

Appendix G: Strategic Employment Options Appraisal (Pre-Submission)

1. Health and Wellbeing

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

Although access to healthcare is less critical for employment sites than for residential development, the employment site involved in this option is located close to Glenfield Surgery, allowing local employees to access healthcare services before, during or after working hours if required. This proximity offers a modest health benefit, particularly for shift workers and those with ongoing health needs.

Option 1 locates employment development immediately adjacent to the existing settlement of Glenfield, close to the Leicester urban area and provides for around 20ha of local employment land. This location provides good access to a large and diverse labour market, including communities that experience varying levels of deprivation, allowing employment opportunities to contribute positively to economic inclusion and wider health outcomes.

The site is also located near existing open spaces and green infrastructure, including the Old Railway Line Nature Area. This provides opportunities for informal recreation, active travel and improved mental wellbeing during breaks or commuting. The potential to integrate green infrastructure within the site further supports positive health outcomes by improving environmental quality and providing healthier working environments.

It is anticipated that there will be **minor positive effects** through this option with some level of access to employment and contribution to reducing health inequalities through job provision, supporting positive health outcomes, as well as proximity to greenspace.

With regards to amenity and safety aspects, the proposed site is adjacent to an existing employment area and unlikely to have any direct effects upon residential or other sensitive uses. There could be an increase in HGV traffic and general trips along Kirby Road which could affect amenity for some residents in this area, but the effects are not considered to be significant given that there is a degree of screening between the closest residential areas and most traffic has direct access from the strategic road network to the employment areas. Therefore, **neutral effects** are predicted in this respect.

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 distributes employment development across several settlements, including Glenfield, Stoney Stanton and Whetstone and makes provision for around 39ha of new local employment land, providing employment opportunities closer to where a wider range of people live. This pattern can reduce commuting distances for some workers, supporting work-life balance and potentially lowering stress associated with longer journeys. Access to healthcare facilities varies between sites but is generally within 1-2 km, allowing employees reasonable access to services around working hours. While this is not a critical factor for employment uses, it offers a modest benefit in supporting workforce wellbeing.

Several sites are located close to existing open spaces and areas of green infrastructure, particularly around Stoney Stanton and Whetstone. These areas provide opportunities for walking, informal recreation and improved mental wellbeing.

However, the dispersed nature of development means that the quality and consistency of access to greenspace varies between locations. It is also worth noting that mixed use developments would likely come forward at strategic locations in Stoney Stanton and Whetstone, which would bring people closer to job opportunities, and would also likely involve green infrastructure enhancement (which could benefit those at nearby employment uses).

By spreading employment across multiple settlements, Option 2 supports local job creation and can help address health inequalities by improving access to employment in smaller communities.

Overall, there are **potentially significant positive effects** on health and wellbeing through this option, with localised benefits from job creation and access to greenspace and health facilities.

With regards to amenity, the new areas of employment land are not located close to existing residential areas or other sensitive land uses. Therefore, significant negative effects are unlikely to arise in this respect. The new employment areas will be part of mixed-use strategic developments, so there is potential for layout and design features to ensure that the employment elements are not intrusive. Therefore, **potential / uncertain minor negative effects** are predicted at this stage.

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

Option 3 builds on the pattern of employment development established under Option 2 by introducing additional strategic employment sites, including the strategic B8 site west of M69 Junction 2 (36ha) and the larger strategic element at Whetstone Pastures around 80ha). These additions extend employment growth beyond local settlement edges into more strategic, transport-oriented locations.

The increased scale of employment delivery has the potential to generate substantial additional job opportunities, which could contribute positively to income, economic security and wider health outcomes across a broader labour market. In this respect, Option 3 has the potential to further support the reduction of health inequalities by increasing access to employment, particularly for those able to access strategic locations by car. However, compared to Option 2, the additional strategic sites are generally less closely related to existing settlements and healthcare facilities. While access to healthcare is not a primary consideration for employment development, this reduced proximity limits opportunities for employees to access services before or after work, representing a small adverse change relative to Option 2. It is worth noting though that strategic housing growth could come forward at these locations, which would better link new homes and jobs in this regard for some people.

