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Appendix A  Commuting Flows

Figure A1.1  Blaby Commuter Flow

Source: Census 2001
Figure A1.2  Charnwood Commuter Flow

Total Commute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In</th>
<th>13,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41,700 commute within Charnwood

Source: Census 2001
Figure A1.3  Harborough Commuter Flow

Source: Census 2001
Figure A1.4  Hinckley and Bosworth Commuter Flow

27,400 commute within Hinckley & Bosworth

Total Commute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In</th>
<th>Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001
Figure A1.5  Leicester Commuter Flow

| Source: Census 2001 |

- **Total Commute**
  - In: 61,200
  - Out: 20,800

- **83,900 commute within the City of Leicester**
Figure A1.6  Melton Commuter Flow

| Source: Census 2001 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Commute</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>1,600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15,100 commute within Melton

Source: Census 2001
Figure A1.7  North West Leicestershire Commuter Flow

24,400 commute within NW Leicestershire
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Figure A1.8  Oadby and Wigston Commuter Flow

Source: Census 2001
Appendix B  Employment Sector Definitions

OFFICES:       SIC
● Printing & publishing       22
● Banking & finance           65
● Insurance                  66
● Broking & fund management  67.1
● Aux. Insurance & pension   67.2
● Property development & letting  70.1,2
● Real estate: fee/contact    70.3
● Computer                   72
● Research & development     73
● Legal                      74.11
● Accounting                 74.12
● Market research            74.13,14
● Holding companies          74.15
● Architecture & engineering 74.2,3
● Advertising                74.4
● Recruitment, security & business support  74.5,6,8
● Membership organisations  91

INDUSTRIAL:
● Manufacture (bar printing and publishing)  15-37 (bar 22)
● Construction                    45
● Motor vehicle repair            50.2
● Waste treatment                 90

WAREHOUSING:
● Wholesale                      51
● Warehouse & freight forward    63(bar .3)
● National post                  64.11
● Courier                        64.12
● Renting: construction equipment 71.32
● Renting: non construction eqpt 71(bar.32)
● Taxi, freight & pipeline (part) 60.2,3
### Appendix C  Floorspace Definitions

#### C1  ODPM Floorspace Definitions up to 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail premises</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Factories</th>
<th>Warehouses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG3</td>
<td>Car showroom</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CO1</td>
<td>Computer centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MH1</td>
<td>Health centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Office (local govt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>Café</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR2</td>
<td>Food court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>Betting shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>Hairdressing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4</td>
<td>Kiosk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS5</td>
<td>Laundrette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS6</td>
<td>Post office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS7</td>
<td>Showroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS8</td>
<td>Hypermarket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS9</td>
<td>Superstore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS10</td>
<td>Retail warehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT1</td>
<td>Amusement arcade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ODPM Floorspace Definition 2005 onwards

**Table A.2: Bulk and non-bulk hereditaments: England and Wales, 1st April 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bulk class</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Special category codes</th>
<th>Primary descriptions</th>
<th>Building use type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail premises</strong></td>
<td>Premises that provide 'off-street' goods and services to the public. They include supermarkets, corner shops, local post offices, restaurant, cafes, launderettes and many others. Public houses and hotels are classed as non-bulk.</td>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>Shop – standard unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>Shop – not elsewhere specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>Shop – corner shop/small units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hairdressing/Beauty Salons</td>
<td>Hairdressing Salon</td>
<td>Shop – standard unit non-retail area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Shop – standard unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offices</strong></td>
<td>These include purpose-built office buildings, offices over shops, light storage facilities and light industrial activities. Larger banks, building societies and post offices containing substantial office space may be included in this class, rather than in the retail bulk class.</td>
<td>Offices (including computer centres)</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Offices – purpose built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offices (including computer centres)</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Offices – converted from residential commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offices (including computer centres)</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Offices – converted from other commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offices (including computer centres)</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Offices – over shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offices (including computer centres)</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Offices – converted from factory/warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factories</strong></td>
<td>These range from small workshops to very large manufacturing units. Some industrial hereditaments where the rateable value is not primarily derived from floorspace (for example iron and steel plants) are classed as non-bulk.</td>
<td>Factories, workshops and warehouses (inc bakeries and dairies)</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Factory/workshop – purpose built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factories, workshops and warehouses (inc bakeries and dairies)</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Factory/workshop – converted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factories, workshops and warehouses (inc bakeries and dairies)</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Factory/workshop – purpose built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle repair workshops and garages</td>
<td>Vehicle Repair Workshop</td>
<td>Factory/workshop – purpose built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factories, workshops and warehouses (inc bakeries and dairies)</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Factory/workshop – not elsewhere specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warehouses</strong></td>
<td>These range from small storage units and depots to very large distribution warehouses. It also now includes virtually all car showrooms.</td>
<td>Factories, workshops and warehouses (inc bakeries and dairies)</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>Warehouse/store – purpose built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stores</td>
<td>Store</td>
<td>Warehouse/store – land used for storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factories, workshops and warehouses (inc bakeries and dairies)</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>Warehouse/store – converted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factories, workshops and warehouses (inc bakeries and dairies)</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>Factory/workshop – purpose built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Car showrooms</td>
<td>Car Showroom</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Floorspace Definitions

### Table A.2: Bulk and non-bulk herediments: England and Wales, 1st April 2005 (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other bulk premises</strong></td>
<td>A new classification for 2005 that includes mostly ‘community’ type establishments such as community/civic centres, village halls and social clubs. Building use types are generally not available for this bulk class.</td>
<td>Village halls, scout huts, cadet huts etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clubs and institutions</td>
<td>Clubs and institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community day centres</td>
<td>Community day centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day nurseries/play schools</td>
<td>Day nurseries/play schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clubhouses</td>
<td>Clubhouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-bulk</strong></td>
<td>The non-bulk group includes all herediments that would not appear in the other bulk classes above. This would include premises such as car parks, sport and leisure facilities, public houses and public facilities such as schools, hospitals, museums and libraries. Building use types are generally not available for non-bulk herediments.</td>
<td>Public houses/pub restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising rights/stations</td>
<td>Public House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car spaces</td>
<td>Advertising Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local authority schools</td>
<td>Car Parking Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holiday homes/self-catering</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-catering Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix D  Outstanding Planning Permissions and Allocations, March 2007

### Table D1.1  Leicester City’s outstanding planning permissions and allocations, March 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Offices/Science Park</th>
<th>Open/Industrial</th>
<th>Strategic Warehousing</th>
<th>Permission/Allocation/Windfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gipsy Lane, Brickworks, Victoria Road East</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Meadows Science and Technology Park Phases 1 and 2</td>
<td>44,000 (SP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gipsy Lane Brickworks, Victoria Road East</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain, Road/Barkbythorpe Road, Troon Industrial Area</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syston Street East, Humberstone Sidings</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowisher Road</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevanth Road, unit 1</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton Business Park (Bursom), Hoods Close</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkby Road</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge Road, Land to the south</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington Street &amp; Ulverscroft Road</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedham Street, Lesta Packaging plc</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanvey Gate (adj.Joiners Arms PH)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langham Road</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterside Road, Hamilton Industrial Park</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorse Hill, Boston Road, Gorse Hill Industrial Estate Part Plot 4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Street, Fara estates</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langham Road</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberstone Road, Nedham Street</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanvey Gate, Adjacent 25 Pasture lane</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Business Park</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBQ Phase 1</td>
<td>47,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,960</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leicester City Council, PACEC
### Table D1.2  Blaby’s outstanding planning permissions and allocations, March 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Offices/Science Park</th>
<th>Open/Industrial</th>
<th>Strategic Warehousing</th>
<th>Permission/Allocation/Windfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grove Business &amp; Distribution Park, Enderby; Woodlands, Phase 2, Plot 1; Barnsdale Way/Thorpe Way</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry Lane, Enderby</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Park, Narborough</td>
<td>35,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby Park Farm, Ratby Lane, Kirby Muxloe</td>
<td>9,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrens Industrial Estate, Mill Hill Industrial Estate, Enderby</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent Couture Marketing, Station Road, Stoney Stanton</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highfields Enterprise Zone, Stoney Stanton</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whetstone Pastures Farm, Whetstone</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldspar Close, Plot E unit 2, Warrens Industrial Area</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Blaby District Council, PACEC

