

## Appendix 4 - Sustainability Appraisal Baseline Information for Mole Valley – Work in Progress updating May 2013

This appendix sets out the baseline and trend information illustrating the state of and quality of life in Mole Valley. It provides the basis to identify sustainability issues.

There are a number of indicators where baseline data is currently not obtainable at a district level and, where appropriate, alternative indicator information may be sought. For example Surrey county or South East regional data (ie including MV) may be a reasonable proxy in assessing some sustainability trends.

As the suite of indicators has been developed it has become apparent for some indicators that meaningful data will not be available. These have been deleted. Other indicators may have been subject to revision. Moreover there have been extensive changes to the amount of data that DCLG is requiring local authorities to report and some data sets have not been maintained or updated. In some instances the definitions of topics being reported have been revised such that previous trend information is no longer comparable or relevant.

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley (MV) Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Overarching Indicator</b>						
a. Ecological Footprint (gha = global hectares) (per capita = per person)	MV 2001: = 6.39 gha/cap 2004: = 6.30 gha/cap 2006: = 5.76 gha/cap	South East: 2001: = 6.1 2004: = 5.63 2006: = 5.09	UK 5.4 5.3 4.64	The world average is 2.2gha. At current world population levels 1.8gha per person is the equivalent to one planet Earth.	In 2006 Mole Valley's ecological footprint was the fourth largest in England. MV footprint is x3 planet Earth's.	A positive (ie reducing) direction but still significantly higher than United Kingdom average  REAP (Resource and Energy Analysis Program). University of York – Stockholm Institute  AMR 2011-12: Overarching Aim / Indicator

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley (MV) Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Social progress that recognises the needs of everyone</b>						
<b>1. To provide sufficient housing to enable people to live in a home suitable to their needs and which they can afford.</b>						
ai. Net additions to stock (net dwelling completions less other losses) (dwpa = dwellings per annum)	2006-07 = 581 dwpa 2007-08 = 269 2008-09 = 167 2009-10 = 115 2010-11 = 113 2011-12 = 235 2012-13 = 173 Average = 236 dwpa	None	Mole Valley Core Strategy set an annual average requirement of 188 dw/pa from 2006 to 2026.	Completions are above annual target.	Positive	Mole Valley housing completions data and AMR (H1 and H2 – former COIs).
aii. Number of years housing supply	At April 2009 = 5.1 years At April 2010 = 4.1 years At April 2011 = 3.3 years At April 2012 = 3.4 years At April 2013 = 3.9 years	None	Requirement to maintain a 5 year supply	Declining supply as building out of sites with permission is not being matched by level of new permissions	Negative	AMR and Statements of Housing Supply
b. Affordable housing delivered per year. Net new dwellings and as a percentage of total new dwellings.	2006-07 = 10 = 28% 2007-08 = 56 = 21% 2008-09 = 39 = 22% 2009-10 = 47 = 41% 2010-11 = 20 = 18% 2011-12 = 82 = 35% 2011-12 = 22 = 12% Average = 42 dwpa	None	South East Plan target is 35% of new housing being affordable. The Core Strategy indicates some net 950 dwellings between 2006 -26 (ie; 47dw/pa).	Numerical target has been met in 3 out of 6 years but overall 6 years average is slightly below the target..	Neutral	Mole Valley housing completions data and AMR  Policy CS4 requires delivery of affordable housing on site on sites of 10 or more. On sites of 1-9 a financial contribution is required.
c. Number of households on the housing register	Mar 2006 = 1,933 Mar 2007 = 1,933 Dec 2009 = 1,670 June 2012 = 1,430	South East: April 2006: = 195,700 April 2007: = 208,420 April 2008: = 203,200		Latest data indicates the number on the register is falling.	Positive (ie a reducing trend)	MVDC

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley (MV) Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Social progress that recognises the needs of everyone</b>						
di. Average property price compared against average workplace earnings	MV: Oct-Dec 04: = £326,011 Jan-Mar 08: = £398,058 April 2009 = N/A *  Average annual fulltime earnings: 2003: = £34,562 2007: = £40,308 2009: = £37,871  Ratio 2003 = 8.55 :1 Ratio 2007 = 9.88 :1 Ratio 2009 = N/A	Surrey Av. property price: Oct-Dec 04: = £285,619 Jan-Mar 08: = £384,127 April 2009 = £260,386 April 2011 = £295,201 Average annual fulltime earnings: 2003: = £27,692 2007: = £38,060 2009: = £32,673  Ratio 2003 = 9.77 :1 Ratio 2007 = 10.09 :1 Ratio 2009 = 8.0: 1	N/A	There is a large mortgage gap, making it hard for first time buyers to access the housing market.	N/A	Property price <a href="http://www.landregistry.gov.uk/public/house-prices-and-sales">http://www.landregistry.gov.uk/public/house-prices-and-sales</a> Land Registry data is now only available at County level  Information not updated - consider using earnings by residence from "nomis" as alternative? Or see Indicator dii below.
dii. Lower quartile housing prices against lower quartile earnings (ratio)	MV 2006 = 11.66 2008 = 11.01 2010 = 10.24 2011 = 10.17	England: 2006 = 7.15 2008 = 6.97 2010 = 6.69 2011 = 6.53		Whilst the ratio is reducing house prices exceed wages by a factor of 10 in MV compared to a rate of 6.5 nationally.	Negative – as although decreasing slightly in absolute terms the affordability gap is very significant.	<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/affordability-including-local-level">https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/affordability-including-local-level</a> Table 576
e. Number of unfit homes in the District	2001 = 22 (0.07%) 2003: = 9 (0.03%) 2006: = 0	South East: = 4.1% of stock 2006: = 3.3% of stock	Eliminate unfit homes in the district	The number of unfit homes has decreased.	N/A	Neighbourhood Statistics. Data set may not be maintained as "unfit" dwellings are now considered against a different range of hazard levels and which are not comparable.
f. The proportion of new homes with 3 or less bedrooms.	2001-06 = 71% (average) 2006-07 = 93% 2007-08 = 88% 2008-09 = 81% 2009-10 = 76% 2010-11 = 70% 2011-12 = 71% 2006-12 = 84% (average)	No data	East Surrey SHMA indicates 80% of market homes should be 1-3 bedrooms.	Target met as averaged over last 6 years but has not been met in last 3 individual years.	Positive – albeit recent trends indicate a fall off	Annual Monitoring Report Core Strategy Policy CS3