The strategic sites also introduce a greater potential for environmental pressures, including increased traffic, noise and air quality effects associated with large-scale B8 uses. These factors could negatively affect workforce wellbeing and the surrounding environment if not effectively mitigated. While there may be opportunities to incorporate green infrastructure within these sites, the overall working environment is likely to be more industrial in character than the local employment sites included under Option 2. Therefore, a mix of effects are predicted. **Minor negative effects** are predicted with regards to amenity and safety issues, and **significant positive effects** with regards to likely improved health outcomes.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Facilities / accessibility	+	++?	++
Amenity	?	?	-

2. Population and Housing

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

Option 1 includes a single employment-only site located adjacent to the existing settlement of Glenfield. The scale of development is limited at around 20ha and does not include any housing provision. As a result, the option has no direct role in meeting housing needs or influencing population growth. While the provision of employment may indirectly support the existing population, the absence of residential development means impacts on population and housing are minimal. Overall, **neutral effects** are expected.

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 increases the scale of development and introduces employment sites alongside planned housing growth at Stoney Stanton and Whetstone, in addition to the employment-only site at Glenfield. This represents a shift from purely employment-focused development towards a more mixed-use approach in some locations.

The inclusion of employment alongside housing for three of the sites (accounting for around half of the total employment land supply) has the potential to support local population needs and provide opportunities for people to live closer to where they work. However, it is not anticipated that the increase in employment land provision would drive significant changes in population or housing demand locally over the plan-period. Therefore, **neutral effects** are expected.

As the mixed-use sites provide housing, but not at a scale that materially influences population change or housing delivery overall in the plan period,

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

Option 3 builds on Option 2 through the inclusion of strategic B8 employment-only sites, increasing the overall quantum of employment land but not introducing any additional housing beyond that already identified. As these additional sites are employment-only (And longer term prospects), they do not significantly alter the housing or population implications established under Option 2. The balance between housing and employment remains largely unchanged, albeit with a stronger emphasis on strategic employment. Whilst there could be some attraction for labour for surrounding areas, it is unlikely to significantly drive housing growth further than projected needs. Therefore, effects are anticipated to be **neutral** for population and housing.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population and housing	0	0	0

3. Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

Option 1 focuses employment development on a single site located north of Glenfield. The site is not subject to statutory biodiversity designations and does not overlap with Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSIs), SACs, SPAs or Ramsar sites. The nearest SSSI (Sheet Hedges Wood) is located over 1.4 km away, indicating a degree of separation from nationally designated biodiversity assets (and limited direct pathways for impacts such as recreational pressure or disturbance).

The site, however, contains Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs), such as Meadow at Glenfield and is in close proximity to others such as Rothley Brook, as well as Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) especially along the north boundary of the site, mature trees, and hedgerows. These features suggest that the site has existing biodiversity value at a local level, particularly in terms of linear habitats and connectivity. Employment development would have the potential to affect these features if not sensitively designed, particularly through land take and increased disturbance.

As a previously undeveloped site, there is potential for biodiversity loss at a local scale. However, the relatively limited scale of development under Option 1 means impacts would be spatially contained. There is also clear potential to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) through retention and enhancement of existing trees and hedgerows, alongside the creation of new green infrastructure within the site.

It is anticipated that, due to the existing value of the site in terms of biodiversity and the potential impacts of employment development in the area, that there will be potential / uncertain **minor negative effects**. Whilst mitigation should allow for significant effects to be avoided, there is likely to be permanent loss of biodiversity, which has integrated into the urban areas.

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 introduces employment development across multiple sites, increasing the overall land area affected and the potential for impacts on biodiversity. None of the sites directly overlap with statutory biodiversity designations, and distances to SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites are generally substantial, reducing the likelihood of direct effects on designated sites.

The sites that are included beyond Option 1 are less constrained than the first site, however Whetstone Pastures contains a number of LWS, notably the Dismantled Railway & Whetstone Gorse, as well as Willoughby Waterleys Meadow, and others including mature trees. However, it is acknowledged that the lower level of employment land, on large strategic sites, means that there is room to avoid effects.

There are hedgerows, trees, and watercourses that go through some of the sites, indicating a moderate local biodiversity value, with potential impacts arising from habitat loss, fragmentation and disturbance associated with employment uses. The cumulative effect of development across multiple sites increases the risk of incremental loss of locally important habitats.

The dispersed nature of development also makes consistent biodiversity enhancement more challenging. While individual sites offer opportunities for BNG through landscape buffers, retained hedgerows and green infrastructure, the overall increase in land take compared to Option 1 means that biodiversity pressures are greater, even with mitigation in place.

Overall, it is anticipated that there will be **minor negative impacts**, due to increased cumulative impacts on local biodiversity assets, however it is noted that there are opportunities for BNG, but a greater overall loss of existing habitat.