### Table D1.3  Charnwood’s outstanding planning permissions and allocations, March 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Offices/Science Park</th>
<th>Open/Industrial</th>
<th>Strategic Warehousing</th>
<th>Permission/Allocation/Windfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burder Street Regeneration, Loughborough</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Park, Ashby Road, Loughborough</td>
<td>43,000 (SP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontylure Farm (Watermead Business Park), Syston</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrowgate Drive (Hallamfields), Birstall</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 Loughborough Road (Granite Way), Mountsorrel</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Road, Loughborough</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Dishley Grange, Hatherm</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Warren, East Goscote</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough Industrial Park, Weldon Road, Loughborough</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothley Lodge</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Charnwood Borough Council, PACEC
### Table D1.4  Oadby & Wigston outstanding planning permissions and allocations, March 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Offices/Science Park</th>
<th>Open/Industrial</th>
<th>Strategic Warehousing</th>
<th>Permission/Allocation/Windfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wigston Railway Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports field off Tiger's Road, South Wigston</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land West of Magna Road, Magna Industrial Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oadby & Wigston Borough Council, PACEC
Table D1.5  *Harborough’s outstanding planning permissions and allocations, March 2007*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Offices/Science Park</th>
<th>Open/Industrial</th>
<th>Strategic Warehousing</th>
<th>Permission/Allocation/Windfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land at Sutton Farm, Leicester Road</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruntingthorpe Industrial Estate</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land off Marlborough Drive, Fleckney</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Gate House Lane, Great Easton</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Farm, Main Street, Hungarton</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road, Husbands Bosworth</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibertoft Road, Husbands Bosworth</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Site, Central Park, Leicester Street, Lutterworth</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Coventry Road (Leaders Farm), Lutterworth</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Northampton Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Tungstone Batteries Ltd, Lathkill Street, Market Harborough</td>
<td>5,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery Site, Riverside, Market Harborough</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside, Market Harborough</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfield Farm, Leicester Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Road/ Rockingham Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Rockingham Road, Market Harborough (&quot;Peaker Park&quot;)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Northampton Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>34,818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowden Business Village</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Goods Yard, Rockingham Road</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Hall, Stanford Park</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67,490</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Harborough District Council, PACEC
### Table D1.6  H&B’s outstanding planning permissions and allocations, March 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Offices/Science Park</th>
<th>Open/Industrial</th>
<th>Strategic Warehousing</th>
<th>Permission/Allocation/Windfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIRA, Higham on the Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land North of Coventry Road, Hinckley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear of Sketchley Works, Rugby Road, Hinckley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Watling Street, Nutts Lane, Hinckley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlink Distribution Park, Stanton near Bardon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Jarvis, Coventry Road, Hinckley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatfield Way, Hinckley Fields Industrial Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson Road, Harrowbrook Industrial Estate, Hinckley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwell Business Centre, Barwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit B, Warwick Buildings, Rossendale Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nailstone Colliery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, PACEC

### Table D1.7  Melton’s outstanding planning permissions and allocations, March 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Offices/Science Park</th>
<th>Open/Industrial</th>
<th>Strategic Warehousing</th>
<th>Permission/Allocation/Windfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asfordby Business Park, Asfordby</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton Lane, Bottesford</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Street, Melton Mowbray</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O Gaunt Industrial Estate, Somerby</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holwell Works, Asfordby Hill</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedigree Petfoods Ltd, Mill Road, Melton Mowbray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester Road</td>
<td>8,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,920 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,920</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Melton Borough Council, PACEC
### NW Leicestershire’s outstanding planning permissions and allocations, March 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Offices/Science Park</th>
<th>Open/Industrial</th>
<th>Strategic Warehousing</th>
<th>Permission/Allocation/Windfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Business Park</td>
<td>12,760</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Business Park, East Midlands Airport</td>
<td>58,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Farm, Castle Donington</td>
<td>17,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension to Westminster Estate, Measham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site off Long Lane, Kegworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Business Park (also known as Bardon Lodge), Coalville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitwick Business Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Business Park (also known as Bardon Lodge), Coalville/Stephenson Industrial Estate/Langham Park, Castle Donington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;A (different plots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe Business Park, Ashby</td>
<td>5,388</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>P&amp;A (different plots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Swain Park, Albert Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>P&amp;A (different plots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Distribution Centre (Previously Castle Donnington Power Station Site)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlink (also known as Battleflat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Tournament Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltop, Bardon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardon Hall, Coalville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Vulcan Way, Coalville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Citrus Grove, Kegworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Cottage/Former Rawdon Colliery, Moira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moira Road, Woodville Woodlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stardust, Bardon</td>
<td>5,574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99,642</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: North West Leicestershire District Council, PACEC
### Market Attractiveness Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defines ownership issues</strong></td>
<td><strong>Defines on site constraints</strong></td>
<td><strong>Defines utility infrastructure constraints</strong></td>
<td><strong>Defines highway infrastructure constraints</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site owned landowner(s) who are unwilling to either sell or develop or subject to ransom strips</td>
<td>Severe land contamination and or ground stability issues</td>
<td>Site subject to long term site assembly problem</td>
<td>Site subject to development embargo due to costs of increasing capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Public or private owners with developer committed to early development</em></td>
<td><em>Minor land remediation required</em></td>
<td><em>Some land remediation required</em></td>
<td><em>No land remediation required</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defines utility infrastructure constraints:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Defines highway infrastructure constraints</strong></td>
<td><strong>Defines potential and current market interest in the site for B1, 2 or 8 uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, sewage, drainage, electricity, gas and broadband</td>
<td>Capacity constraints on site access, subject to Transport Assessment</td>
<td>Site subject of recent planning application(s)</td>
<td>Site subject of recent planning application(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Site subject to long term site assembly problem</em></td>
<td>Substantial off site highway capacity improvements required</td>
<td><em>Site subject of active marketing for employment development</em></td>
<td><em>Site subject of active marketing for employment development</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Some land remediation required</em></td>
<td><em>Some infrastructure improvements required</em></td>
<td><em>Site subject of either recent funding, land sale or pre let deal</em></td>
<td><em>Site subject of either recent funding, land sale or pre let deal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Substantial off and on site infrastructure improvements required</em></td>
<td><em>Capacity constraints defined, costed and affordable</em></td>
<td><em>Site clearance and preparation either completed or underway</em></td>
<td><em>Site clearance and preparation either completed or underway</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Usual site access and service road(s) required</em></td>
<td><em>No constraints on capacity</em></td>
<td>Development either recently completed or under construction on part of the site</td>
<td>Development either recently completed or under construction on part of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sustainable Development Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development Factor</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defines flood risk</td>
<td>EA map predicts more than 50% of site at 1 in 100 risk</td>
<td>EA map predicts less than 50% of site at 1 in 100 risk</td>
<td>EA map predicts more than 50% of site at 1 in 1000 risk</td>
<td>EA map predicts less than 50% of site at 1 in 1000 risk</td>
<td>EA map predicts no risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines accessibility by foot and cycle</td>
<td>No footways or cycle paths linking substantial residential areas with the site</td>
<td>Uncoordinated footways and cycle paths that do not conveniently link with residential areas or may be subject of safety issues</td>
<td>One basic footway and cycle path between a residential area and the site</td>
<td>Two safe and well maintained footways and cycle paths between residential areas and the site</td>
<td>Three or more safe and well maintained footways and cycle paths between residential areas and the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines accessibility by public transport</td>
<td>No bus stop or railway station within 800 m of the site</td>
<td>Bus or train frequency for all stops within 800 m is less than hourly, i.e., 12 scheduled calls between 06.00 – 18.00 Monday to Saturdays</td>
<td>Bus or train frequency for all stops within 800 m is hourly, i.e., 13 scheduled calls between 06.00 – 18.00 Monday to Saturdays</td>
<td>Bus frequency for all stops within 800 m is half hourly, i.e., 26 scheduled calls between 06.00 – 18.00 Monday to Saturdays</td>
<td>a) Bus frequency for all stops within 800 m is 15 minutes or more, i.e., 56 or more scheduled calls between 06.00 – 18.00 Monday to Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines accessibility to local facilities</td>
<td>No facilities within 800 metres</td>
<td>Small shopping parade within 800 metres</td>
<td>Local centre within 800 metres</td>
<td>District or town centre within 800 metres</td>
<td>District or town centre within 600 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines easy and appropriate accessibility to highway network</td>
<td>Access by HGVs subject to restrictions and need for inconvenient alternative routes</td>
<td>Access by cars and HGVs generates unacceptable environmental impacts on residential areas, congestion and air quality</td>
<td>Access by cars and HGVs generates some environmental impacts on residential areas, congestion and air quality</td>
<td>Access by cars and HGVs accommodated on appropriate A and Trunk roads</td>
<td>B 8: Linked to rail and motorway access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Factors</td>
<td>Score 1</td>
<td>Score 2</td>
<td>Score 3</td>
<td>Score 4</td>
<td>Score 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines site’s strategic importance to the delivery of the RSS/RES</td>
<td>Site is not located in an area of strategic importance</td>
<td>Site is located adjacent to an area of strategic importance</td>
<td>Site is located in an areas of strategic importance</td>
<td>Site is located in an areas of strategic importance</td>
<td>Site is located in an areas of strategic importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site identified or likely to be required for a specific use or specialist use</td>
<td>Sites is unlikely to be required for either a specific or specialist use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the site part of a comprehensive development proposal which depends on the site being partly or wholly developed for employment user</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there public funding committed (or likely to be provided) sufficient to overcome infrastructure or on-site constraints to make employment development viable?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding support is being considered</td>
<td>Funding is committed as a strategic priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F  Floorspace Densities

