classifications of availability:

Is the Site Available?	A site is considered available for development when, on best available information, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems.
Available	The site is controlled / owned by a developer who has expressed an intention to develop or a land owner(s) has expressed an intention to sell for employment uses and there are no legal or ownership issues which could prevent employment development being delivered early in the plan period.
Potentially Available	The site could become 'available' in the next 5yrs; and has no ownership or legal issues which could prevent employment development being delivered during the in the next 10yrs.
Not Currently Available	The site has legal / ownership issues which would prevent employment development being delivered at some point in the plan period.
Not Available	There is no evidence to suggest that a landowner / developer has expressed an intention to develop / sell the site for employment development
<p>Site availability will be assessed against a list of criteria reflecting guidance and local circumstances covering;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ownership factors • Current Use / Planning History 	

Figure 3: Categories of Availability

- 2.11.2 As planning applications can be made by persons who do not need to have an interest in the land, sites with planning permission have to supply adequate evidence to meet the 'available' criteria defined above.
- 2.11.3 The separation of sites into degrees of availability enables a picture of capacity to be drawn to inform the potential phasing of delivery via the Allocation DPD. Where insufficient information is available, sites have been classified as 'not available' until more certainty on availability is ascertained. Where potentially conflicting information is available (e.g. evidence of non delivery for employment uses, or evidence of owner intent to develop for alternative / mixed uses not including employment uses) this may result in the site being classified, as a minimum, as not currently available.
- 2.12 Assessing Achievability for Employment Uses**
- 2.12.1 In common with the SHLAA; a site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that employment uses will be developed on the site at a particular point in time.
- 2.12.2 The pro-forma used for the SHLAA / ERTCAA Call for Sites 2011 required an estimate of the commercial floor-space to be built on site per annum. This was asked on all sites and not just those with planning permission. Respondents were also asked whether there were any accessibility, market and/or cost factors, which may constrain development.
- 2.12.3 Recorded information on sites with specific contamination and sites with the potential to be affected by contamination, due to past or current use, has also been checked. Where contamination issues are identified, without possible

mitigation or where mitigation is likely to affect viability, the site in question is deemed not achievable.

2.13. Degrees of Achievability for Employment Uses

2.13.1 The information received from the site pro forma's, together with selected assessment criteria, was used to classify the sites into the following categories:

Is the Site Achievable?	A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that employment will be developed on the site at a particular time.
Achievable	There are no market, cost or delivery factors that would make employment development economically unviable and there is a reasonable prospect that employment will be developed on site early within the plan period.
Potentially Achievable	There are no market, cost or delivery factors that would make employment development economically unviable within the next 5-10 yrs and there is a reasonable prospect that employment uses will be developed at some stage during the plan period.
Not Currently Achievable	Market, cost & / or delivery factors indicate that employment development is unlikely to be delivered on site within the plan period
Not Achievable	Market, cost or delivery factors indicate that no employment development is economically viable on site either now or in the future.
<p>Site achievability will be assessed against a list of criteria reflecting guidance and local circumstances covering;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure constraints (on & off site) • Market attractiveness (current / potential) • Gap funding potential 	

Figure 4: Categories of Achievability

2.13.2 Where site pro-forma's were not submitted for allocated sites information from the HELS and L&L HMA ELS studies has been used to help classify sites.

2.13.3 For sites without planning permission the timeframe for delivery is estimated taking into consideration the site's; likely use, market attractiveness, size and potential employment capacity and the timeframe suggested by the owner / developer.

2.14 Estimating the Employment Potential of Each Site

2.14.1 The potential of each site, in terms of the use class of employment development and the capacity for floor-space, is a factor in determining a site's 'fitness for purpose' for inclusion in any portfolio of future employment sites. Each site is assessed in the context of its likely function⁶ and likely use class (B1/B2/B8 or open B use). In the interests of consistency and comparability – likely use is that considered most likely by the assessing

⁶ Function – as per ODPM segments (e.g. as a Warehouse / Distribution Centre, High Quality Business Park, General Industrial Area etc.)

officer, having regard to the submitting parties proposed use, site constraints and market factors.

2.14.2 The potential amount of development a site can deliver is dependent on the likely density of development. Calculations of employment potential are based upon average densities and plot ratio's for different classes of employment use as outlined in the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area Employment Land Review (March 2008) as follows:

Warehousing - 5,000m² per ha (gross external floorspace)
 Industrial - 4,200m² per ha (gross external floorspace)
 Office - 3,000m² per ha (gross external floorspace)

2.14.3 The density of office development can vary significantly between rural, town centre and out of town locations or in mixed use schemes, 3,000m² per hectare is used as a minimum to reflect the rural nature of the area and land supply in the district.