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley (MV) Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Social progress that recognises the needs of everyone</b>						
g Completion of Extra Care Housing (housing for the elderly) – gross units	2006 - 07 = 69 2007 - 08 = 10 2008 - 09 = 30 2009 - 10 = 0 2010 - 11 = 0 2011 - 12 = 4		No specific target	Negligible levels of housing for the elderly built in last 3 years	Negative	Mole Valley - AMR  Extra care housing is designed with the needs of older people in mind and with varying levels of care and support. Homes are self contained but have communal facilities available.
<b>2. To facilitate the improved health and wellbeing of the whole population.</b>						
a. Early deaths from circulatory disease and cancer	MV: Circulatory Disease 2002-2004 = 59 2005-2007 = 61 2008-2010 = 44  Cancer 2002-2004 = 99 2005-2007 = 84 2008-2010 = 95	England Circulatory Disease  2008-10 = 67  Cancer  2008-10 = 110	Govt PSA targets are to reduce death rates in persons under 75 for circulatory disease by 40% and cancer by 20% from 1995/97 baseline	Early deaths from circulatory disease and cancer in Mole Valley are lower than national rates.	Positive – circulatory disease. Declining figures and below national rates.  Positive – Cancer. Below national rates but fluctuating reduction.	Regional Monitoring Report 2008 NHS Mole Valley Health Profile 2012 (3 yearly figures - local value figure used) <a href="http://www.healthprofiles.info">www.healthprofiles.info</a>  Check if this data is now on Surrey.
b. Infant mortality rates -IMR (per thousand live births) (rates calculated over 2 year average)	MV: 2004-06 = 2.1 2005-07 = 2.0 2008-10 = 1.9	England: 2004-06 = 5.0 2005-07 = 4.9 2008-10 = 4.6	To see an improving trend	IMR is significantly below national average and continues to decline.	Positive	Regional Monitoring Report 2008 NHS Mole Valley Health Profiles <a href="http://www.healthprofiles.info">www.healthprofiles.info</a>
c. Conceptions among girls under 18 (per thousand)	MV: 2004-06 = 18.1 2005-07 = 18.7 2008-10 = 20.2	England: 2004-06 = 41.1 2005-07 = 41.2 2008-10 = 38.1	PSA target is to reduce conception rate by 50% by 2010 (Q – what baseline?)	The rate is significantly lower than national average but is not decreasing.	Neutral	Regional Monitoring Report 2007 and 2008 NHS Mole Valley Health Profiles <a href="http://www.healthprofiles.info">www.healthprofiles.info</a>  <a href="http://www.apho.org.uk/default.aspx?QN=HP_DATAABLES">http://www.apho.org.uk/default.aspx?QN=HP_DATAABLES</a>

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley (MV) Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments																														
<b>Social progress that recognises the needs of everyone</b>																																				
d. Life expectancy (years)	MV: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>M</th> <th>F</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>77.7</td> <td>82.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-06</td> <td>79.9</td> <td>83.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-07:</td> <td>79.8</td> <td>83.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008-10</td> <td>81.0</td> <td>84.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		M	F	2001	77.7	82.6	2004-06	79.9	83.4	2005-07:	79.8	83.9	2008-10	81.0	84.2	England: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>M</th> <th>F</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-06</td> <td>77.3</td> <td>81.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-07:</td> <td>77.6</td> <td>81.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008-10</td> <td>78.6</td> <td>82.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		M	F	2001	-	-	2004-06	77.3	81.5	2005-07:	77.6	81.8	2008-10	78.6	82.6	To see an improving trend	Life expectancy is above the regional and national averages and is increasing for both males and females.	Positive	See also Surrey County Planning Profile of Surrey. Regional Monitoring Report 2007. NHS – Mole Valley Health Profile 2008 and 2012. <a href="http://www.apho.org.uk/default.aspx?QN=HP_DATATABLES">http://www.apho.org.uk/default.aspx?QN=HP_DATATABLES</a>
	M	F																																		
2001	77.7	82.6																																		
2004-06	79.9	83.4																																		
2005-07:	79.8	83.9																																		
2008-10	81.0	84.2																																		
	M	F																																		
2001	-	-																																		
2004-06	77.3	81.5																																		
2005-07:	77.6	81.8																																		
2008-10	78.6	82.6																																		
e. Percentage of people whose health is classed as good	MV <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001:</td> <td>= 74.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011:</td> <td>= 85.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2001:	= 74.2%	2011:	= 85.2%	Surrey England <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001</td> <td>74.5%</td> <td>68.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011:</td> <td>-</td> <td>81.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2001	74.5%	68.8%	2011:	-	81.4%	To see an improving trend		Positive	Census 2001: General Health (UV20) Census 2011: KS301																				
2001:	= 74.2%																																			
2011:	= 85.2%																																			
2001	74.5%	68.8%																																		
2011:	-	81.4%																																		
f. Number of new healthcare facilities provided and the number lost to alternative uses	2006-07: New modern Medwyn Surgery at Reigate Rd, Dorking, replaced older premises at Moores Road.	No losses in period to 2012.	No specific target		Neutral																															
g. Rate of physical activity Sport England: adult participation in 30 minutes moderate intensity sport*  * Sport England defines this as 1 session a week or at least 4 sessions in the previous 28 days.	MV: <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005-06 = 35.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006-07 = -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08 = 39.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008-09 = 38.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009-10 = 35.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-11 = 38.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12 = 43.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2005-06 = 35.5%	2006-07 = -	2007-08 = 39.7	2008-09 = 38.0	2009-10 = 35.8	2010-11 = 38.0	2011-12 = 43.8	South East England <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>36.7</td> <td>34.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>38.0</td> <td>35.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>36.9</td> <td>35.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>37.0</td> <td>35.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>35.7</td> <td>34.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>37.3</td> <td>35.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	36.7	34.2	-	-	38.0	35.8	36.9	35.7	37.0	35.3	35.7	34.8	37.3	35.7	National target not identified	Mole Valley Sport England figures are above both South East and national rates of participation	Positive	Sport England Active People Survey (replaces NI 8)  <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/research/active_people_survey/active_people_survey_6/key_results_for_aps6_q2.aspx">http://www.sportengland.org/research/active_people_survey/active_people_survey_6/key_results_for_aps6_q2.aspx</a>									
2005-06 = 35.5%																																				
2006-07 = -																																				
2007-08 = 39.7																																				
2008-09 = 38.0																																				
2009-10 = 35.8																																				
2010-11 = 38.0																																				
2011-12 = 43.8																																				
36.7	34.2																																			
-	-																																			
38.0	35.8																																			
36.9	35.7																																			
37.0	35.3																																			
35.7	34.8																																			
37.3	35.7																																			
h) Access to open space /greenspace:	See 5d																																			