F1  Strategic Warehousing

F1.1 The East Midlands Strategic Distribution Study explores the amount of floorspace required per worker. The table below summarises the estimates of floorspace per worker from 4 separate surveys.

Table F1.1  Estimates of floorspace requirements for strategic distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Description</th>
<th>Floorspace (sq.m.)</th>
<th>Number employees</th>
<th>sq.m. per worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King Sturge – survey of 45 strategic distribution units of &gt;10,000 sq.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savills – 100 warehouses in the West Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Logis – 32 units of &gt;10,000 sq.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP estimates (below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: East Midlands Strategic Distribution Study

F1.2 The estimates made by RTP are based on DCLG Commercial Floor Space statistics and employment estimates from the Annual Business Inquiry, taken at middle layer strategic output area.

Table F1.2  Estimation of employment densities in strategic distribution parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Floor space (sq.m.)</th>
<th>Number employees</th>
<th>sq.m. per worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Garden Shed</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Road and Pro Logis Park</td>
<td>364,000</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro Hub Freight Park</td>
<td>394,000</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove Valley Park</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlink</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRFT Logistics Park</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,264,000</td>
<td>14,385</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: East Midlands Strategic Distribution Study: RTP; DCLG Commercial and Industrial Floor Space Statistics 2005; ABI 2004

F1.3 Overall, employment densities in large-scale warehouses are lower than other business uses, but there is considerable variation.
Appendix G  Employment Forecasts to Land and Floorspace Estimates

Step One: Experian Forecasts

Total Employment

G1.1 Total employment is forecast to increase by 17,700 jobs across Leicestershire by 2016, and then a further, 7,000 jobs by 2026. The largest growth up to 2026 is forecast in Blaby (6,200 jobs), followed by North West Leicestershire (5,900 jobs). Only an additional 2,200 jobs are forecast in Leicester City (which shows a decline from 2016 levels of employment).

Table G1.1 Employment Forecasts, Total, 2007-2026, Jobs ‘000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>180.2</td>
<td>183.9</td>
<td>182.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>321.5</td>
<td>329.3</td>
<td>331.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>486.7</td>
<td>504.4</td>
<td>511.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding. Source: Experian; PACEC

Offices

G1.2 Table G1.2 sets out forecasts for employment increases in offices and Table G1.3 sets out forecasts for employment increases in offices plus public administration. Public administration may be included in offices as it tends to take up office space that otherwise may be taken by commercial office occupiers.

G1.3 In total across the HMA, office employment is forecast to increase by 14,200 jobs by 2026 (10,500 by 2016). If public administration is included, the forecast increase is lower, with 10,000 additional jobs by 2026 (8,300 by 2016). This is because across Leicestershire and Leicester City, employment in public administration is forecast to decline. We show here office and public administration employment compared to just offices to demonstrate the effect of including public administration. In later steps of the forecast, we show just offices and public administration (to be consistent with other work across the region e.g. EMLPS).

G1.4 The largest forecasts in office employment are set out in Leicester City, with an additional 7,200 jobs by 2026 (2,900 if public administration is included). This is
followed by Harborough (1,800 jobs), Hinckley & Bosworth (1,400 jobs) and Blaby (1,300 jobs).

### Table G1.2  Employment Forecasts, Offices, 2007-2026, Jobs ‘000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUA</strong></td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HMA</strong></td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding.

Source: Experian; PACEC

### Table G1.3  Employment Forecasts, Offices and Public Administration, 2007-2026, Jobs ‘000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUA</strong></td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HMA</strong></td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>119.7</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding.

Source: Experian; PACEC

**Industrial**

G1.5 Industrial employment is forecast to decline by 2016 and 2026 across the HMA. By 2016 it is forecast around 6,600 jobs will be lost, and up to 2026 around 12,000 jobs will be lost. The bulk of these losses are forecast to be in Leicester City. Blaby is forecast to experience a small increase in industrial employment, with these increases mainly in construction and engineering sectors.
Table G1.4  Employment Forecasts, Industrial, 2007-2026, Jobs ‘000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding.
Source: Experian; PACEC

Warehousing

G1.6
Employment in warehousing overall is forecast to decline up to 2026 by around 800 jobs (with 200 lost by 2016). Growth forecast in North West Leicestershire (of 1,900 jobs) is forecast to be balanced out by losses of 1,900 jobs in Leicester City. Other districts are forecast to experience small changes in warehousing employment.