2.14.4 An estimate of employment potential was calculated for each site using the following formula:

Site area x density (for likely use class) = employment potential (m²)

In cases where a mix of B uses are assessed as potentially appropriate on a single site an average of the densities for the appropriate uses is taken and multiplied by the site area.

3.0 Outcomes of the Employment Land Availability Assessment (ERTCAA – Employment only)

3.1 Assessment Outcomes

3.1.1 The following section outlines the outcomes of the assessment process. Table 1 below provides a summary of the Initial assessment stage.

Table 1:

ELAA Initial Assessment Outcome Summary

ERTCAA Ref	Site Address	Initial Assessment	Initial Assessment Overall Score (max. 35)
Market			
Harborough			
E/001M/11	Land adjacent to Bowden Business Village	Pass	20
E/002M/11	Airfield Farm	Pass	30
E/003M/11	Land off Dingley Road, Great Bowden, LE16 7ET	Fail	23
E/004M/11	Land at Knights End Rd, Great Bowden	Fail	23
E/005M/11	West of Northampton Road (MH/4)	Pass	28
E/007M/11	East of Rockingham Road (Peaker Park) (MH/6)	Pass	29
E/008M/11	Railway Goods Yard (MH/7)	Pass	25
E/010M/11	Land West of Rockingham Rd	Fail	29

Key Centres			
E/001LT/11	Land south of Lutterworth Rd / Coventry Rd	Fail	19
E/002LT/11	Vedonis Works, Leicester Road	Pass	23
E/003LT/11	South of Coventry Road (Leaders Farm) (LW/5)	Pass	25
E/004LT/11	Land north of Lutterworth Road	Fail	24
E/005LT/11	Land South of Lutterworth Road	Pass	23
E/001B/11	Land at Coventry Road	Pass	23
Rural Centres			
E/001RC/11	Land off Malborough Way	Pass	20
E/002RC/11	Kilby Road, Fleckney	Pass	20
E/003RC/11	Land south of Priory Business Park, Wistow	Pass	19
	Road		
E/004RC/11	Land south & west of Priory Business Park, Wistow Rd	Pass	19
E/005RC/11	Land adjoining the A6 & North of Wistow Rd	Pass	20
E/006RC/11	Land to east of Harborough Road, Kibworth	Pass	19
E/007RC/11	Land to southern fringe of Great Glen	Fail	17
E/008RC/11	Land off Rolleston Road, Billesdon	Pass	15
Other Locations			
E/001OC/11	Treetops, Bruntingthorpe Airfield	Pass	11
E/002OC/11	Land south of Bruntingthorpe Industrial Estate, Bruntingthorpe	Pass	12
E/003OC/11	Land west of Bruntingthorpe Industrial Estate, Bruntingthorpe	Pass	12
E/005OC/11	Land south of A4303, Magna Park	Pass	15
E/006OC/11	The Paddock, off Lutterworth Road, Arnesby	Fail	15
E/007OC/11	Land north of Frolesworth Rd, Leire	Pass	8
E/008OC/11	Arkwright Hill Farm Industrial Est, Lutterworth Rd, Cosby	Pass	13

3.1.2 Table 2 provides a summary of the Second assessment stage for sites assessed as having (to varying degrees) some potential for employment development.

Table 2:

ELAA Second Assessment Outcome (Sites with Potential for Employment Development)

ERTCAA Ref	Site Address	Summary Classification			Area (Ha)	Estimated Floor-space (m2)
		Suitable	Available	Achievable		
E/001M/11	Land adjacent to Bowden Business Village, Market Harborough	Potentially Suitable	Available	Achievable	1	3,000