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley (MV) Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Social progress that recognises the needs of everyone</b>						
<b>3. To reduce poverty and social exclusion.</b>						
a. Proportion of children living in poverty*	MV: 2010                      7.9%	Surrey                      England 10.2%                      20.6%		Mole Valley is below the regional and national averages	N/A	<a href="http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/PprofileLocateTool.aspx">http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/PprofileLocateTool.aspx</a>  * proportion of children in families in receipt of out of work benefits where income is less than 60% of median income. NI 116 now superseded.
b. Percentage of population of working age who are claiming key benefits	MV: 2006*                      6.2% 2007                      6.0 2008                      6.0 2009                      7.0 2010                      7.5 2011                      7.1 2012 (Feb*)              7.2 2012 (Nov)              6.8	South East                      GB 9.5%                      14% 9.4                      13.7 9.1                      13.3 10.6                      14.8 10.9                      15.0 10.6                      14.7 10.9                      15.0 10.3                      14.1		Whilst MV figures are rising they are only half the national rate.	Negative – against local rising trend  Positive – compared to national position	NOMIS: <u>Total</u> claimants data figures <a href="https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/203843182/5/report.aspx">https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/203843182/5/report.aspx</a>  *Data at Feb each year and then latest figures
ci. Number of claimants age 16+ who are income deprived (Income Support claimants).	2004 = 1,090 2006 = 1,010 2008 = 1,020 2010 = 930			A reducing number of claimants. However information is not up to date. Refer to Housing benefit claimants below for comparison.	Positive	Neighbourhood Statistics  * No certainty that the figures are comparing like with like.
cii Housing Benefit claimants	2009 (Aug) = 3,220 2010 = 3,400 2011 = 3,470 2012 = 3,640			Increasing trend	Negative	<a href="http://83.244.183.193/hb_la/#view=hblaview8&amp;selectedWafers=0&amp;selectedColumns=0,53">http://83.244.183.193/hb_la/#view=hblaview8&amp;selectedWafers=0&amp;selectedColumns=0,53</a>
d. Average rank for Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD).	MV 2004: = ranked 351 2007: = ranked 339 2010 = ranked 310	Surrey Average 330 - - (MV 4 <sup>th</sup> best in Surrey local authority rankings)  Surrey county is the 5 <sup>th</sup> least deprived County/Unitary authority (144 <sup>th</sup> out of 149).	Districts in England are ranked 1 to 354 with 1 being most deprived and 354 the least deprived.	Surreyi / JSNA paper comments that MV's change in ranking is due to improvements in other local authority areas and not due to an increase in deprivation.	Neutral	ONS: IMD Statistics <a href="http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/ViewPage1.aspx?C=Resource&amp;ResourceID=766&amp;cookieCheck=true">http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/VViewPage1.aspx?C=Resource&amp;ResourceID=766&amp;cookieCheck=true</a>  IMD 2007 and 2010 methodology is the same but 2004 may not be directly comparable.

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley (MV) Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Social progress that recognises the needs of everyone</b>						
e. Percentage of pupils achieving five or more A*-C GCSEs (by location of pupil residence) <u>incl Maths and English</u>	MV: 2006-07 = 62.6 2007-08 = 61.0 2008-09 = 59.9 2009-10 = 63.2 2010-11 = 66.8	S East: 49.4 England: 45.5 51.8 47.8 53.7 50.7 57.5 55.1 59.6 58.2		Generally improving performance (albeit grade inflation?) and performance better than regional and national rates	Positive	Neighbourhood Statistics  <a href="http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?adminCompAndTimeId=23910%3A220&amp;a=3&amp;b=277121&amp;c=mole&amp;d=13&amp;r=1&amp;e=5&amp;f=23763&amp;o=243&amp;q=490789&amp;i=1001x1003x1004x1005&amp;l=1983&amp;m=0&amp;s=1353077342335&amp;enc=1">http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?adminCompAndTimeId=23910%3A220&amp;a=3&amp;b=277121&amp;c=mole&amp;d=13&amp;r=1&amp;e=5&amp;f=23763&amp;o=243&amp;q=490789&amp;i=1001x1003x1004x1005&amp;l=1983&amp;m=0&amp;s=1353077342335&amp;enc=1</a>  5 GCSE's incl English and Maths reflects former NI 75
fi. Qualifications: % of working age population qualified to NVQ2 and above (GCSE's and higher)	MV 2006 = 76.2 2007 = 70.9 2008 = 74.6 2009 = 77.1 2010 = 85.2 2011 = 77.8	SE GB 67.6 63.6 67.8 64.2 67.7 63.9 69.0 65.4 70.7 67.2 73.3 69.7		MV population is more qualified than the regional and national averages at NVQ2	Positive	NOMIS data: ONS annual population survey. Working age population = 16-64 <a href="https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/imp/la/contents.aspx">https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/imp/la/contents.aspx</a>
fii. Qualifications: % of working age population qualified to NVQ4 and above (Degree and higher)	MV 2006 = 44.0 2007 = 47.0 2008 = 46.6 2009 = 41.6 2010 = 46.0 2011 = 39.2	SE GB 30.3 27.4 30.7 28.5 31.0 28.6 32.6 29.9 33.9 31.3 36.2 32.9		MV population is more qualified than the regional and national averages at NVQ4. Reason for sharp decline in 2011 not known	Positive – with regard to regional and national comparators. Negative – with regard to recent decline.	NOMIS data: ONS annual population survey. Working age population = 16-64 <a href="https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/imp/la/contents.aspx">https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/imp/la/contents.aspx</a>
g. Proportion of adults with poor literacy and numeracy skills <i>(Figures relate to proportion of adults with skills levels below: EL3 - Entry Level 3 being level expected of 11 year old L2 – Level 2 equivalent to GCSE Grades A-C)</i>	MV 2003 Literacy EL3 = 5% L2 = 57%  Numeracy EL3 = 35% L2 = 32%	2003 SE Eng Literacy EL3 = 5% 16% L2 = 53% 56%  Numeracy EL3 = 26% 21% L2 = 31% 75%		Mole Valley EL3 Literacy levels are lower than national figures but at L2 level are at the national average. Numeracy levels at EL3 are worse than national levels but for L2 are significantly better.	Neutral	Skills for Life Survey - 2003  Original website archived. Now BIS – has headline data but no local info; <a href="http://www.bis.gov.uk/asset/biscore/further-education-skills/docs/0-9/11-1367-2011-skills-for-life-survey-findings">http://www.bis.gov.uk/asset/biscore/further-education-skills/docs/0-9/11-1367-2011-skills-for-life-survey-findings</a>