Table G1.5  Employment Forecasts, Warehousing, 2007-2026, Jobs ‘000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding.
Source: Experian; PACEC

Step Two: Forecasts to Floorspace

Offices and Public Administration

G1.7
The table below sets out translating the change in employment to floorspace using standard employment densities. Around 180,000 sq.m. are forecast to be required to accommodate additional jobs up to 2026.
### Table G1.6  Employment Forecasts and Floorspace Requirement, Offices and Public Administration, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in jobs (000s)</th>
<th>Employment density, sq.m.</th>
<th>Change in floorspace, sq.m.</th>
<th>2007-2016</th>
<th>2007-2026</th>
<th>2007-2016</th>
<th>2007-2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15,360</td>
<td>21,562</td>
<td>15,360</td>
<td>21,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10,475</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>10,475</td>
<td>8,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25,462</td>
<td>35,837</td>
<td>25,462</td>
<td>35,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16,035</td>
<td>26,427</td>
<td>16,035</td>
<td>26,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>3,696</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>3,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20,809</td>
<td>23,014</td>
<td>20,809</td>
<td>23,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7,326</td>
<td>8,007</td>
<td>7,326</td>
<td>8,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49,643</td>
<td>52,888</td>
<td>49,643</td>
<td>52,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82,804</td>
<td>90,518</td>
<td>82,804</td>
<td>90,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>149,202</td>
<td>179,493</td>
<td>149,202</td>
<td>179,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding.  
Source: Experian; PACEC

### Industrial

Table G1.7  Employment Forecasts and Floorspace Requirement, Industrial, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in jobs (000s)</th>
<th>Employment density, sq.m.</th>
<th>Change in floorspace, sq.m.</th>
<th>2007-2016</th>
<th>2007-2026</th>
<th>2007-2016</th>
<th>2007-2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11,664</td>
<td>52,334</td>
<td>11,664</td>
<td>52,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-24,234</td>
<td>-40,089</td>
<td>-24,234</td>
<td>-40,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-21,862</td>
<td>-30,940</td>
<td>-21,862</td>
<td>-30,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-8,569</td>
<td>-477</td>
<td>-8,569</td>
<td>-477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-4,992</td>
<td>-14,098</td>
<td>-4,992</td>
<td>-14,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8,787</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8,787</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-11,806</td>
<td>-25,919</td>
<td>-11,806</td>
<td>-25,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-152,657</td>
<td>-311,528</td>
<td>-152,657</td>
<td>-311,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-177,033</td>
<td>-325,202</td>
<td>-177,033</td>
<td>-325,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-203,669</td>
<td>-370,661</td>
<td>-203,669</td>
<td>-370,661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding.  
Source: Experian; PACEC

### Warehousing

Table G1.9  Employment Forecasts and Floorspace Requirement, Warehousing, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in jobs (000s)</th>
<th>Employment density, sq.m.</th>
<th>Change in floorspace, sq.m.</th>
<th>2007-2016</th>
<th>2007-2026</th>
<th>2007-2016</th>
<th>2007-2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-2,357</td>
<td>17,643</td>
<td>-2,357</td>
<td>17,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-27,300</td>
<td>-31,378</td>
<td>-27,300</td>
<td>-31,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-9,846</td>
<td>-13,738</td>
<td>-9,846</td>
<td>-13,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-4,302</td>
<td>-4,334</td>
<td>-4,302</td>
<td>-4,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-6,574</td>
<td>-16,062</td>
<td>-6,574</td>
<td>-16,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8,787</td>
<td>31,230</td>
<td>8,787</td>
<td>31,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-11,806</td>
<td>-20,029</td>
<td>-11,806</td>
<td>-20,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-152,657</td>
<td>-311,528</td>
<td>-152,657</td>
<td>-311,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-177,033</td>
<td>-325,202</td>
<td>-177,033</td>
<td>-325,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-203,669</td>
<td>-370,661</td>
<td>-203,669</td>
<td>-370,661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding.  
Source: Experian; PACEC

An overall loss of around 71,000 sq.m. for warehousing across Leicester and Leicestershire HMA up to 2026 comprises some increases and some declines across the districts. For example, North West Leicestershire is forecast increases of 168,000 sq.m., whilst Leicester City is forecast a decline of 164,000 sq.m. up to 2026.
Table G1.8  Employment Forecasts and Floorspace Requirement, Warehousing, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in jobs (000s)</th>
<th>Employment density, sq.m.</th>
<th>Change in floorspace, sq.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding.  
Source: Experian; PACEC

Step Three: Floorspace to Land

G1.10 The tables below translate the forecast floorspace to land. We undertake this only for industrial and warehousing floorspace at present; office employment is more easily understood in floorspace since there are wide divergences in plot ratios that may be applied, depending upon where the offices are built.

Industrial

G1.11 Translating the floorspace requirement into land gives an overall requirement for a loss of around 90ha up to 2026.

Table G1.9 Floorspace and Land Requirement, Industrial, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in floorspace, sq.m.</th>
<th>Plot ratio</th>
<th>Change in land, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>11,664</td>
<td>52,334</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>-24,234</td>
<td>-40,089</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>-21,862</td>
<td>-30,940</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>-8,569</td>
<td>-477</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>-4,992</td>
<td>-14,098</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>8,787</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>-11,806</td>
<td>-25,919</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>-152,657</td>
<td>-311,528</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>-177,033</td>
<td>-325,202</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>-203,669</td>
<td>-370,661</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding.  
Source: Experian; PACEC
**Warehousing**

G1.12 An overall loss of around 14 ha for warehousing across Leicester and Leicestershire HMA comprises some growth and some decline across the districts. For example, North West Leicestershire is forecast increases of 34 ha, whilst Leicester City is forecast a decline of 33 ha up to 2026.

**Table G1.10 Employment Forecasts and Floorspace Requirement, Warehousing, 2007-2026**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Change in floorspace, sq.m.</th>
<th>Plot ratio</th>
<th>Change in land, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>-4,095</td>
<td>-16,036</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>20,592</td>
<td>-43,340</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>10,137</td>
<td>16,568</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>11,298</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>-4,190</td>
<td>-11,875</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>121,321</td>
<td>168,235</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>-14,069</td>
<td>-22,301</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>-113,701</td>
<td>-164,301</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>-152,456</td>
<td>-245,978</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>-13,890</td>
<td>-71,154</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding.
Source: Experian; PACEC

**Step Four: Renewal and Pipeline**

G1.13 In this step we set out the estimate of floorspace and land required for renewal and pipeline in each of the Districts and the HMA as a whole. We set out figures for the ‘medium’ scenario from Table 6.1. Offices floorspace is set out in square metres and industrial and warehousing land as hectares.

**Offices and Public Administration**

G1.14 Overall in Leicestershire and Leicester City we estimate 252,000 sq.m. of land will be required for renewal up to 2026, of which 126,000 sq.m. will be on new land.
### Table G1.11  Floorspace requirement for renewal, Offices and Public Administration Floorspace, 2007-2016, 2026, sq.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Development requirement p.a.</th>
<th>Requirement to 2016</th>
<th>Requirement on new land to 2016</th>
<th>Requirement to 2026</th>
<th>Requirement on new land to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>19,530</td>
<td>9,765</td>
<td>41,230</td>
<td>20,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>12,420</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>26,220</td>
<td>13,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>14,250</td>
<td>7,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>14,630</td>
<td>7,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>13,140</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>27,740</td>
<td>13,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>3,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>52,200</td>
<td>26,100</td>
<td>110,200</td>
<td>55,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>972,000</td>
<td>9,720</td>
<td>87,480</td>
<td>43,740</td>
<td>184,680</td>
<td>92,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HMA</strong></td>
<td>1,330,000</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>119,700</td>
<td>59,850</td>
<td>252,700</td>
<td>126,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC, DCLG

### Industrial

**G1.15** Overall in Leicester and Leicestershire there is a requirement for renewal of around 195 ha, of which around 98 ha will be on ‘new land’. Leicester City (34 ha), Charnwood (18 ha) and Hinckley and Bosworth (16 ha) have the highest requirements for renewal on ‘new land’ as they currently have the highest levels of stock within the HMA.