E/002M/11	Airfield Farm, Market Harborough	Potentially Suitable	Potentially Available	Potentially Achievable	10	40,666
E/007M/11	East of Rockingham Road (Peaker Park), Market Harborough	Suitable	Available	Achievable	2.2	6,600
E/002LT/11	Vedonis Works, Leicester Road, Lutterworth	Suitable	Potentially Available	Achievable	2	7,960
E/005LT/11	Land South of Lutterworth Road, Lutterworth	Potentially Suitable	Available	Achievable	4.1	16,670
E/001B/11	Land at Coventry Road, Broughton Astley	Potentially Suitable	Available	Potentially Achievable	7	28,462
E/001RC/11	Land off Malborough Way, Fleckney	Suitable	Available	Achievable	2.9	11,791
E/003RC/11	Land south of Priory Business Park, Wistow Road, Kibworth	Potentially Suitable	Available	Achievable	2.5	10,165
E/004RC/11	Land south & west of Priory Business Park, Wistow Rd, Kibworth	Potentially Suitable	Available	Achievable	9.1	37,122
E/005RC/11	Land adjoining the A6 & North of Wistow Rd, Kibworth	Suitable	Available	Achievable	2.9	11,558
Total					43.7	173,994

3.1.3 Table 3 provides a summary of the Second assessment stage for sites assessed as not having the potential for employment development, on one or more grounds (i.e. suitability, availability, or achievability).

Table 3:

ELAA Second Assessment Outcome (Sites without Potential for Employment Development)

ERTCAA Ref	Site Address	Summary Classification			Area (Ha)	Estimated Floor-space
		Suitable	Available	Achievable		
E/005M/11	West of Northampton Road, Market Harborough	Suitable	Not Available	Potentially Achievable	1.8	6,480
E/008M/11	Railway Goods Yard, Market Harborough	Not Currently Suitable	Not Available	Not Currently Achievable	1.8	7,560
E/003LT/11	South of Coventry Road (Leaders Farm), Lutterworth	Suitable	Not Available	Potentially Achievable	4.4	15,840
E/002RC/11	Kilby Road, Fleckney	Potentially Suitable	Potentially Available	Not Currently Achievable	14.2	57,574
E/006RC/11	Land to east of Harborough Road, Kibworth	Not suitable	Potentially Available	Not Achievable	7	28,462

E/008RC/11	Land off Rolleston Road, Billesdon	Not suitable	Potentially Available	Potentially Achievable	6.6	26,672
E/005OC/11	Land south of A4303, Magna Park, nr Lutterworth	Not Suitable	Available	Potentially Achievable	40	200,000
E/007OC/11	Land north of Frolesworth Rd, Leire	Not Suitable	Potentially Available	Not Currently Achievable	1	4,200
E/008OC/11	Arkwright Hill Farm Industrial Est, Lutterworth Rd, Cosby	Not Suitable	Potentially Available	Achievable	7.7	31,552
E/001OC/11	Treetops, Bruntingthorpe Airfield, Bruntingthorpe	Not Suitable	Available	Potentially Achievable	1	5,000
E/002OC/11	Land-south of Bruntingthorpe Industrial Estate, Bruntingthorpe	Not Suitable	Available	Potentially Achievable	3.5	12,600
E/003OC/11	Land west of Bruntingthorpe Industrial Estate, Bruntingthorpe	Not Suitable	Available	Potentially Achievable	1.7	5,940
Total					90.7	401,880

3.1.4 Table 4 below gives an overview of the 29 sites assessed by the ELAA on a settlement by settlement basis.

Table 4: Overview of ELAA Sites by Settlement

Settlement	No. sites at Initial Assessment Stage	No. sites at Second Assessment Stage	No. sites assessed to have some employment potential
Market Harborough	8	5	3
Lutterworth	5	3	2
Broughton Astley	1	1	1
Leicester PUA	0	0	0
Rural Centres	8	7	4
Other	7	6	0
Total	29	22	10

3.1.3 Appendix A provides a summary of those sites deemed to be ineligible for or which were excluded from the ELAA, with reasons for their omission.

3.1.4 Appendix B provides maps and summary information on a site by site basis for all sites listed in Tables 2 and 3 above.

3.1.5 Appendix C provides maps and summary information on a site by site basis for sites listed in Table 1 that were assessed as failing the initial assessment and did not progress to the second assessment stage.

3.1.6 Appendix D provides composite maps for the larger settlements of; Market Harborough, Lutterworth, Broughton Astley, the rural centres of Kibworth and Fleckney, and Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground where multiple sites have been assessed.

3.1.7 The identified constraints on individual sites would need to be overcome for the site in question to be included within any future assessment. Emphasis is

placed on the promoter of the site to provide the evidence needed to show that any constraints could be overcome in the future.