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley (MV) Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Social progress that recognises the needs of everyone</b>						
h. Percentage of all respondents satisfied with the local bus service	MV 2008: All respondents = 33%  User Satisfaction = 42 %  (45% of residents have used the bus service in the last 12 months)	Surrey: 2003/04: = 33% 2006/07: = 49%	Surrey = 46% satisfaction by 2010.	Satisfaction is increasing.	Positive – though data is not up to date.	Mole Valley Place Survey 2008 Surrey Movement Monitoring Report 2007 Surrey Local Transport Plan Monitoring Report 8  <a href="http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/sccwebsite/sccwspages.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE_RTF/Transport+Statistics+for+Surrey?opendocument">http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/sccwebsite/sccwspages.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE_RTF/Transport+Statistics+for+Surrey?opendocument</a>
i. Local bus services (passenger journeys per year)	N/A	Surrey: 2003/04 = 25.8 million 2006/07 = 26.2 million 2007/08 = 27.2 million 2009/10 = 29.9 million	Surrey = 25.8 million by 2010/11	County target exceeded. The amount of journeys per year is increasing. Surrey County Council website indicates usage of buses has increased in Surrey against the national trend.	Positive	Surrey Movement Monitoring Report 2007 Surrey Local Transport Plan Monitoring Report 2008  <a href="http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/sccwebsite/sccwspages.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE_RTF/Transport+Statistics+for+Surrey?opendocument">http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/sccwebsite/sccwspages.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE_RTF/Transport+Statistics+for+Surrey?opendocument</a>
j. The number of recorded offences per 1000 people ▪ Violence against the person ▪ Robbery ▪ Burglary ▪ Theft of motor vehicle ▪ Theft from motor vehicle	MV  2010/11  11  0.3  4.9  1.8  4.0	England  2010/11  14.7  1.4  9.5  1.9  5.7		Levels of crime are below national rates	Positive	<a href="http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadKeyFigures.do?a=3&amp;b=277121&amp;c=RH4+1SJ&amp;d=13&amp;e=3&amp;g=490747&amp;i=1001x1003x1004&amp;m=0&amp;r=0&amp;s=1264164483903&amp;enc=1">http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadKeyFigures.do?a=3&amp;b=277121&amp;c=RH4+1SJ&amp;d=13&amp;e=3&amp;g=490747&amp;i=1001x1003x1004&amp;m=0&amp;r=0&amp;s=1264164483903&amp;enc=1</a>  2010 MYE as base
k. The proportion of people that live in fear of crime ▪ % very worried about burglary ▪ % high level of worry about car crime	N/A  N/A	Surrey: 2002/03: 9% 2004/05: 10%  11% 8%			N/A	<a href="http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/crimeew0304.html">http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/crimeew0304.html</a>  <a href="http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs07/southeast07.pdf">http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs07/southeast07.pdf</a>  No statistics found for updating



SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley (MV) Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Social progress that recognises the needs of everyone</b>						
▪ % high level of worry about violent crime	N/A	13%	11%			
▪ % high level of perceived disorder	N/A	15%	13%			
l. Pedestrian/ cyclists – number killed or seriously injured (KSI) per 100,000 population	Casualties per 100,000: Pedestrians: = 31.1 Cyclists: = 34.8  2006: Pedestrians: = 36.1 Cyclists: = 33.6	Surrey: 2002/03: Pedestrians: = 40.3 Cyclists: = 29.9 2006: Pedestrians: = 38.6 Cyclists: = 36.8			N/A	<a href="http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-safety/road-accidents-facts-and-figures">http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-safety/road-accidents-facts-and-figures</a>  No recent data
m. Road safety – All ages – casualties: killed and seriously injured (KSI) and slightly injured		Surrey: KSI                      Slight 2006 = 583            6,265 2007 = 598            5,524 2008 = 528            5,411 2009 = 571            5,184 2010 = 561            4,811		Generally declining (ie improving) figures	Positive	<a href="http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-safety/road-accidents-facts-and-figures">http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-safety/road-accidents-facts-and-figures</a>
<b>4. To minimise the harm from flooding.</b>						
ai. Number of properties* at risk from flooding (Zones 2 and 3)	District 2004 = 1,559 2009 = 1,563 2011 = 1,573		Prevent all inappropriate development in the flood plain		Negative – however all permitted / built sites require a satisfactory Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)	See AMR PDI 41 for commentary. *Using Addresspoint data
aii. Number of planning permissions (for dwellings) granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flooding grounds	No. of dwellings 2006-07 = 1* 2007-08 = 0 2008-09 = 0 2009-10 = 0 2010-11 = 0		No dwellings should be permitted contrary to advice	In principle target has been met.	Positive	* Dwelling in 2006-07 was outside flood zones when originally permitted
<b>5. To improve accessibility to all services and facilities and natural greenspace.</b>						
a. Proportion of development located in accessible areas* – Housing sites of 5+ dwellings.	2006-07 = 91% 2007-08 = 95% 2008-09 = 100% 2009-10 = 72% 2010-11 = 68% 2011-12 = 96%	Indicator doesn't state the actual amount of development and therefore only gives a partial picture			Neutral	See AMR's Annex 5  *Average accessibility to all services within 30 min by public transport. Core Strategy Policy CS18.

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley (MV) Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Social progress that recognises the needs of everyone</b>						
b. Accessibility by public transport, cycling and walking (percentage of population within 20 minutes travel time)	See Mole Valley Settlement Hierarchy (Oct 2008) which includes information about settlements with regard to the availability and access to such facilities. Also Core Strategy Community Facilities and Infrastructure Requirement : Position Statement Oct 2008.				N/A - No statistical / trend data available	The published Surrey Movement Monitoring Report 2007/8 only provides 30 minute data by public transport.
c. Number and direction (and distance) of journey to work movements: <u>% of resident population travelling less than 2km to work</u>	Total In-commuters = 19,636 Total out-commuters = 18,804 = 16.7%	England: = 20%			Neutral / <b>Negative</b> : in and out commuting flows nearly balance but overall high levels of commuting. <b>Negative</b>	2001 Census  Census data only available every 10 years
<u>% of resident population travelling more than 20km to work:</u>	= 20.1%	England: = 12.6%			<b>Negative</b>	
d. Access to open space, sport and recreation (and natural greenspace).	2007: 2,718 ha of natural and semi natural greenspace = 34ha per 1,000 population	2007: Elmbridge = 10ha per 1,000 Epsom and Ewell = 11ha per 1,000	The PPG17 assessment does not set a standard / target for access to natural / semi natural greenspace. The Natural England ANGSt standards are at para 5.19 of the PPG17 assessment. And the access to these re shown on maps in the document	Using population forecasts at 2007 then there will still be 32ha per 1,000 population in 2026	<b>Positive</b> Core Strategy para 6.5.1 states that provision is reasonable or good for most types of open space, sports and recreation facilities but there are some local deficiencies in the more urban areas. Deficits are offset by access to large areas of natural/semi natural greenspace	Mole Valley Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study 2007 (PPG17 Assessment)