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

Option 3 builds on Option 2 through the inclusion of additional strategic employment sites, including the strategic B8 site southwest of M69 Junction 2 and the strategic B8 element at Whetstone Pastures. These sites represent a notable increase in scale and introduce development in locations closer to sensitive biodiversity assets.

The site southwest of M69 Junction 2 is located very close to Burbage Common and Woods SSSI and adjacent to a number of LWS, increasing the potential risk of indirect effects such as disturbance, air quality impacts and habitat fragmentation. The industrial nature of B8 development, including large-scale built form and HGV activity, heightens the potential pressure on nearby biodiversity receptors compared to smaller local employment sites.

The expansion of employment development at Whetstone Pastures further increases cumulative impacts on LWS, hedgerows and green corridors identified in the area. While these larger sites may offer scope to incorporate significant areas of green infrastructure and deliver BNG in quantitative terms, this potential must be balanced against the higher baseline biodiversity value and proximity to sensitive receptors. The site is large, and so the potential for enhancement elsewhere could be a possibility, but this becomes more problematic if housing is also proposed, as the overall area of development would need to increase. Therefore, minor negative effects are predicted at this stage.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?	-	-

4. Cultural Heritage

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

Option 1 focuses employment development on land north of Glenfield. The site does not overlap with any designated heritage assets and is not located within a conservation area. The nearest heritage assets are a Scheduled Monument, the moated site and garden enclosure at Glenfield and Conservation Area both of which are located around 65 metres to the south of the site, indicating a close spatial relationship that could give rise to setting effects.

There are several listed buildings in the surrounding area, including Grade II listed buildings within Glenfield, although no listed buildings are located within the site itself. The proximity of these assets means that development could affect their setting, particularly through changes in land use and the introduction of large-scale employment buildings. However, the relatively limited scale of development under Option 1 reduces the extent of potential impacts.

There are no direct overlaps with Registered Battlefields or Registered Parks and Gardens. Given the site's relationship with existing urban development, the historic environment in this location is already influenced by modern land uses, which limits the sensitivity of the wider setting. It is predicted that there are uncertain **minor negative effects** on cultural heritage due to potential impacts on nearby heritage assets, however no direct impacts or loss of designated assets are likely.

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 introduces employment development across several sites, increasing the number of heritage assets potentially affected. None of the sites directly overlap with designated heritage assets, and no Scheduled Monuments or Registered Parks and Gardens are located within site boundaries. However, Whetstone Pastures does contain a Grade II Listed Building in the north of the site, but the site is large in proportion to the level of employment land being allocated so development could hypothetically avoid this.

Several sites are located in proximity to Scheduled Monuments and listed buildings, particularly around Stoney Stanton and Whetstone, where historic village cores contain multiple designated assets. Whetstone Pastures in particular is adjacent to Willoughby Waterleys Conservation Area, which may affect the character and appearance of the designated area. Development at the edge of these settlements has the potential to affect the setting of heritage assets, especially where large-scale employment buildings contrast with historic settlement character.

Overall, it is anticipated that **minor negative effects** are more likely (compared to option 1) due to the increased potential for development to affect multiple heritage assets across several settlements.

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

Option 3 extends Option 2 through the inclusion of strategic employment sites, notably the site west of M69 Junction 2 and the strategic element at Whetstone Pastures. These additions represent a substantial increase in scale and introduce employment development in areas with different heritage sensitivities.

The site west of M69 Junction 2 is located within the wider setting of several designated heritage assets, including nearby listed buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens at a greater distance. While there is no direct overlap with heritage assets, the scale and industrial nature of B8 development increases the potential for longer-distance setting effects, particularly on rural heritage assets whose significance derives in part from their landscape context.

The inclusion of strategic B8 development at Whetstone Pastures further increases the cumulative pressure on the historic setting of Whetstone and surrounding heritage assets. Compared to Option 2, Option 3 introduces a greater risk of harm arising from scale and visibility, even where individual sites avoid direct impacts. However, whilst greater than Option 2, it is not anticipated that development through Option 3 would have major significant effects on cultural heritage, therefore **minor negative effects** are still predicted.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Cultural Heritage	?	-	

5. Waste

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

Option 1 delivers a limited scale of employment development on a single site. Employment uses would generate commercial and industrial waste, the majority of which would be managed through established waste collection and disposal systems. The site's proximity to the Leicester urban area means that existing waste management infrastructure is readily accessible, reducing the need for long-distance transport of waste.