3.2 Summary of Initial Assessment

- 3.2.1 In total 35 sites, either existing allocation sites or those submitted through the call for sites process, have been assessed as part of the ELAA. Of these 29 were subject to the initial assessment stage, the remaining 6 sites were omitted and are listed in Appendix A.
- 3.2.2 Of the 29 sites that were subject to the initial assessment stage (see Table 1), 22 were assessed to pass and were progressed to the second assessment stage. The overall scores for individual sites that passed the initial assessment ranged from 30 (highest) to 8 (lowest) from a possible maximum score of 35, illustrating the extent of variation in the potential of the sites for employment development.
- 3.2.3 Appendix C provides summary information for the 7 sites that didn't progress to the second assessment stage due to key environmental constraints. If evidence is provided or site boundaries are amended to overcome such constraint/s, this will be taken into account when the ELAA is updated.

3.3 Summary of Second Assessment

- 3.3.1 A total of 22 sites were assessed at the second assessment stage, with 10 assessed as having (to varying degrees) some potential for development for employment (see Table 2).
- 3.2.1 Collectively these 10 sites, assessed as having some potential for employment development, could potentially provide a total of 43.7ha of employment development estimated to deliver some 174,000m² of floor-space for B class employment uses. Table 5 below provides a breakdown by settlement of the sites assessed as having some potential for employment development.

Table 5: Sites with Potential for Employment – capacity by Settlement

Settlement	No. of Sites	Total Area (ha)	Estimated Total Floorspace (m ²)
Market Harborough	3	13.2	50,266
Lutterworth	2	6.1	24,630
Broughton Astley	1	7	28,462
Rural Centres	4	17.4	70,636
Other	0	0.0	0
Total	10	43.7	173,994

- 3.2.2 It indicates that the greatest potential for employment provision in both total area & total floor-space exists in the rural centres, mainly Kibworth.
- 3.2.3 Of the 10 sites assessed as having some potential for employment development 1 site is on Previously Developed Land. The remaining 9 are greenfield sites indicating that potential provision is heavily focussed on greenfield sites.

3.2.4 In terms of likely types of B class employment use – of the 10 sites assessed as having some potential at the second assessment stage the majority are considered to have the potential for all / any B class use (i.e. B1/B2/B8), see Table 6 below;

Table 6: Sites with Potential for Employment – Use Breakdown by Settlement

	Restricted B class use suitability	Single or limited range of B class uses	General B1/B2 Uses only	All / any B class uses (Open)	Premium B class uses (B1a/b)
Market Harborough	0	1	0	1	1
Lutterworth	0	1	0	1	0
Broughton Astley	0	0	0	1	0
Rural Centres	0	0	0	4	0
Total	0	2	0	7	1

Appendix 1



**SHLAA Update & ERTCAA Call for Sites Developer Panel,
24 May 2011**

Minutes

Attendees:

**Andrew Bamber - Mather Jamie
Anabel Rooksby - Peveril Homes
Angus Hudson - Sworders
Brian Mullin - Marrons (accompanied by David Walton)
Christopher Chastney - CJC Developments
Joe Welch - Andrew Granger & Co
John Deakin - Barratt Homes
Laura Tilston - SSR Planning
Lance Wiggins - Landmark Planning
Miles Collison - Strutt & Parker
Nelson Renner - Sugar Hill Homes (accompanied by Will Renner)
Peter Wilkinson - Landmark Planning
Richard Foxon - Strutt & Parker
Robert Jays - William Davis**

**Steve Pointer - Harborough District Council (HDC)
Julie Tanner - HDC
Joe Qureshi - HDC**

Update on Harborough Core Strategy Submission draft 2011

A brief introduction and progress update was provided on the Core Strategy and upcoming Examination In Public.

SHLAA Update outline of changes to methodology for use in establishing a 5 year supply

The opening up of SHLAA to cover additional settlements beyond Market Harborough, Broughton Astley, Lutterworth, and the Leicester Urban Fringe was welcomed. However, issues were raised that the SHLAA still doesn't everywhere in relation to Policy 17 of the Core Strategy. An example was used of another Local Authority's Examination where the Inspector was keen that all the evidence should fully back up the Core Strategy.

ERTCAA Call for Sites overview and discussion on proposed methodology template

It was stated the rural locations in Development Control terms are widely termed as not sustainable. This was applied to Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground where there is a strong level of demand from specialist markets such as the auto-motive industry, research and development, and universities. The ground was also described as operating at full capacity. Again issues were raised with Policy 17 of the Core Strategy, as it does not make any reference to the site.