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Effective protection of the Environment</b>						
<b>6. To make the best use of previously developed land which is not of high environmental value and existing buildings.</b>						
a. Percentage of dwellings built on previously developed land (PDL) (urban and rural).	2006-07 = 89.8% 2007-08 = 99.2% 2008-09 = 98.8% New PDL definition: 2010-11 = 74% 2011-12 = 82%	South East: 2006 = 76% England: 2007 = 79% 2008 = ** 77% 79%	Superseded national target was 60%	High rates of dwelling completions on PDL are being maintained.	Positive	In house monitoring. Annual / Authority Monitoring Reports. Government amended definition of PDL in revision to PPS3 and hence NPPF.
b. The amount of commercial development built on previously developed land	MV 2006-07 = 94% 2007-08 = 92% 2008-09 = 100% 2009-10 = 84% 2010-11 = 100% 2011-12 = 100%	South East  2007-08 = 75%		Rate of 100% reflects intent to recycle land. Rates below this reflect conversion of rural buildings rather than greenfield land.	Positive	In house monitoring. Annual / Authority Monitoring Reports.
c. Average density (Dwellings per Ha.=dwha)	MV: Sites 10+ All Sites 2006-07 = 50.9 38.9 2007-08 = 74.3 41.5 2008-09 = 54.8 36.4 2009-10 = 25.8 22.5 2010-11 = 41.9 22.5 2011-12 = 52.0 24.2	All Sites SE England 2006 = 37 41 2007 = 40 44 2008 = 38 44	Superseded target in PPS3 was = 30 dwha. South East Plan Policy H5 = 40 dwha. Densities should rise in the expectation of making the best use of land	Mole Valley – all sites average density is below national figure. However on sites of 10+ densities have exceeded targets..	Positive	In house monitoring. Annual / Authority Monitoring Reports.  May not be comparing directly given source of CLG = OS land use statistics
<b>7. To reduce land contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity</b>						
a. Amount of contaminated land remediated – as suitable for use?	Planning Data Part IIA strategy inspections		Part IIA strategy		N/A - No statistical / trend data available	Need to assess data sources: SCC Waste Planning? Environment Agency?. No Part IIA sites data. Data may not be available from Environmental Health information.
b. Area of grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land lost to development	No agricultural land has been lost to built development.		No loss of grade 1 or 2 agricultural land	No land lost.	Positive	In house monitoring

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Effective protection of the Environment</b>						
<b>8. To ensure air quality continues to improve.</b>						
a. Annual average of NO <sub>2</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub> , within Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA's) relative to national standards	No AQMA's within the district. Local monitoring indicates that air quality is within national limits.	2006 - South East has 14% of England NO <sub>2</sub> and 12% of England PM <sub>10</sub>			N/A - indicator not relevant as no AQMA's in the District	A significant proportion of annual mean PM <sub>10</sub> is derived from regional background sources and is outside of the control of local authorities
b. Level of vehicle emissions (100% in 1999)		Surrey 2003/04: =	Limit emissions to level specified below as% of 1999 level by 2006	Surrey was on track to meet the 2006 targets	N/A - No statistical / trend data available	Surrey LTP Annual Progress Report 2004 data only at a County level. No comparable data in Surrey LTP Annual Progress Report 2008 or Surrey Movement Monitoring Report 2007
1) Hydrocarbons		54.0%	35%			
2) Total oxides of nitrogen		60.0%	45%			
3) Particulates		77.0%	80%			
4) Carbon monoxide		56.0%	35%			
<b>9. To reduce noise pollution.</b>						
a. The monitoring of LEQ noise levels around airports	Total area covered by 66 LEQ and higher = 260.1 Ha  Addresspoints: May 2005 = 83 Jan 2010 = 87 Nov 2012 = 76		No increase in the number of properties affected.  Planning permission will not normally be granted for development sites in Category C (ie, 66 LEQ and above).	Mole Valley resists granting permission for developments in areas affected by high levels of noise and places conditions on planning permissions where necessary.	Positive – figures indicate a decline but this may reflect revisions to the data source rather than trend changes?	MV GIS -. Addresspoint may not be reliable nor a continuing data source. Analysis based on the 1996 noise forecasts - daytime data only. See Local Plan Policy ENV56.
b. The percentage of population <u>who</u> benefit from quiet road surfacing	No published Mole Valley data.	Surrey: 2004-05 = 11.3% 2005-06 = 13.7% 2006-07 = 16.8% 2007-08 = 18.6%			N/A - No statistical / trend data available	Surrey LTP Annual Progress Report 2008 Local Indicator 5 - <i>phrased as population who benefit from low noise surfacing</i>
<b>10. To reduce light pollution.</b>						
a. Number of applications and permissions for new floodlights which include a condition to minimise light pollution and spillage.	Between 2006 and 2012 10 applications including floodlighting and security lighting were received. 4 applications were refused or withdrawn. The 6 permitted applications all included conditions regarding the lighting type or hours of operation.				Positive	Wording of indicator has been revised and is based on Elmbridge BC's indicator.

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Effective protection of the Environment</b>						
<b>11. To improve the water quality of the rivers and groundwater, and maintain an adequate supply of water.</b>						
a. Percentage of rivers in the plan area whose biological quality is rated as "good"	River Mole 2000 = 55.8% 2002 = 47.2% 2004 = 52.1% 2005 = 60.7%	In 2006 77% of river lengths in South East were of good biological quality		Trend is positive but data is now elderly	N/A - No recent statistical / trend data available	Indicator reflects Audit Commission data which is no longer updated. See amended indicator below.
a. Biological grade of sample river length	River Mole – Dorking STW – Leatherhead (River Lane) 2000 = C 2003 = C 2006 = C	Grade A = very good (ie unpolluted) Grade F –bad (species tolerant of pollution only)			N/A - No recent statistical / trend data available	<a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk">www.environment-agency.gov.uk</a> "What's in Your Backyard".  Indicator reflects data available on Env Agency website
b. Percentage of rivers in plan area whose chemical quality is rated as "good"	2000-02: River Mole 2000 = 56.5% 2002 = 61.9% 2003 = 27.4% 2004 = 51.7% 2005 = 76.5%				N/A - No recent statistical / trend data available	<a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk">www.environment-agency.gov.uk</a> 'What's in Your Backyard'  Indicator reflects Audit Commission data which is no longer updated. Currently no data on Env. Agency website which would allow new indicator to be used.
c. Quality of groundwater	85% of Sutton and East Surrey's water supply comes from groundwater sources  In 2003, 99.76% of water quality tests complied with the regulations. In 2008 this was 99.93% and 2010 was 99.98%		Sufficient supply for essential services & environmental needs		Positive	Environment Agency Thames Region/South East State of the Environment reports.  See Sutton and East Surrey Water website for local data and key facts <a href="http://www.waterplc.com/pages/about/key-facts/">http://www.waterplc.com/pages/about/key-facts/</a>