The concentration of development at one location allows waste management to be planned in a coordinated manner, supporting efficient segregation and storage and collection of waste. The limited scale of development also constrains the overall quantity of waste generated. Overall, it is anticipated that there will be broadly **neutral effects**, with a relatively low level of growth in an area that is already primarily used for industry, having a relatively negligible impact on waste

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 increases the overall quantity of waste generated through the development of multiple employment sites across several settlements. This might place a greater demand on waste collection and management services, particularly where sites are more dispersed.

The spatial distribution of development reduces opportunities for shared waste facilities and may lead to less efficient collection arrangements compared to Option 1. However, all sites are located within areas that are served by existing municipal and commercial waste infrastructure. Overall, it is expected that there might be increased waste generation and greater demands on collection regimes due to dispersion, but broadly manageable, therefore **neutral effects** are expected.

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

Option 3 extends Option 2 through the inclusion of large-scale strategic employment sites, particularly B8 uses. These sites are likely to generate higher volumes of commercial and industrial waste, including packaging and operational waste associated with logistics activities.

The scale of development increases waste arisings compared to Option 2, and may require enhanced on-site waste management facilities and more frequent collection. While strategic sites may allow for efficient, purpose-built waste handling infrastructure, the overall pressure on waste management systems could be greater. Overall, **minor negative effects** are anticipated.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Waste	0	0	-

6. Minerals

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

Option 1 directs employment development to a single site north of Glenfield. Based on the available evidence, the site is not located within a Minerals Safeguarding Area and does not overlap with known mineral resources of strategic importance. As a result, employment development under Option 1 is unlikely to lead to the damage of mineral resources or constrain future mineral extraction. The limited scale and focused nature of development further reduces the risk of indirect impacts on mineral supply. Therefore, effects are likely to be broadly **neutral**.

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 introduces employment development across several sites, including Land West of Stoney Stanton, where part of the south-east corner of the site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for sand and gravel. Development of permanent employment uses in this location has the potential to sterilise safeguarded mineral resources, particularly where prior extraction has not occurred.

While not all of the site is affected, the presence of the MSA represents a constraint and introduces a risk that mineral resources could be lost to future supply. The remaining sites under Option 2 are not identified as being within MSAs, limiting the extent of impacts elsewhere. Overall, Option 2 presents an increase in mineral sterilisation risk compared to Option 1, driven primarily by the Stoney Stanton site.

Therefore, there are **uncertain minor negative effects** anticipated, with the potential for damage to safeguarded mineral resources.

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

Option 3 builds upon Option 2 through the inclusion of additional employment land. However, no new Mineral Safeguarding Areas are introduced, and the key minerals constraint remains confined to Land West of Stoney Stanton, which is already included under Option 2.

As such, Option 3 does not materially alter the nature or magnitude of minerals effects identified for Option 2, therefore **uncertain minor negative effects** are anticipated.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Minerals	0	?	?

7. Landscape and Soil

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

Option 1 includes one employment site at Land North of Glenfield. This site is located on the edge of an existing settlements and within landscapes that have been identified as having low to medium landscape sensitivity in the Landscape Study. As a result, the potential for significant adverse effects on landscape character is relatively limited.

In terms of soils, the proposed site includes areas of agricultural land, potentially including best and most versatile (BMV) land (Grades 1–3a). However, given there is only a single site under this option, the overall loss of agricultural soil resource would be low. With appropriate soil management measures, including soil handling and reuse, impacts on soil quality are likely to be minor.

The scale of development proposed under Option 1 is modest, reducing the risk of widespread landscape change or intrusion into open countryside. While some localised effects on landscape character and visual amenity are likely, particularly where development extends beyond existing built form, these impacts are expected to be minor and capable of mitigation through sensitive siting, landscape buffers and appropriate design. Overall, Option 1 is likely to result in a **minor adverse effect** on landscape, representing the lowest level of landscape impact across the three options.

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 introduces additional employment sites, including Land West of Stoney Stanton, Whetstone Pastures, and Land South of Whetstone. Several of these sites are located within landscapes assessed as having medium sensitivity, with some areas displaying features of local importance such as open farmland, settlement separation and valued rural views.

The increased number of sites under Option 2 also results in a greater loss of agricultural land, including potential areas of best and most versatile soils. While the scale of loss remains relatively modest, the cumulative effect across multiple sites could be more noticeable. Nevertheless, impacts on soils could be reduced through careful site design and layout, minimisation of land take and good soil management practices. Overall, impacts are predicted to be minor.