It was acknowledged that if there are divergences then HDC need to look at ways to overcome this. SP stated that the evidence illustrating the level of demand for employment in rural areas was crucial.

Further issues were briefly discussed regarding opportunities for greater policy guidance and control regarding Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground. It was agreed that such discussions were more relevant for the Core Strategy Examination.

On a widely level it was generally acknowledged that Harborough has huge opportunities for to gain a large amount of employment land. However, a number of concerns were raised over the currently lack land available given the level of demand.

Conversely HDC stated that a number of outstanding Local Plan Employment Allocations were yet to be fully built out. A number of issues were raised as to why the above allocations have yet to be fully developed these included; cheaper rents in neighbouring areas such as Corby, and that sites nearer to motorways provided more suitable locations. It was also stated that there is evidence that owners are holding back employment sites due to the low margin levels created by the current economic downturn.

The wider issue of recession was agreed as a key stumbling block for new development, as people have paid higher prices for land compared to there current market values. In addition, the issues of banks not lending for commercial developments was also stated.

HDC commented that its evidence studies have illustrated that there is a low strategic demand for additional employment sites. It was argued that this evidence was based on suspect assumptions made within the East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy.

When the Panel was asked about the general level of demand for employment a number comments were raised regarding smaller commercial space within the rural areas. It was widely acknowledged that smaller scale rural employment sites where in high demand across the District; and that such sites could create opportunities for new business start ups.

Regarding new employment sites versus conversion of existing buildings; the Panel commented that due to vacancy rates and problems surrounding borrowing people who have existing buildings in good areas hold an advantage over developers of new sites. It was also generally accepted that new developments require higher rents to cover the higher borrowing costs needed.

The lack of available free hold sites in Harborough was also raised as an issue.

HDC commented that recent Planning Appeals have backed up the notion of focusing development in rural areas which already have supporting services/facilities in place. Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council was highlighted as having an interesting approach towards development in areas. In addition Leicestershire County Council's forthcoming intention to take a strict stance on development in unsustainable locations was also pointed out.

Finally HDC asked for any detailed comments on the initial ERTCAA methodology. Concerns were raised over the suitability aspects of the assessment, as it was not deemed to be policy neutral. Using landscape character and conservation constraints to rule out potential sites for development was also viewed as highly subjective.

General discussion on the perceived level of market demand in the District

A high level of demand was stated for the Farndon Road site. However it is also commented that Council were asking a lot for social housing and Section 106 agreements (especially in the current climate).

HDC commented that a move towards to the Community Infrastructure Levy would provide a fairer system in the future, and that it could be incorporated within the development costs rather than be negotiated away.

Issues regarding current viability levels were also raised, and it was stated that the Council needs think about if they want more social housing, or continue to pay the current rates to Leicester County Council for there additional service provisions. (It was commented that the County are still demanding payments which are being taken away from affordable housing provision. The same comment was also applied to the Police).

The Council's latest 5 Year Housing Land Supply Position was briefly discussed, along with the Localism Bill. It was acknowledged that the potential impact of the Bill is still subject to a large amount of uncertainty. However it was stated the Bill would not impact on the SHLAA methodology.

Finally regarding the SHLAA methodology it was stated that the assessment should use the develop projections given on each site (as part of the call for sites process).

Sites Proposed for Employment Development Assessment Criteria

Each site will be assessed in the context of its proposed / likely function as identified the in L&L HMA ELS (2008)⁷. Each criterion is assessed using a sliding scale of 1-5 with 5 representing the best circumstances in relation to the site being identified for employment uses.

Initial Assessment		
Environmental Constraints		Pass / Fail
1a	Flood Risk (site located outside flood zone 2 & 3)	
1b	Protected designation (site located outside Green Wedge / Separation Area)	
1c	Conservation area (proposal of appropriate scale / design for CA)	
1d	Proximity to listed building / Scheduled Ancient Monument (as above)	
1e	SSI or other sensitive nature conservation sites (site outside / not in close proximity to)	
1f	Other constraints	
Outcome (continue to assess sites that 'Pass')		

⁷ Leicester & Leicestershire HMA Employment Land Study (PACEC 2008) – Appendix K i.e:
Strategic Freight & Distribution Centre
Science Park
Office
Open Uses (Light & General Industry & Small Scale Warehousing)