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Effective protection of the Environment</b>						
d Water supply and demand balance	S&ESW Water Resource Management Plan includes a review of the supply-demand balance. It shows S&ESW currently has a surplus in resources for the dry year annual average scenario that is maintained throughout the planning period (2006 - 2035). There is however a deficit in resources for the dry year peak period. This is driving the need for additional demand management and supply side developments.				Neutral	Sutton and East Surrey Water (S&ESW) Resources Management Plan (2008)  <a href="http://www.waterplc.com/us/erfiles/file/WRMP_AR3.pdf">http://www.waterplc.com/us/erfiles/file/WRMP_AR3.pdf</a>
<b>12. To conserve enhance biodiversity and networks of natural habitat.</b>						
a. Extent and condition of land designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). • Percentage in favourable condition or in unfavourable – recovering	2004 = 84% 2008 = 91% 2010 = 99% 2012 = 99%	South East 2007 = 81%	No reduction in extent of SSSI and ensure that 95% of SSSI's are favourable or recovering condition by 2010 (national PSA target)	National target had been met by 2009	Positive	Data in See AMR <a href="http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/special/sssi/report.cfm?category=C,CF">http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/special/sssi/report.cfm?category=C,CF</a>  Natural England website: Quality of SSSI is generally out of Local Authority control, being primarily a land management issue.
b. Area	2004	2012:				
1. Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs)	855ha	867ha			Increasing area covered by SNCI designation	Positive
2. Sites of Potential SNCI	627ha	627ha				Neutral
3. Condition and management of SNCI's	Sites meeting conservation management criteria: 2008-09 = 39% of sites 2011-12 = 43% of sites				Increasing proportion of sites / area meeting conservation management criteria	Positive
						See AMR
						See AMR
						Surrey CC Report Single List Indicator 160

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Effective protection of the Environment</b>						
4. Local Nature Reserves	At 2000: = 4 Totalling 71.39 ha By 2006/07: = 5 Totalling 99.39 ha			The number and area of LNRs is increasing.	Positive	See AMR
c. Extent of ancient woodlands	2004: = 3,023 ha (11.7% of the district)  2011 = 3,237ha (12.5% of the district)	Woodland coverage 6,881ha some 26.6% of the district. Ancient woodland is 47% of all woodland			Positive	See AMR
d. Sites covered by Local Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)	2012 = 7		Enhancement and creation of habitat		N/A - No trend data	Biological Records Centre
<b>13. To conserve and enhance landscape character and feature, the historic environment and cultural assets and their setting.</b>						
a. Number of listed buildings, ancient monuments and conservation areas	Listed Buildings: 2004 = 992 2006 = 1,003 2009 = 1,007 2012 = 1,010  Ancient Monuments: = 27  Conservation Areas: = 28 wholly or partly within the district.	2012: Grade 1 = 6 Grade 2* = 45 Grade 2 = 959  Leatherhead and Dorking Conservation Areas have been extended since 2009. Increases total district extents from 398.4ha to approx 415.6 ha.	Not to see a reduction in these numbers		Positive	See AMR
b. Proportion of statutory listed buildings at risk	2004 = 1 (Brockham Lime Works) 2007 = 2 2012 = 2 (Ruins of Betchworth Castle and Brockham Lime Works)	Mole Valley = 0.2%  UK = 3.1%	To see this figure reduced	The number at risk is unchanged.	Neutral	Buildings at Risk Register (EHBRR): <a href="http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/heritage-at-risk/">http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/heritage-at-risk/</a>
c. Proportion of statutory listed buildings demolished or removed from the list owing to approved or unauthorised alternations.	2001 – 2008 incl. = None 2009 = None 2011-12 = 1*	* building demolished and removed to Weald and Downland Museum	For this figure to remain at 0.		Neutral	Mole Valley data

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Effective protection of the Environment</b>						
d. Proportion of scheduled ancient monuments at risk	1 (Betchworth Castle) out of total of 27 Ancient Monuments in the District: = 3.7%	UK = 18% of Ancient Monuments are at risk			Neutral	English Heritage  This may not be within LPAs control. Some AM's are at risk due to management issues rather than through development proposals.
e. The percentage of resident users satisfied with cultural assets	2003    2006    2008				Neutral	MVDC: General Survey 2006. Place Survey 2008 Indicator revised as Council data reflects those who are satisfied.  Data set may not be updated
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sport and Leisure</li> <li>▪ Museums / Galleries</li> </ul>	80%    71%    63% 64%    49%    56%					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Theatres / Concert Halls</li> <li>▪ Libraries</li> <li>▪ Parks and Open Spaces</li> </ul>	82%    70%    76% N/A    87%    81% 88%    83%    81%					
<b>14. To reduce the need to travel, encourage sustainable transport options and make the best use of existing transport infrastructure.</b>						
a. Traffic reduction (Percentage of 1998 value)		Surrey 2003/04:    104%	To limit traffic growth to 107% of the 1998 levels	From 2006 to 2007 traffic on all roads in Surrey increased by 0.3% compared to an increase of 1.3% nationally.	Neutral	Surrey LTP Progress Report 2004 Target 1 p.27 Surrey Movement Monitoring Report 2007/8  Surrey CC – Suggest reword indicator so that the reduction in the growth of traffic can be considered but to date no new monitoring reports.
b. Proportion of travel to work by mode	2001:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Car = 63.7%</li> <li>▪ Rail = 10.8%</li> <li>▪ Bus = 1.1%</li> <li>▪ Motor cycle = 1.0%</li> <li>▪ Bicycle = 1.7%</li> </ul>	Surrey 2001    South East 2006    2007 64.5%    73%    72% 10.6%    7%    7% 2.3%    4%    5% 1.2%    1% 2.2%    3%    3%			N/A - No trend data	2001 Census Regional Monitoring Reports 2007 and 2008  Awaiting 2011 Census



SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Effective protection of the Environment</b>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Walking = 8.5%</li> <li>▪ Other = 0.5%</li> <li>▪ Works at or from home = 12.6%</li> </ul>		8.0% 11% 10% 0.5% 1% 10.7%				
c. Proportion of schools with current travel plans	March 2005: 13 = 38% April 2009: 20 = 71% only 8 schools have still to submit travel plans	Surrey 2006/07: = 66% of schools have submitted travel plans			Positive	See AMR PDI 34  SCC LTP Annual Progress Report 2008
d. Length of cycle tracks and number of cycling trips		Surrey Cycling trips – annualised from 2003-04 base 2003-04 = 100 2004-05 = 100 2005-06 = 107 2006-07 = 103 2007-08 = 110	Surrey target is 106 at 2007-08	Number of cycle trips is increasing	N/A – No recent trend data	SCC LTP Annual Progress Report 2008 - LTP Indicator 3 -Annex 5 Rights of Way  No data about cycle track length in Surrey LTP 2008 – Annex 5 Rights of Way Improvement Plan
e. Accessibility by public transport, cycling and walking (percentage of population within 20 minutes travel time)		Surrey 2003/04:		Surrey is:	N/A – No recent trend data	This indicator is repeated at 6b. The published Surrey Movement Monitoring Report 2007/8 only provides 30 minute data by public transport.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ accessibility by cycle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centres 58.4%</li> <li>Schools &amp; colleges 75.1%</li> <li>Railway stations 82.3%</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ accessibility by walking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centres 22.9%</li> <li>Schools &amp; colleges 34.4%</li> <li>Railway stations 40.5%</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ accessibility by public transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town centres 28.7%</li> <li>Schools &amp; colleges 46.8%</li> <li>Railway stations 48.9%</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			60% by 2006 77% by 2006 83% by 2006  23% by 2006 35% by 2006 38% by 2006  40% by 2006 54% by 2006 65% by 2006	on track to meet target on track on track  on track on track on track  not on track not on track not on track		
f. Household transport by mode	MV:	Surrey: England		Surrey has highest levels of cars and MV is 3 <sup>rd</sup> highest in the County.	Negative – increasing car ownership	Census data
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ % of households without a car / van</li> </ul>	2001 = 13.1% 2011 = 12.3%	14.0%   23.0% 13.1%   25.8%				