The increased number and spread of sites under Option 2 heightens the potential for cumulative landscape effects, particularly where development occurs within the same character areas as other development. The introduction of larger employment buildings may affect the rural setting of settlements and alter local landscape character if not carefully designed. Nevertheless, the scale of growth remains moderate and largely focused close to existing settlements. With appropriate landscape-led masterplanning, retention of key features and other landscape mitigation methods, the landscape impacts of Option 2 are considered to be likely but manageable, resulting in **minor negative effects** overall.

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

Option 3 includes all sites identified under Option 2 and additionally includes large strategic employment land at Whetstone Pastures (80ha) and Land West of Stoney Stanton (M69 Junction 2 36ha). These strategic sites are located within open countryside and affect larger tracts of landscape, including areas identified in the Landscape Study as having medium to high sensitivity, particularly in relation to scale and openness.

The scale and massing of development under Option 3 significantly increases the potential for substantial changes to landscape character and visual amenity, including increased prominence of large buildings, loss of openness and erosion of rural character. The concentration of development on strategic sites also increases the risk of long-term and cumulative landscape impacts, particularly where development is visible from key routes and nearby settlements.

The scale of development under Option 3 also results in the greatest loss of agricultural land, including likely losses of best and most versatile soils. The large, contiguous nature of the strategic sites limits opportunities to avoid soil loss, and impacts on soil resources are therefore more difficult to mitigate. While soil management and reuse could reduce harm, the overall magnitude of soil loss would be greatest under this option. Overall, **significant negative effects** are predicted in this regard.

While mitigation measures such as structural landscaping, green infrastructure corridors and careful building design could reduce impacts, the effectiveness of mitigation would be critical. Overall, Option 3 is likely to result in moderate to potentially significant adverse effects on landscape, representing the greatest landscape impact of the three options.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Landscape	-	-	--?
Soil	-	-	--

8. Environmental Protection: Water

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

The scale of development under Option 1 is relatively limited, allowing flood risk to be addressed through site-specific design measures such as sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and careful layout. Managing flood risk is important for the protection of water quality, as flood events can affect water in a number of negative ways.

Concentrating development on one site also reduces the cumulative risk of increasing surface water runoff across multiple catchments. There is no evidence of direct impacts on designated water bodies or groundwater sources.

With appropriate mitigation, the potential for adverse effects on water quality and hydrology is limited. Therefore, **neutral effects** are predicted, with some flood risk constraints – however impacts are localised and manageable through mitigation.

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 increases the scale and geographic spread of employment development, affecting multiple sites with varying levels of flood risk. The additional sites show overlaps with surface water flood risk zones, and some are located within or close to Flood Zones 2 and 3, increasing the complexity of managing flood risk.

The dispersed pattern of development raises the potential for cumulative impacts on surface water runoff across different catchments, particularly where multiple sites require engineered drainage solutions. While all sites can be designed to incorporate SuDS, the need to manage water quality and flow across several locations increases the risk of residual effects. No direct impacts on designated water bodies or groundwater sources are identified. However, compared to Option 1, Option 2 presents a higher overall level of water-related constraint due to its scale and distribution. It is also the case that additional employment land provision will increase the use of water and the discharge of wastewater, which puts some additional strain on these systems. Therefore, uncertain **minor negative effects** are predicted for the water theme.

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

Option 3 extends Option 2 through the inclusion of additional strategic employment land. However, the additional sites do not introduce significantly greater flood risk or water quality constraints than those already present under Option 2. As a result, while the overall scale of development increases, the nature and severity of water-related constraints remain broadly unchanged compared to Option 2. Therefore, it is anticipated that this option will have uncertain **minor negative effects**.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality	0	?	?

9. Environmental Protection: Air Quality

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

Option 1 focuses employment development on land north of Glenfield. The site does not overlap an Air Quality Management Area, with the nearest AQMA located over 1.6 km away. This indicates that the site is not located within an area currently experiencing managed air quality exceedances. Existing air quality conditions in the surrounding area are already influenced by urban traffic associated with Leicester and Glenfield.

Employment development would generate additional vehicle movements associated with commuting and servicing. However, the site's proximity to the Leicester urban area and good public transport accessibility provides some opportunity to limit car-based commuting. Given the relatively modest scale of development and the absence of nearby AQMA constraints, impacts on air quality are likely to be localised and incremental.

The site benefits from good access to public transport and proximity to the Leicester urban area, which provides some potential to limit car-based commuting. However, employment development would still generate additional vehicle movements, including staff travel and servicing traffic, which could contribute to localised increases in emissions on nearby roads. Given the relatively limited scale of development under Option 1 and its location adjacent to an established urban area, any additional air quality effects are likely to be limited, rather than resulting in significant deterioration of existing conditions. It is anticipated that **minor negative effects** could potentially arise given the increase in vehicle movements, but there is a degree of uncertainty.