Initial Assessment		Category	Scale				
Other Factors			1	2	3	4	5
1	Sequential Test : Rest of Leics	Suitability	In countryside (beyond towns/villages) or PUA		Within /adjacent to a Rural Centre	Adjacent to Market Harborough or a Key Centre Astley)	Within Market Harborough or a Key Centre
2	Accessibility by workforce	Suitability	Population of less than 5,000 within 5 km radius of the site	Population of between 5-10,000 within 5 km radius of the site	Population of between 10,000 and 15,000 within 5 km radius of the site	Population of between 15,000 and 20,000 within 5 km radius of the site	Population of 20,000 or more within 5 km radius of the site
3	Accessibility by sustainable modes	Suitability	Isolated - No existing access to site or settlement by foot, cycle, bus and/or train services	Relatively isolated - No existing access to nearest settlement by foot / cycle or bus	Existing footways, on-road cycle access. Bus and /or train services via nearest settlement (less than 3 times per hour)	Existing footways, on road cycle. Bus and /or train services in close proximity (less than 3 times per hour)	Existing high quality access by foot, cycle path, bus and/or train services 4 or more times per hour)
4	Sustainable Buildings	Achievability	Low potential to design for passive heating and cooling, and on-site renewable energy generation		Average potential to design for passive heating and cooling, and on-site renewable energy generation		High potential to design for passive heating and cooling, and on-site renewable energy generation
5	Sustainable Travel patterns	Suitability	Low potential to reduce the need to travel and improve access by foot, bicycle and public transport		Average potential to reduce the need to travel and improve access by foot, cycle and public transport.		High potential to maximise opportunities to reduce the need to travel and improve access by foot, bicycle and public transport
6	Sustainable Economic Development(score a) and then either b), c) or d) – Max score 10	Suitability					
	a) Responsive to market needs		Least attractive to investor, priority sector and small business needs		Quite attractive to investor, priority sector and small business needs		Most attractive to investor, priority sector and small business needs
	b) Urban regeneration and		Outside built form of a Rural Centre & on	Within built form of a Rural Centre & on	Within / adjacent to built form of MH or	Within built form of MH or Key Centre &	Priority regeneration /

	planned growth		PDL	previously undeveloped land	a Key Centre & on previously undeveloped land	on PDL	growth area or Sustainable Urban Extension
	c) Rural diversification		Inappropriate scale, inconsistent with policy approach to supporting employment in the countryside	Inappropriate scale, consistent with policy approach to supporting employment in the countryside	Appropriate scale, consistent with policy approach to supporting employment in the countryside	Appropriate scale, consistent with preferred location for employment in the rural area.	Appropriate scale, consistent with spatial hierarchy policy
	d) Road-rail strategic distribution		Does not meet any RSS criteria for growth in rail-based freight		Meets the two major RSS criteria (site area and W10 or W12 rail gauge) subject to investment		Meets major and minor RSS criteria for growth in rail-based freight

Progress sites from 'Initial Assessment' that best fit identified gap (location, market segment, property type) in Harborough's provision

Second Assessment		Category	Scale				
1. Market Attractiveness Factors			1	2	3	4	5
A	Highway infrastructure constraints	Achievability	Capacity constraints on site access, subject to Transport Assessment	Substantial off site highway capacity improvements required	Some additional highway improvement works required	Usual site access and service road(s) required	Site access in place
B	Utilities Infrastructure (e.g. water, sewage, drainage, electricity, gas, broadband)	Achievability	Site subject to development embargo due to costs of increasing capacity	Substantial off and on site infrastructure improvements required	Some infrastructure improvements required	Capacity constraints defined, costed and affordable	No constraints on capacity
C	On site constraints	Achievability	Severe land contamination and or ground stability issues	Problematic land contamination and or ground stability issues	Some land remediation required	Minor land remediation required	No land remediation required
D	Ownership Issues	Availability	Site owned by landowner(s) who are unwilling to either sell /	Site subject to long term site assembly problem	Some land ownership issues but subject to negotiation by	Single owner with minor legal issues (e.g. unsigned S 106	Public or private owners with developer committed to