### Table G1.12  Land requirement for renewal, Industrial Floorspace, 2007-2016, 2026, ha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Development requirement p.a.</th>
<th>Requirement to 2016</th>
<th>Requirement on new land to 2016</th>
<th>Requirement to 2026</th>
<th>Requirement on new land to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>124.3</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HMA</strong></td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>195.1</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC, DCLG
**Warehousing**

G1.16 Overall this amounts to a requirement for 170 ha of land for renewal of the existing stock, of which 128 ha are assumed to be on ‘new land’. The largest requirements are in Harborough (31 ha), Leicester City (29 ha) and North West Leicestershire (23 ha) as they currently have the highest levels of stock.

**Table G1.13 Land requirement for renewal, Warehousing Floorspace, 2007-2016, 2026, ha**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Stock Developme nt p.a.</th>
<th>Requirement to 2016</th>
<th>Requirement on new land to 2016</th>
<th>Requirement to 2026</th>
<th>Requirement on new land to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HMA</strong></td>
<td>896</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>170.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC, DCLG

**Total Requirement**

G1.17 In this step we set out the estimate of floorspace and land required for renewal and pipeline in each of the Districts and HMA as a whole. We set out figures for office floorspace in square metres and for industrial and warehousing land as hectares. The scenarios are set out in Appendix H.

G1.18 The total requirement for floorspace is calculated by adding:

- The change in the requirement for land resulting from forecast change in numbers of jobs over the plan period; and
- The requirement for new land resulting from the renewal of existing stock.

G1.19 For demand, where a negative requirement is identified e.g. if the area is predicted to suffer a decline in employment (e.g. industrial) over the plan period, we consider below solely the requirement from renewal on new land. This is because new land is required for renewal (by the definition set out in 6.1.14-6.1.23). Whilst jobs may be lost over the plan period, and therefore land may be stop being used for industrial purposes, this land is not likely to be taken up for renewal and therefore should not be included in the balance. This methodology also allows for unsuitable employment land to fall out of the employment land stock and be used for other, more suitable purposes whilst locating in a new, more appropriate location.
G1.20 Total requirements in each of the districts, City, PUA and HMA are set out in the tables below. Overall in the HMA there is a requirement for 306,000 sq.m. of office floorspace, 140 hectares of industrial land and 165 hectares of warehousing land. The majority of the office and industrial land requirement is for the PUA. The largest single requirement for warehousing floorspace is for North West Leicestershire, mainly for renewal of the existing stock.

**Offices and Public Administration**

G1.21 Around 305,000 sq.m. of floorspace are required up to 2026, of which the Principal Urban Area again forms around three fifths.

**Table G1.14** Floorspace requirement for Offices and Public Administration, 2007-2016, 2026, sq.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in floorspace</th>
<th>Requirement for renewal on new land</th>
<th>Total Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>15,360</td>
<td>21,562</td>
<td>9,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>10,475</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>6,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>25,462</td>
<td>35,837</td>
<td>3,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>16,035</td>
<td>26,427</td>
<td>3,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>3,696</td>
<td>2,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>20,809</td>
<td>23,014</td>
<td>6,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>7,326</td>
<td>8,007</td>
<td>1,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>49,643</td>
<td>52,888</td>
<td>26,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>82,804</td>
<td>90,518</td>
<td>43,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>149,202</td>
<td>179,493</td>
<td>59,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC

**Industrial**

G1.22 The situation with industrial land is more complicated. In many areas there is a forecast decline in the number of jobs in industrial sectors. In these cases, we include land purely for renewal. Overall in the HMA, around 88 ha are expected to be lost through declines in employment in the industry, but around 127 ha are expected to be required for renewal.
Table G1.15  Land requirement for Industrial, 2007-2016, 2026, ha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in land</th>
<th>Requirement for renewal on new land</th>
<th>Total requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>-5.</td>
<td>-7.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>-0.</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>-3.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>-6.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>-36.</td>
<td>-74.</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>-42.</td>
<td>-77.</td>
<td>59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>-48.</td>
<td>-88.</td>
<td>76.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This includes an additional estimate a quarter of the 17 ha of employment land identified in Leicester City as no longer fit for purpose, and 26 ha for firms seeking to relocate from the intervention areas.
Source: PACEC

Again, the forecasts for many of the districts show a declining requirement for employment land for warehousing resulting from declines in employment (14 ha reduction up to 2026 in the HMA). In these scenarios we only count land for renewal as part of the total requirement. Overall this shows a net requirement for around 165.1 ha in the HMA up to 2026, with 57.3 hectares in the PUA and 57.0 hectares in North West Leicestershire.

Table G1.16  Land requirement for Warehousing, 2007-2016, 2026, ha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Change in land</th>
<th>Requirement for renewal on new land</th>
<th>Total requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>-22.7</td>
<td>-32.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>-30.5</td>
<td>-49.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-14.2</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
### Leicester and Leicestershire HMA

**Table H1.1**  
Leicester and Leicestershire HMA, Supply Demand Gap Analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices, sq.m.</th>
<th>Industrial, ha</th>
<th>Warehousing, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>305,843</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>165.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>398,012</td>
<td>206.7</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>92,169</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>-86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>326,372</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>20,529</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>337,431</td>
<td>172.5</td>
<td>197.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>398,012</td>
<td>206.7</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>60,581</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>-118.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>326,372</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-11,059</td>
<td>-35.1</td>
<td>-118.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>274,256</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>133.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>398,012</td>
<td>206.7</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>123,756</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>-54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>326,372</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>52,116</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>-54.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
### PUA

#### Table H1.2  PUA, Supply Demand Gap Analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices, sq.m.</th>
<th>Industrial, ha</th>
<th>Warehousing, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>182,858</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>221,960</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>39,102</td>
<td>-27.7</td>
<td>-57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>221,960</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>39,102</td>
<td>-43.7</td>
<td>-57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>205,943</td>
<td>125.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>221,960</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>16,017</td>
<td>-48.8</td>
<td>-71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>221,960</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>16,017</td>
<td>-64.4</td>
<td>-71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>159,773</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>221,960</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>62,187</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
<td>-43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>221,960</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>62,187</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
<td>-43.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
### Leicester City

**Table H1.3  Leicester City, Supply Demand Gap Analysis, 2007-2026**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices, sq.m.</th>
<th>Industrial, ha</th>
<th>Warehousing, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>107,988</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>91,960</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>-16,028</td>
<td>-39.3</td>
<td>-29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>91,960</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-16,028</td>
<td>-39.3</td>
<td>-29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>121,763</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>91,960</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>-29,803</td>
<td>-50.6</td>
<td>-36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>91,960</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-29,803</td>
<td>-50.7</td>
<td>-36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>94,213</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>91,960</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>-2,253</td>
<td>-28.0</td>
<td>-22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>91,960</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-2,253</td>
<td>-28.0</td>
<td>-22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
### Blaby

**Table H1.4  Blaby, Supply Demand Gap Analysis, 2007-2026**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices, sq.m.</th>
<th>Industrial, ha</th>
<th>Warehousing, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>42,177</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>61,700</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>19,523</td>
<td>-11.8</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>61,700</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>19,523</td>
<td>-11.8</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>47,330</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>61,700</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>14,370</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
<td>-15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>61,700</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>14,370</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
<td>-15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>37,023</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>61,700</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>24,677</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>61,700</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>24,677</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
### Charnwood

#### Table H1.5  Charnwood, Supply Demand Gap Analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices, sq.m.</th>
<th>Industrial, ha</th>
<th>Warehousing, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>21,171</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>68,300</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>47,129</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>68,300</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>47,129</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>24,449</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>68,300</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>43,851</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>68,300</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>43,851</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>17,894</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>68,300</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>50,406</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>68,300</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>50,406</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
## Oadby & Wigston