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 distributes employment development across several sites. None of these sites overlap an AQMA, and all are located over 1.5 km from the nearest air quality management areas. This suggests that development would not directly affect locations currently subject to statutory air quality controls.

The increased scale and dispersed nature of employment development would result in a greater number of vehicle movements across the network, including commuter and servicing traffic. While this may lead to incremental deterioration in local air quality along affected routes, particularly at peak times, impacts would be spread across a wider area and would not be focused on known air quality hotspots. They would also take place against a backdrop of generally improving air quality across the District as indicated in the Council's Air Quality Assessment. Nonetheless, it is anticipated that **minor negative effects** are likely given the increase in vehicle movements associated with this growth option.

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

Option 3 extends Option 2 through the inclusion of strategic B8 employment sites, increasing the scale of development and the intensity of freight and HGV movements.

While the additional sites, including land west of M69 Junction 2 and Whetstone Pastures, are also located well away from AQMAs (over 8.5 km to the nearest), the nature of strategic logistics uses is likely to generate higher emissions per trip.

Compared to Option 2, Option 3 would therefore introduce greater overall traffic-related emissions, particularly on the strategic road network, but also on the local road network in the absence of improvements to access to the Strategic Road Network (SRN) near to the proposed sites. However, based on the available evidence, these effects would remain indirect and diffuse, rather than directly affecting designated air quality management areas. Therefore, **minor negative effects** remain.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Air quality	?	-	-

10. Climate Change

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

In terms of climate change, Option 1 concentrates employment development on a single site adjacent to the existing settlement of Glenfield and close to the Leicester urban area. This location benefits from relatively good accessibility to the local labour market and public transport, which provides some opportunity to limit car-based commuting and associated greenhouse gas emissions. The scale of development under Option 1 is limited compared to the other options, resulting in lower overall levels of traffic generation and energy demand. While employment uses would still generate emissions through commuting, servicing and operational activity, these effects are limited by the modest quantum of development and the site's proximity to an existing urban area.

Option 1 represents a contained pattern of growth, reducing the risk of unnecessary travel distances and supporting comparatively lower emissions relative to the higher growth options. Overall, **neutral effects** are predicted.

With regards to flood risk and other resilience factors, Option 1 focuses employment development on a single site north of Glenfield. The site is affected by areas of surface water flood risk, with small proportions of the site falling within the 1 in 30, 1 in 100 and 1 in 1,000 year surface water flood risk categories. There is also a limited overlap with Flood Zones 2 and 3, indicating some sensitivity in relation to fluvial flooding. Further the smaller scale of development reduces exposure to climate-related risks such as extreme rainfall and heat events. On balance, **neutral effects** are predicted in this regard.

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 introduces a greater number of employment sites, including Land West of Stoney Stanton, Whetstone Pastures, and Land South of Whetstone. The increased scale and dispersal of development under this option is likely to result in higher greenhouse gas emissions, particularly from construction activity and additional vehicle movements associated with commuting and freight.

An increase in employment land provision will likely lead to increased use of resources during construction, but operationally such developments should be more efficient than some older employment land. In this respect, one would expect per capita emissions not to significantly increase. The locations are accessible to an extent and could support sustainable travel, but an increase in trips is inevitable, and therefore uncertain **minor negative effects** could arise in terms of emissions from transportation.

Option 2 increases the scale and geographic spread of employment development, with all sites being subject to varying levels of flood risk. These sites show overlaps with surface water flood risk zones, and some are located within or close to Flood Zones 2 and 3. The dispersed pattern of development raises the potential for cumulative impacts on surface water runoff across different catchments, particularly where sites require engineered drainage solutions. While all sites can be designed to incorporate SuDS, the need to manage water quality and flow across several locations increases the risk of residual effects. This indicates a minor level of climate vulnerability, particularly in relation to extreme rainfall events which are expected to increase in frequency and intensity due to climate change. However, the majority of sites remain capable of accommodating mitigation measures such as SuDS, green roofs, and flood-resilient design. Therefore, **neutral effects** are predicted for this option.

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

The significantly larger quantum of employment floorspace, together with its strategic warehousing function, is likely to result in higher absolute greenhouse gas emissions from embedded carbon, increased HGV and LGV vehicle movements and employee commuting.

Although the sites will form part of comprehensive mixed-use developments, allowing for integrated masterplanning and potential delivery of sustainable transport corridors, the nature of logistics development typically generates a high proportion of road-based trips. Even with mitigations such as travel planning, bus infrastructure, last-mile delivery consolidation, and potential future uptake of low-carbon freight technologies, transport remains a contributor to emissions under this option.