			develop, or site subject to ransom strips / preference for other use		willing parties	agreement)	early development
E	Potential & current market interest in the site for B1/B2/B8 uses	Achievability	Site subject of recent planning application(s)	Site subject of active marketing for employment development	Site subject of either recent funding, land sale or pre let deal	Site clearance and preparation either completed or underway	Development either recently completed or under construction on part of the site
2. Sustainable Development Factors			1	2	3	4	5
A	Flood Risk	Suitability	All site zone 3 – High probability of flooding or Functional floodplain.	Zone 2 Medium Probability of flooding.		Substantial part of site zone 1 (Low probability of flooding) - mitigation possible & viable .	All site zone 1 – Low probability of flooding
B	Accessibility by foot / cycle	Suitability	No footways or cycles paths linking substantial residential areas with the site	Uncoordinated footways and cycle paths that do not conveniently link with residential areas or may be subject of safety issues	One basic footway and cycle path between a residential area and the site	Two safe and well maintained footways and cycle paths between residential areas and the site	Three or more safe and well maintained footways and cycle paths between residential areas and the site
C	Accessibility by public transport	Suitability	No existing public transport links or opportunity	Relatively isolated from public transport links and /or very limited service. (e.g. no stops within 800m, less than hourly service 06.00 – 18.00 Mon to Sat)	Relatively close proximity to public transport links but possible limitations in frequency	Relatively close proximity (800m) to public transport links with good frequency.	Close proximity (400m) to public transport links with excellent frequency to a wide range of locations.
D	Accessibility to local facilities	Suitability	No facilities /access to local facilities nearby.	Limited facilities within 800m / nearest settlement	Rural centre within 800 metres – access to basic range of facilities	Close proximity to district / key centre & it's facilities	District or key centre within 800 metres - good access to a wide range of

E	Easy & Appropriate accessibility to highway network	Suitability	Access by HGVs subject to restrictions and need for inconvenient alternative routes	Access by cars and HGVs generates unacceptable environmental, congestion and air quality impacts	Access by cars and HGVs generates some environmental impacts on residential areas, congestion and air quality – mitigation possible	Access by cars and HGVs accommodated on appropriate A and Trunk roads	facilities Access by cars and HGVs accommodated on appropriate A and Trunk roads, close proximity to motorway network.
3. Strategic Planning Factors			1	2	3	4	5
A	Will the site contribute to sustainable economic development?	Suitability	Site / proposed use is within an area or market segment of over-supply or low market demand and conflicts with local employment / business objectives	Site may conflict with local employment / business objectives		Site / proposed use is within an area or market segment of under supply or high market demand and would significantly support local employment / business objectives	Site identified for a specific use within L & L HMA priority sector.
B	Is public funded committed / likely to overcome infrastructure constraints / on-site constraints to make development viable	Achievability	No		Funding support is being considered		Funding is committed as a strategic priority
4. Other *			1	2	3	4	5
A	Internal site environment (topography, shape, environmental features)	Suitability	Irregular/narrow shape, sloping / uneven, under 1ha, other severe environmental constraints		Adequate shape / topography, between 1-5ha. Some environmental constraints – can be accommodated / mitigated		Regular shape, level, over 5ha., no significant other environmental features / constraints
B	External environment (prominence,		Low profile site, unattractive		Medium profile site, average		Prominent site, high profile

	general attractiveness of location, adjacent land uses, visual quality & impact, broadband connectivity)	Achievability	location (remote /run-down area)incompatible adjacent land uses		location & attractiveness of area, mix of adjacent land uses which don't preclude employment use		location, quality / attractive area, compatible adjacent land uses.
C	Planning History	Availability	No past planning history for employment uses		Evidence of past pre-application interest	Past / lapsed permission for employment use	Current permission for employment uses
D	Likely use / market segment (see Footnote 1 above ¹)	Achievability	Restricted suitability - specialist / bad neighbour uses only	Suitable for single / limited range B uses (either B1/ B2/ B8)	Suitable for general B1/2 uses only	Suitable for all / any B uses or mixed use	Suitable for premium B Class uses (B1a/b)
E	Conformity with adopted planning policy (Limits to Development, Landscape Character, PDL)	Suitability	In open countryside, Greenfield site in high landscape character area	Outside Limits to development, Greenfield site, area of medium / high landscape character.	Outside Limits to development , PDL or Greenfield, in area of low landscape character	Adjacent to Limits to development / some impact on landscape character can be mitigated	Within 'Limits to Development', PDL and no negative impact on landscape character

* Additional to PACEC 2008 Appendix K

W:\pplpolicy\Planning Policy\Development Plans\Harborough LDF 2006-2016\Evidence\SHLAA & ERTCAA 2011\ERTCAA Report\Appendix 2 - Sites for Employment Development - Assessment Criteria.doc