### Table H1.6  Oadby & Wigston, Supply Demand Gap Analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices, sq.m.</th>
<th>Industrial, ha</th>
<th>Warehousing, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>11,522</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>-11,522</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-11,522</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>12,401</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>-12,401</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-12,401</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>10,643</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>-10,643</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-10,643</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
**Harborough**

**Table H1.7  Harborough, Supply Demand Gap Analysis, 2007-2026**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices, sq.m.</th>
<th>Industrial, ha</th>
<th>Warehousing, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>42,962</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>67,490</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>24,528</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>-32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>54,290</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>11,328</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>-32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>44,743</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>67,490</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>22,747</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>-40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>54,290</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>9,547</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>41,181</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>67,490</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>26,309</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>-25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>54,290</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>13,109</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-25.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
**Hinckley & Bosworth**

**Table H1.8  Hinckley & Bosworth, Supply Demand Gap Analysis, 2007-2026**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices, sq.m.</th>
<th>Industrial, ha</th>
<th>Warehousing, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>33,742</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>-33,742</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-33,742</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>35,571</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>-35,571</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-35,571</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>31,914</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>-31,914</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-31,914</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
### Melton

**Table H1.9  Melton, Supply Demand Gap Analysis, 2007-2026**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices, sq.m.</th>
<th>Industrial, ha</th>
<th>Warehousing, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>9,396</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>8,920</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>-476</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>8,920</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-476</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>10,821</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>8,920</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>-1,901</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>8,920</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-1,901</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>7,971</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>8,920</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>8,920</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
### North West Leicestershire

#### Table H1.10  North West Leicestershire, Supply Demand Gap Analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices, sq.m.</th>
<th>Industrial, ha</th>
<th>Warehousing, ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>36,884</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>99,642</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>62,758</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>41,202</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>40,351</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>99,642</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>59,591</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>41,202</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>33,416</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>99,642</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>66,226</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>41,202</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>7,786</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
Appendix I  Report of Stakeholders’ Workshop

I1  Introduction

I1.1  As part of the programme of involving stakeholders in the review, Kishor Tailor, Chief Executive of Leicester Shire Economic Partnership, chaired a workshop on 9th June 2008 at the Walker’s Stadium, Leicester. At the seminar the consultants briefed 54 representatives of landowners, developers, property service companies and local authorities on the main findings and ideas emerging from the review. The main findings arose from the supply and demand gap analysis and ideas were informed by the need to plan for a low carbon era. Stakeholders were then invited to debate four employment land planning issues arising from the proposal for a new pattern of low carbon development in: the New Business Quarter; Sustainable Urban Extensions; Science Parks; market towns and road – rail strategic distribution centres. The main messages arising from these discussions are summarised below:

I2  i) Future Proofing for Sustainable Development:

I2.1  This group considered policy measures needed to deliver the New Business Quarter and Sustainable Urban Extensions as locations for more environmentally sustainable development.

I2.2  For the New Business Quarter, current car parking standards were seen as a constraint on demand. The difficulty of delivering on site renewable energy generation in a city centre location was seen as a constraint on developers.

I2.3  Turning to the Sustainable Urban Extensions, the stakeholders referred to policy approaches elsewhere in the UK. In Ashford, policies are seeking to link employment, housing and public transport. In Wellingborough an employment led approach is being taken to align jobs with homes. Reference was also made to water cycle strategies and the need to plan to reduce per capita water consumption by 50%.

I2.4  To sum up, the group gave its support for low carbon development: low energy buildings in locations where access is predominantly by sustainable modes of transport. However it acknowledged that decision takers will be among the last to use cars. Subject to car parking standards reflecting this reality, there is a case for a further office allocation in the New Business Quarter.

I3  ii) Public Sector Supply Side Roles:

I3.1  This group considered possible public sector interventions to deliver low carbon development.

I3.2  In discussing the New Business Quarter, the stakeholders recognised the attractiveness of central locations and rail links to London but noted that the need for
better public transport links to the city centre: park and ride and express buses and more local railway stations.

I3.3 The group also suggested car parking standards have created a moral hazard: they have stimulated demand for car dependent office – of – town office schemes. A review of the standards is needed to stimulate demand for city centre office schemes which can be accessed by sustainable modes of transport.

I3.4 In parallel measures are required to free up the Leicester industrial property market. Two key measures were proposed: to bring forward sites for development and hence free up existing space and refurbishing vacant space for reuse by among others firms relocating from of the intervention areas. For these measures to succeed, robust planning policies will be required to protect the existing stock from higher value uses such as housing.

I3.5 The stakeholders stressed the importance of employment schemes front loading sustainable urban extensions to create demand for homes and help establish patterns of short distance commuting.

I3.6 The group concluded that it would be difficult for the private sector to act alone in the delivery of Sustainable Urban Extensions. This called for a clear public sector policy framework and structures to plan and co – ordinate investment in infrastructure for housing, employment and transport.

I3.7 Public sector investment though would need to comply with EU state aid rules and should not be used to subsidise development for which there is no prospective market demand. The Science Park schemes were cited as possible examples of such subsidies.

I4 iii) Market Perspectives on Supply:

I4.1 The group considered issues with the existing stock and constraints on future supply.

I4.2 Beginning with Leicester the stakeholders noted the constraint on car parking was not complemented by high quality public transport provision. As a result the city lacked high quality offices and firms were taking up space in out of town locations. In addition to the poor stock of offices, the city lacks industrial space.

I4.3 The stakeholders viewed Sustainable Urban Extensions to be the key to future supply but a clear public policy framework and infrastructure investment package would be required to enable private investment.

I4.4 Support was voiced for road – rail strategic distribution centres as they would mitigate demand for road space.
I4.5 Whilst the need to identify large employment land allocations was acknowledged, the role of small scale schemes in rural locations should not be overlooked as part of an overall pattern of sustainable development.

I5.1 iv) Market Perspectives on Demand:

I5.2 The group considered businesses’ employment land and property requirements.

I5.3 The stakeholders’ central concerns were the cost burden of low carbon development, the effect of these costs on international competitiveness and the need for more market intelligence.

I5.4 On the first point, it was questioned whether firms could afford the additional capital and rental costs to pay for higher construction costs.

I5.5 On the second point, it was felt that high environmental standards put UK firms at a cost disadvantage firms in countries without such standards.

I5.6 In response to these points it was argued that rising fuel prices would make lower carbon building a source of cost advantage and competitiveness.

I5.6 On the third point, a call was made to emda, LSEP and Invest Leicestershire to feedback more intelligence to the market: which interventions have succeeded and which have not; which enquiries have translated into deals and why have those companies invested in the sub region?
Appendix J  Full Supply Demand Gap Analysis Tables

Table J1.1 Proposed employment land allocations to 2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Light industrial and small warehousing</th>
<th>Strategic warehousing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUA</td>
<td>46,000 sq m</td>
<td>100 ha</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester City</td>
<td>60,000 sq m</td>
<td>9.3 ha</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North SUEs</td>
<td>20-25 ha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South SUEs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50 ha</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaby SUEs</td>
<td>24 ha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>5,800 sq m</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUA total</td>
<td>65,800 sq m</td>
<td>103.3 ha</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Leicestershire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Leicestershire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalville SUEs</td>
<td>20-25 ha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail-linked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34,000 sq m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUEs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25 ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborough</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>2 ha</td>
<td>(500 sq m)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Min 100,300 sq m</td>
<td>Max 178.3 ha</td>
<td>50 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. May not sum due to rounding.
Source: Experian; PACEC