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators		Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Effective protection of the Environment</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ % of households with 2 or more cars / vans</li> <li>▪ Cars per household</li> </ul>	2001 = 47.5% 2011 = 48.7%  2001 = 1.52 2011 = 1.57	45.4% - 1.46 1.51	33% 32.1% 1.10 1.16				
<b>15. To ensure the District adapts to the impacts of the changing climate.</b>							
a. Emissions of greenhouse gases, CO <sub>2</sub> (per capita emissions/tonnes) (Per capita = total emissions from all sources divided by MYE population)	MV 2006 = 9.8 2007 = 9.6 2008 = 9.2 2009 = 8.4 2010 = 8.5	S East 8.0 7.9 7.8 7.1 7.3	England 8.6 8.5 8.2 7.4 7.6	Reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions by 20% by 2010 from 1990 levels (Defra PSA). Reduction of 80% by about 2050 (Climate Change Act 2008)	Generally reducing figures which appear to have flattened off. MV figures higher than national and regional averages	Positive – in that rates are declining albeit above national rates	AMR PDI 40 <a href="http://www.decc.gov.uk/publications/basket.aspx?filepath=11%2fstats%2fclimate-change%2f6223-local-and-regional-co2-emissions-estimates-for-200.xls&amp;filetype=4#basket">http://www.decc.gov.uk/publications/basket.aspx?filepath=11%2fstats%2fclimate-change%2f6223-local-and-regional-co2-emissions-estimates-for-200.xls&amp;filetype=4#basket</a>
b. CO <sub>2</sub> emissions in scope of influence of Local Authorities (formerly; Emissions of greenhouse gases, CO <sub>2</sub> from Mole Valley Council operations –tonnes)	2006 = 656 ktonnes 2007 = 652 2008 = 633 2009 = 574 2010 = 591  Reduction of 65 ktonnes (a 10% reduction)			MV target is to reduce the Council's own carbon footprint by 35% by 2015 from 2008/09 baseline. Data from DECC no longer reflects the original indicator.	The Council is seeking to reduce its carbon footprint and reduce energy consumption and costs and to show leadership to the community by example.	Positive	MV Corporate Plan 2011-15 <a href="http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/11/stats/climate-change/6222-local-and-regional-co2-emissions-estimates-for-200.xls">http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/11/stats/climate-change/6222-local-and-regional-co2-emissions-estimates-for-200.xls</a>  <i>Data reflects former NI 186</i>
c. Number of homes damaged as a result of an extreme weather event (using subsidence / underpinning data as a proxy)	Building control starts for underpinning: 2006 = 10 2007 = 17 2008 = 5 2009 = 1 2010 = 2 2011 = 6 2012 = 2 (Jan - Oct)	Need to compare against national weather pattern in preceding periods to see if any trend.				N/A - no discernable pattern?	Subsidence data – building control starts for remedial works- eg underpinning used as a proxy indicator. MV BC data should include all schemes: unlikely private inspectors will do such schemes. MV BCO's -may not be a reliable indicator – use with caution

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Maintenance of a stable level of economic growth</b>						
<b>16. Provide for employment opportunities to meet the needs of the local economy.</b>						
a. Jobseekers Allowance (JSA) claimant counts aged 16 -64 unemployed for over 12 months.	MV: Sept 2006 = 45 0.1% Sept 2007 = 30 0.1% Sept 2008 = 25 0.0% Sept 2009 = 65 0.1% Sept 2010 = 115 0.2% Sept 2011 = 105 0.2% Sept 2012 = 150 0.3% Oct 2012 = 150 0.3%	GB 0.4% 0.3% 0.2% 0.4% 0.6% 0.6% 1.1% 1.1%		Increasing long term unemployed	Negative	NOMIS: JSA claimants  Data % is number of persons claiming JSA as proportion of resident population of same age
b. Percentage of people of working age* that are economically active	Feb 2004 = 82.5% Sept 2007 = 79.8% June 2009 = 80.2% June 2012 = 79.4%	South East: GB 82.1% 78.2% 81.9% 78.5% 82.4% 78.9% 79.3% 76.6%		Current activity rates are at the regional average but higher than national activity rates.	Positive	NOMIS Labour Market Profile: Mole Valley. Data from ONS National Population Survey.
c. The net change* in the number of VAT registrations and deregistrations	MV 2006: = 0.9% 2007 = 1.6%  2010 = -1.2% 2011 = -1.2%	S East: GB 1.9% 2.0% 2.8% -  England -1.6% -1.9% -2.2% -2.7%		Deaths of firms is exceeding births	Negative	Historic data on Nomis. 2010 onwards at: ONS Neighbourhood Statistics: Topic -Economic Deprivation: Business Demography *Net change figure is the proportion of end of year stock of VAT registered businesses
de. Average weekly earning for full time male and females working in the district ▪ :Fulltime males ▪ :Fulltime females ▪ For all full timers	2003 2006 2009 2011 £610 £655 £771 £777 £424 £402 £535 £516 £520 £551 £699 £690	South East 2011 GB 2011 £578 £541 £454 £446 £528 £503		Earnings are in excess of regional and national averages but indication of decline in wages.	Negative	NOMIS official labour market statistics - Labour Market Profile