The strategic sites may, however, offer opportunities that smaller sites do not, including sustainable design and layout to help minimise emissions. However, overall emissions are still likely to be higher than those for Options 1 and 2. As such, **a minor negative effect** is predicted with greater certainty.

Despite the larger land requirement, none of the additional Option 3 sites are significantly constrained by either fluvial or surface-water flood risk, meaning the option does not inherently increase exposure to flooding. However, the scale and form of strategic warehousing introduce additional climate-resilience considerations, as extensive hardstanding and large roof areas will generate high volumes of surface water runoff and reduce opportunities for natural infiltration unless permeable design features are incorporated. Because these sites form part of planned mixed-use communities, water management can be addressed holistically through integrated blue-green infrastructure, strategic SuDS networks, and landscape-led attenuation features, offering greater resilience than piecemeal development. Overall, flood-related impacts ought to remain manageable and the sites should be capable of accommodating appropriate mitigation measures, resulting in **neutral effects** overall in this respect.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Mitigation	0	?	-
Flooding	0	0	0

11. Economy

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

Option 1 delivers a modest level of employment land over the plan period, largely supporting industrial and warehousing uses, with no significant expansion of strategic B8 logistics provision beyond sites already committed. As a result, Option 1 would support continued economic activity and job retention but offers limited scope for economic diversification or step-change growth. The restricted scale of development may reduce the district's ability to respond flexibly to changing market demand and could limit opportunities to attract new investment, particularly in strategic logistics and higher-value employment sectors. Moreover, it will also necessitate the loss of an existing employment premise to facilitate access into the land to the rear of Mill Lane.

Further, the Land North of Glenfield site involves growth in an area that is already well connected to the M1, A46, and A50. The site is also located directly adjacent to the existing Mill Lane Key Employment Site (KES), as well as in close proximity to the Optimus Point KES and the County Hall KES, therefore relating well to existing KES, and would provide land to support local business growth. On balance, **minor positive effects** are predicted.

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 delivers a medium level of growth across four sites. This option increases the supply and range of employment land, supporting a broader mix of uses including industrial, warehousing and some office and R&D floorspace. The scale of growth under Option 2 improves the district's ability to accommodate business expansion, attract inward investment and provide a wider range of job opportunities for local resident. Overall, potential **significant positive effects** are predicted.

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

Option 3 builds on the economic effects of Option 2 through the inclusion of strategic B8 employment sites, notably the land west of M69 Junction 2 and Whetstone Pastures. These additions significantly increase the scale and diversity of employment provision, strengthening the role of the area within the sub-regional and regional economy. The strategic location of the land west M69 Junction 2-adjacent to the motorway site could support logistics and distribution uses that are not well accommodated within smaller, settlement-edge employment sites. This enhances economic resilience by broadening the employment base and attracting inward investment and supporting supply chains. The scale of development also increases the capacity to deliver a substantial number of jobs, including roles across a range of skill levels.

However, the economic benefits of Option 3 are more unevenly distributed than under Option 2. Strategic sites are less closely aligned with individual settlements, which may reduce direct benefits to some local communities compared to more locally focused employment provision. There is also a greater reliance on a specific sector (B8 logistics), which can reduce economic diversity if not balanced by other employment types. Overall, Option 3 represents a step change in economic ambition compared to Option 2, delivering strong growth potential but with a more strategic, less locally embedded character. It is considered that this option is likely to have **significant positive** effects, due to substantial increase in employment capacity, inward investment potential and sub-regional economic role, outweighing reduced localised distribution of benefits.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Economy	+	++?	++

12. Accessibility

Option 1 (Lower Growth)

Option 1 is located immediately north of Glenfield, giving it a strong spatial relationship with the existing settlement and access to a sizeable local labour catchment. The site adjoins the built-up edge of Glenfield and is close to the wider Leicester urban area, supporting integration with established infrastructure and providing good access to the workforce. Its proximity to several key employment spaces further enhances accessibility by utilising existing transport links and minimising travel times.

Public transport accessibility is strong, with a bus stop approximately 350 metres away on Church Road, offering opportunities for commuting by bus and reducing reliance on private cars. The site is also within cycling distance of Glenfield and western Leicester and adjoins National Cycle Route 63 (the Ivanhoe trail), supporting active travel for short-distance journeys. Reasonable walking and cycling access to key services further promotes non-car travel and limits the need for longer trips.