Leicester City

Table J1.2 Leicester City office supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sq.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>107,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations and consents</td>
<td>91,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBQ Phases 1 (Int House, Spread Eagle) and Phase 2</td>
<td>47,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Meadows Science Park (B1b)</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Street, Fara Estate</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>-16,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
Table J1.3  Leicester City industrial supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Business Park</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gipsy Lane Brickworks, Victoria Road East</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisher Road</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gipsy Lane, Brickworks, Victoria Road East</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain, Road/Barkbythorpe Road, Troon Industrial Area</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton Business Park (Bursom), Hoods Close</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syston Street East, Humberstone Sidings</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkby Road</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge Road, Land to the south</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington Street &amp; Ulverscroft Road</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedham Street, Lesta Packaging plc</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanvey Gate (adj. Joiners Arms PH)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langham Road</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterside Road, Hamilton Industrial Park</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorse Hill, Boston Road, Gorse Hill Industrial Estate Part, Plot 4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langham Road</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberstone Road, Nedham Street</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanvery Gate, Adjacent 25 Pasture Lane</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td><strong>-39.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC

Table J1.4  Leicester City warehousing supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td><strong>-29.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
### Blaby

#### Offices

**Table J1.5**  Blaby office supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sq.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional require</td>
<td>42,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>61,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Park</td>
<td>35,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Park</td>
<td>16,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby Park Farm</td>
<td>9,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td>19,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC

**Table J1.6**  Blaby industrial supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional require</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry Lane, Enderby</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent Couture Marketing, Station Road, Stoney Stanton</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrens Industrial Estate, Mill Hill Industrial Estate, Enderby</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whetstone Pastures Farm, Whetstone</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldspar Close, Plot E unit 2, Warrens Industrial Area</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highfields Enterprise Zone, Stoney Stanton</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td>-11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC

**Table J1.7**  Blaby warehousing supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional require</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply – Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td>-12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
Charnwood

Table J1.8  Charnwood office supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sq.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>21,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>68,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough Science Park Phase 2 (B1b)</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermead Business Park</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishley Grange</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>47,129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC

Table J1.9  Charnwood industrial supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Dishley Grange, Hathern</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrowgate Drive (Hallamfields), Birstall</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothley Lodge</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Warren, East Goscote</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough Industrial Park, Weldon Road, Loughborough</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 Loughborough Road (Granite Way), Mountsorrel</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burder Street Regeneration, Loughborough</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Road, Loughborough</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unsuitable sites/ sites unlikely to come forward

Burder Street Regeneration, Loughborough | -0.9 |
Land at Dishley Grange, Hathern | -12.0 |

Effective Supply | 28.9 |

EFFECTIVE GAP | 10.6 |

Source: PACEC
Table J1.10  Charnwood warehousing supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply – Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC

Oadby & Wigston

J1.2  Oadby & Wigston currently has no office supply identified. However, masterplans have identified potential for 1,125 sq m of offices in Oadby town centre and 4,675 sq m of offices in Wigston town centre.

Table J1.11  Oadby & Wigston office supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sq.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>11,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>-11,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC

J1.3  If Wigston Railway Triangle is excluded from demand, there may be a shortfall of land for renewal of existing industrial and warehousing sites in Oadby & Wigston.

Table J1.12  Oadby & Wigston industrial supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigston Railway Triangle</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports field off Tiger’s Road, South Wigston</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land West of Magna Road, Magna Industrial Estate</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unsuitable sites/sites unlikely to come forward**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wigston Railway Triangle</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effective Supply**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supply</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effective Gap**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Gap</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
Table J1.13  Oadby & Wigston warehousing supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC

Harborough

Table J1.14  Harborough office supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sq.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unsuitable sites/ sites unlikely to come forward

| South of Coventry Road (Leaders Farm), Lutterworth | -13,200 |

Effective supply  54,290

Effective GAP  11,328

Source: PACEC
### Table J1.15  Harborough industrial supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfield Farm, Leicester Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Rockingham Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Goods Yard, Rockingham Road</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road, Husbands Bosworth</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery Site, Riverside, Market Harborough</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Rockingham Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Northampton Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Great House Lane, Great Easton</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land off Marlborough Drive, Fleckney</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Market Harborough</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Farm, Main Street, Hungarton</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Sutton Farm, Leicester Road</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibertoft Road, Husbands Bosworth</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Road/Rockingham Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruntingthorpe Industrial Estate</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Hall, Stanford Park, Westrill and Starmore</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GAP** | 17.1

**Unsuitable sites/ sites unlikely to come forward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West of Northampton Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Rockingham Road, Market Harborough (“Peaker Park”)</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Rockingham Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Goods Yard, Rockingham Road, Market Harborough</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effective supply** | 11.7

**Effective GAP** | 7.7

Source: PACEC
### Table J1.16  Harborough warehousing supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfield Farm (part)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td><strong>-32.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC

### Hinckley & Bosworth

### Table J1.17  Hinckley & Bosworth office supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sq.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>33,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td><strong>-33,742</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
**Table J1.18**  
Hinckley & Bosworth industrial supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRA, Higham on the Hill</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land North of Coventry Road, Hinckley</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear of Sketchley Works, Rugby Road, Hinckley</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Jarvis, Coventry Road, Hinckley</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Watling Street, Nutts Lane, Hinckley</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwell Business Centre, Barwell</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatfield Way, Hinckley Fields Industrial Estate</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson Road, Harrowbrook Industrial Estate, Hinckley</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit B, Warwick Buildings, Rossendale Road</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuitable sites/sites unlikely to come forward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRA, Higham on the Hill</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Jarvis, Coventry Road, Hinckley</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Supply</strong></td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective GAP</strong></td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: PACEC*

**Table J1.19**  
Hinckley & Bosworth warehousing supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nailstone Colliery</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlink Distribution Park, Stanton near Bardon</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: PACEC*
### Melton

**Table J1.20  Melton office supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sq.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>9,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>8,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester Road</td>
<td>8,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td><strong>-476</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC

**Table J1.21  Melton industrial supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asfordby Business Park, Asfordby</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holwell Works, Asfordby Hill</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton Lane, Bottesford</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O Gaunt Industrial Estate, Somerby</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Street, Melton Mowbray</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedigree Petfoods Ltd, Mill Road, Melton Mowbray</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unsuitable sites/sites unlikely to come forward
- Asfordby Business Park, Asfordby: -16.0
- Holwell Works, Asfordby Hill: -15.0

**Effective Supply**: 1.4

**Effective GAP**: -3.9

Source: PACEC

**Table J1.22  Melton warehousing supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total additional requirement</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td><strong>-7.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
### North West Leicestershire

**Table J1.23  North West Leicestershire office supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sq.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total additional requirement</strong></td>
<td>36,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</strong></td>
<td>99,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Business Park</td>
<td>58,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Farm</td>
<td>17,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Business Park</td>
<td>12,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stardust, Bardon (windfall)</td>
<td>5,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe Business Park</td>
<td>5,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td>62,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuitable sites/sites unlikely to come forward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Business Park</td>
<td>-58,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective supply</strong></td>
<td>41,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective GAP</strong></td>
<td>4,318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
**Table J1.24**  North West Leicestershire industrial supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total additional requirement</strong></td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</strong></td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension to Westminster Estate, Measham</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Citrus Grove, Kegworth</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Swain Park, Albert Village</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moira Road, Woodville Woodlands</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltop, Bardon</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Business Park</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe Business Park, Ashby</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Business Park (also known as Bardon Lodge), Coalville</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson Industrial Estate</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langham Park, Castle Donington</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site off Long Lane, Kegworth</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Cottage/Former Rawdon Colliery, Moira</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitwick Business Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardon Hall, Coalville</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff 42</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Tournament Way</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Vulcan Way, Coalville</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC

**Table J1.25**  North West Leicestershire warehousing supply and demand gap analysis, 2007-2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total additional requirement</strong></td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply - Allocations &amp; consents</strong></td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Distribution Centre (Previously Castle Donnington Power Station Site)</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlink (also known as Battleflat)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe Business Park</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PACEC
Appendix K  Initial and Second Site Assessments of Sites Nominated for Employment Development

K1  Key to Scoring Categories

K1.1  Each criterion has been assigned a sliding score of 1 – 5 with 5 representing the best circumstances in relation to the site being identified as suitable for employment development and that development contributing to sustainability and wider strategic policy objectives. Each is to be assessed in the context of its proposed/likely function, i.e. as a strategic freight and distribution centre, science park, offices or open use (light and general industry and small scale warehousing).