The site benefits from an accessible urban-edge location near employment opportunities in Glenfield and Leicester, although it does not directly overlap with designated employment areas. Currently however it is noted that there is no formal pedestrian access to the site via Mill Lane. While development would generate additional traffic during peak hours and through servicing movements, the scale proposed under Option 1 is relatively modest and concentrated in a relatively well-connected location. Consequently, impacts on the local road network are expected to be localised and manageable, with good potential for mitigation through travel planning and sustainable access measures, including local active travel improvements.

Overall, Option 1 performs well in accessibility terms. It is likely to have neutral effects on congestion, with some localised increases in peak-hour traffic, but these are offset by its strategic location and strong sustainable travel options. In sustainability terms, the site is anticipated to have a **minor positive effect** due to its good access to services, public transport, and proximity to a large urban labour market, supporting sustainable commuting patterns.

Option 2 (Mid Growth)

Option 2 distributes growth across several sites on the edges of Glenfield and close to Stoney Stanton and Countesthorpe / Whetstone, all of which have relationships with existing settlements. These locations provide access to local labour markets and established transport infrastructure, although accessibility varies between sites.

The sites are within reasonable walking distance of bus stops (generally 150 - 450 metres) providing opportunities for bus-based commuting. The proximity of sites to nearby residential areas also supports cycling and short-distance car journeys. However, the more dispersed pattern of development means that commuting trips are spread across multiple routes and settlements, increasing the likelihood of car use for employees travelling from further afield. Further, while most sites are well related to their host settlements, Whetstone Pastures is somewhat separated from the main built-up area of Whetstone, which may reduce the attractiveness of walking and cycling for some trips and increase reliance on vehicular travel compared to more directly connected urban-edge sites. However, it is noted that in the longer term, strategic development at Whetstone Pastures will create further connections between jobs and homes.

The increased scale and spatial spread of employment under Option 2 would lead to a rise in commuter and servicing traffic on local road networks. This may result in peak-time congestion on key local routes, particularly through village centres and at junctions already experiencing pressure. It is anticipated that there would be **minor negative effects** on congestion, as there would be increased traffic across several settlements, with potential for peak-time congestion on local routes. For sustainability, it is expected that there will be **minor positive effects**, with good overall accessibility to local labour markets and public transport.

Option 3 (Higher Growth)

Option 3 represents the largest scale of employment growth and includes strategic B8 sites designed to serve sub-regional and regional markets. The strategic site west of M69 Junction 2 benefits from some access to the strategic road network, albeit there is currently no access to the M69 to/from the south. Nonetheless partial access to the Strategic Road Network may make it attractive for logistics and distribution uses, but it is relatively remote from existing settlements and public transport.

As a result, employees commuting to this site are more likely to be car-dependent, and the nature of B8 uses would generate significant HGV and servicing movements some of which may need to use local roads to access the SRN. While the strategic employment site at Whetstone Pastures is closer to existing settlements and offers better public transport and cycling potential, overall travel demand under Option 3 would be higher.

The combination of increased commuter traffic and freight movements would place pressure on both local roads and strategic junctions, particularly around the M69 and key connecting routes, increasing the risk of congestion and delays. There will likely be a need for mitigation on junctions and / or new infrastructure to support improved access to development as well as enhanced public transport links to strategic growth.

Overall, it is expected that there will be likely **minor negative effects** on congestion, with expected increases in car and HGV traffic, with heightened congestion risk on local and strategic networks. In terms of sustainability, there is some road accessibility for freight, but schemes could lead to congestion or increased use of local roads including by HGVs. In addition, these sites have limited public transport access and higher car dependency, reducing overall sustainability. Therefore, for this theme minor positive effects carry a greater degree of uncertainty.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Congestion	0	?	-
Sustainability	+	+	+ ?

Table 5.1: Presenting the significance of effects

Type of effect	Likely	Uncertain / potential
Significant positive effects	++	++?
Minor positive effects	+	?
Neutral effects	0	0?
Minor negative effects	-	?
Significant negative effects	--	--?

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Health: Facilities / accessibility	+	++?	++
Health: Amenity / safety	0	?	-
Population and housing	0	0	0
Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?	-	-
Cultural Heritage	?	-	--?
Waste	0	0	-
Minerals	0	?	?
Landscape	-	-	--?
Soil	-	-	--
Water quality	0	?	?
Air quality	?	-	-
Mitigation	0	?	-
Flooding	0	0	0
Economy	+	++?	++
Accessibility: Congestion	0	?	-
Accessibility: Sustainability	+	+	+