CRITERIA AND SCORING REGIME FOR THE INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF SITES NOMINATED FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Constraints: Pass or Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk (in zones 2 and 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area (employment proposal of appropriate scale and design)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to listed building, ancient monument (as above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSI or other sensitive nature conservation sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continue to score sites which pass the above constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequential Test</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Urban Area</td>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within existing urban area or potential Sustainable Urban Extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Accessibility Test

| Rest of Leicestershire | Rural Area | Village centre | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility by workforce</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of less than 10,000 within 3 km radius of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Population of 25,000 or more within 3 km radius of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of between 10,000 and 25,000 within 3 km radius of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility by sustainable modes</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No existing access by foot, cycle, bus and/or train services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing high quality access by foot, cycle path, bus and/or train services 4 or more times per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing footways, on-road cycle, bus and other train services less than 3 times per hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable buildings (level of carbon emissions)</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low potential to design for passive heating and cooling, and on-site renewable energy generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average potential to design for passive heating and cooling, and on-site renewable energy generation</td>
<td></td>
<td>High potential to design for passive heating and cooling, and on-site renewable energy generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable travel patterns</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low potential to reduce the need to travel and improve access by foot, bicycle and public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High potential to maximise opportunities to reduce the need to travel and improve access by foot, bicycle and public transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CRITERIA AND SCORING REGIME FOR THE SECOND ASSESSMENT OF SITES NOMINATED FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT

#### Market Attractiveness Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defines ownership issues</td>
<td>Site owned landowner(s) who are unwilling to either sell or develop or subject to ransom strips</td>
<td>Site subject to long term site assembly problem</td>
<td>Some land ownership issues but subject to negotiation by willing parties</td>
<td>Public or private owners with developer committed to early development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site owned landowner(s) who are unwilling to either sell or develop or subject to ransom strips</td>
<td>Site subject to long term site assembly problem</td>
<td>Some land ownership issues but subject to negotiation by willing parties</td>
<td>Single owner with minor legal issues, for example unsigned S 106 agreement</td>
<td>Public or private owners with developer committed to early development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select for taking forward for the second stage of assessment the highest scoring sites that fit into the identified ‘gap’ in provision by property type (market segment) and location (market area).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defines on site constraints</th>
<th>Severe land contamination and or ground stability issues</th>
<th>Problematic land contamination and or ground stability issues</th>
<th>Some land remediation required</th>
<th>Minor land remediation required</th>
<th>No land remediation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defines utility infrastructure constraints: Water, sewage, drainage, electricity, gas and broadband</td>
<td>Site subject to development embargo due to costs of increasing capacity</td>
<td>Substantial off and on site infrastructure improvements required</td>
<td>Some infrastructure improvements required</td>
<td>Capacity constraints defined, costed and affordable</td>
<td>No constraints on capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines highway infrastructure constraints</td>
<td>Capacity constraints on site access, subject to Transport Assessment</td>
<td>Substantial off site highway capacity improvements required</td>
<td>Some additional highway improvement works required</td>
<td>Usual site access and service road(s) required</td>
<td>Site access in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines potential and current market interest in the site for B1, 2 or 8 uses</td>
<td>Site subject of recent planning application(s)</td>
<td>Site subject of active marketing for employment development</td>
<td>Site subject of either recent funding, land sale or pre let deal</td>
<td>Site clearance and preparation either completed or underway</td>
<td>Development either recently completed or under construction on part of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainable Development Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defines flood risk</td>
<td>EA map predicts more than 50% of site at 1 in 100 risk</td>
<td>EA map predicts less than 50% of site at 1 in 100 risk</td>
<td>EA map predicts more than 50% of site at 1 in 1000 risk</td>
<td>EA map predicts less than 50% of site at 1 in 1000 risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines accessibility by foot and cycle</td>
<td>No footways or cycles paths linking substantial residential areas with the site</td>
<td>Uncoordinated footways and cycle paths that do not conveniently link with residential areas or may be subject of safety issues</td>
<td>One basic footway and cycle path between a residential area and the site</td>
<td>Two safe and well maintained footways and cycle paths between residential areas and the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Initial and Second Site Assessments of Sites Nominated for Employment Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defines accessibility by public transport</th>
<th>No bus stops or railway station within 800 m of the site</th>
<th>Bus or train frequency for all stops within 800 m is less than hourly, i.e. 12 scheduled calls between 06.00 – 18.00 Monday to Saturdays</th>
<th>Bus or train frequency for all stops within 800 m is hourly i.e. 13 scheduled calls between 06.00 – 18.00 Monday to Saturdays</th>
<th>Bus frequency for all stops within 800 m is half hourly i.e. 26 scheduled calls between 06.00 – 18.00 Monday to Saturdays</th>
<th>a) Bus frequency for all stops within 800 m is 15 minutes or more i.e. 56 or more scheduled calls between 06.00 – 18.00 Monday to Saturdays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defines accessibility to local facilities</td>
<td>No facilities within 800 metres</td>
<td>Small shopping parade within 800 metres</td>
<td>Local centre within 800 metres</td>
<td>District or town centre within 800 metres</td>
<td>District or town centre within 600 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines easy and appropriate accessibility to highway network</td>
<td>Access by HGVs subject to restrictions and need for inconvenient alternative routes</td>
<td>Access by cars and HGVs generates unacceptable environmental impacts on residential areas, congestion and air quality</td>
<td>Access by cars and HGVs generates some environmental impacts on residential areas, congestion and air quality</td>
<td>Access by cars and HGVs accommodated on appropriate A and Trunk roads</td>
<td>B 8: Linked to rail and motorway access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Planning Factors</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defines site’s strategic locational importance to the delivery of the RSS/ RES</td>
<td>In a rural area</td>
<td>In village centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In existing built up area, potential SUE or strategic distribution road/rail site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the site contribute to sustainable development?</td>
<td>Does not contribute either to a) regeneration of priority urban renewal areas, b) part of a low carbon</td>
<td>Local level contribution to either a) regeneration of priority urban renewal areas, b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>HMA-level contribution to either a) regeneration of priority urban renewal areas, b) part of a low carbon exemplar scheme or c) growth in rail-based freight.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Initial and Second Site Assessments of Sites Nominated for Employment Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Site A Description</th>
<th>Site B Description</th>
<th>Site C Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Will the site contribute to sustainable development?</strong></td>
<td>Does not maximise existing investment in infrastructure, provides best possible access to services, facilities and jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximises existing investment in infrastructure, provides best possible access to services, facilities and jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Will the site contribute to sustainable economic development?</strong></td>
<td>Site is within an area of over-supply or low market demand.</td>
<td>Site will improve either the regeneration of urban areas or promote the diversification of the rural economy.</td>
<td>Site is identified for a specific use within a priority sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is there public funding committed (or likely to be provided) sufficient to overcome infrastructure or on – site constraints to make employment development viable?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Funding support is being considered</td>
<td>Funding is committed as a strategic priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select the highest scoring sites for more detailed discussions with land owners and developers and consideration as options for preferred locations of growth.