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Maintenance of a stable level of economic growth</b>						
ei. Amount of floorspace in outstanding permissions for commercial development (at 31 <sup>st</sup> March each year)	Office/Business (B1a/B1): 2006 = 42,770m <sup>2</sup> 2008 = 42,050m <sup>2</sup> 2010 = 17,470m <sup>2</sup> 2012 = 10,360m <sup>2</sup>  Industry/Storage (B1c/B2/B8): 2006 = 15,780m <sup>2</sup> 2008 = 19,600m <sup>2</sup> 2010 = 19,290m <sup>2</sup> 2012 = 11,840m <sup>2</sup>			Declining amounts of floorspace in outstanding permissions indicating a tighter supply.	Trend not assessed - uncertain as to what extent a tighter supply is a positive or negative indicator at the local level.	Authority/Annual Monitoring Reports and MVDC monitoring - Schedules of Outstanding Commercial Permissions and Advertised/Vacant Premises
eii. The amount of vacant employment floorspace (at 31 <sup>st</sup> March each year)	Office/Business (B1a/B1): 2006 = 24,180m <sup>2</sup> 2008 = 19,930m <sup>2</sup> 2010 = 24,950m <sup>2</sup> 2012 = 31,840m <sup>2</sup>  Industry/Storage (B1c/B2/B8) 2006 = 4,640m <sup>2</sup> 2008 = 5,480m <sup>2</sup> 2010 = 8,930m <sup>2</sup> 2012 = 7,620m <sup>2</sup>			Offices: Increasing amount of vacant floorspace.  Industrial: Vacant floorspace has increased but the amount is considerably less than that of office floorspace. District figures mask a tighter supply in Dorking	Negative  Trend not assessed	MVDC monitoring reports - Schedules of Outstanding Commercial Permissions and Advertised/Vacant Premises  Vacant floorspace is for the main commercial areas only – ie Leatherhead and Dorking
eiii. Vacant employment floorspace ( offices, industrial and storage) as % of total stock - at 31 <sup>st</sup> March each year	2006 = 5.8% 2008 = 5.1% 2010 = 6.4% 2012 = 8.0%	DCLG consultation document: conversion of commercial to residential indicated a current regional and national vacancy rate of 9%			Negative – vacant floorspace rate is increasing but remains below national and regional averages.	DCLG (Inland Revenue) Floorspace Stats used for total stock and Mole Valley data of vacant floorspace.
f. The area of employment sites lost to other uses	2006-07 = 2.09ha 2007-08 = 0.12ha 2008-09 = 0.13ha 2009-10 = 0.43ha 2010-11 = 1.72ha 2011-12 = 0.18ha			Loss of employment land is mainly to residential uses. Generally low levels with occasional peak years	N/A - no discernable pattern	MVDC. Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) Figures may reflect the building floorspace converted to area rather than actual curtilage

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Maintenance of a stable level of economic growth</b>						
g. The number of rural diversification schemes (Commercial B1-B8 Uses)	2006-2008: 12 applications 42% permitted  2009-11: 18 applications 44% permitted			2009-11 includes repeat applications on same site so actual difference in proposals is low. Consistent rate of permissions.	Neutral	MVDC monitoring  Trends are consistent having regard to policy at that time (ie PPS7, then PPS4 and now NPPF).
h. Shop surveys (change in vacancy rates)	Dorking L'head 2006 = 4.4% 3.8% 2007 = 9.7% 7.3% 2008 = 11% 9.5% 2009 = 8.9% 8.8% 2010 = 8.8% 11.7% 2011 = 8.8% 11.7% 2012 = 8.2% 10.9%	The Council's own target is that vacancies should not exceed 10%.  At September 2012 the national retail vacancy rate was 14.5%			Positive – vacancy levels are below national rates and below or close to the Council's own target	AMR – vacancy rate at December of each year. Latest 2012 data at September 2012
<b>17. Support economic growth which is inclusive, innovative and sustainable.</b>						
a. Growth in Gross Value Added (GVA per capita)  Uses Surrey data as proxy for Mole Valley	Surrey 2002: £20,597 2005: £23,135 2006: £22,309 2007: n/k 2009: £25,432	S East £16,758 £19,373 £20,200 £21,200 £21,498	UK    £20,000 £20,498	Between 2006 and 2009 Surrey GVA increased by 14% compared to 6.4% across the South East region. Whilst trend is generally upwards Surrey indicates Surrey GVA fell by 3.1% (and in England by 2.2%) between 2008 and 2009.	Positive	Surreyi data set: <a href="http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/ProfileLocateTool.aspx">http://www.surreyi.gov.uk/ProfileLocateTool.aspx</a>  Keyword search = "GVA"
b. Number and percentage of resident population age 16-64 who are claiming Job Seekers Allowance (JSA)	MV Mar 2006 = 343 0.7 Mar 2008 = 246 0.5 Mar 2010 = 887 1.7 Mar 2011 = 714 1.4 Mar 2012 = 772 1.5 Oct 2012 = 689 1.3	S East 1.7 1.3 2.9 2.6 2.8 2.5	UK 2.5 2.1 4.0 3.7 4.1 3.8	MV rates had increased significantly but are now stable /reducing. Rates are below regional and national averages.	Positive – whilst rate has increased is significantly below national rate.	NOMIS – Labour Market Profiles: Mole Valley. JSA = people under pensionable age seeking full time employment.
c. Balance between labour supply and labour demand. (Job densities).	MV 2006 = 1.04 2007 = 0.99 2008 = 1.02 2009 = 1.01 2010 = 1.02	S East 0.82 0.82 0.82 0.80 0.80	UK 0.79 0.80 0.79 0.78 0.77	Data indicates that in theory there are an equivalent number of jobs in the district that could be occupied by residents.	Neutral	NOMIS – Labour Market Profiles: Mole Valley. Job densities are the total number of filled jobs divided by the residential population of working age

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Maintenance of a stable level of economic growth</b>						
d. The number of tourism related jobs (as % of total jobs)	MV No. % of jobs 2005 = 3,100 8.0 2006 = 3,400 7.6 2007 = 3,300 8.2 2008 = 3,200 7.7	S East GB 8.0 8.1 8.0 8.3 8.0 8.2 8.2 8.2	None	Numbers of jobs remains at consistent level and as a proportion of total jobs just below regional and national averages.	Neutral	NOMIS – Labour Market Profiles: Mole Valley. See also: Econ impact of tourism Mole Valley 2011 report by Visit Surrey / Tourism SE.
e. Number of residents working at, or from home	2001 Census: 1) Work at or from home: 12.6% 2) Work less than 2km from home: 16.7% 3) Work between 20-40km from home: 17.1%	South East: 9.9% England: 9.2% 20.4% 20.0% 16.7% 7.7%		A higher proportion of residents work from home than nationally but this would appear to be off-set by a higher proportion of longer distance commuters.	Neutral	Census 2001: Journey to Work. Awaiting 2011 Census data
f. UK competitive index ranking	MV 2010 = 9 <sup>th</sup> out of 379 authorities	South East is the UK's most competitive region. Mole Valley is highest ranked authority outside London. (Guildford 17 <sup>th</sup> ; Runnymede 18 <sup>th</sup> and Elmbridge 19 <sup>th</sup> )		Mole Valley was also ranked 9 <sup>th</sup> at the 1997 base-	Positive – high position maintained	Cardiff Met. Univ. - Centre for International Competitiveness: Index 2010. See also BBC Local Growth Reports and Surrey Economic Assessment

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments						
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>												
<b>18. To achieve sustainable production and use of resources.</b>												
a. Amount of energy (gas, electricity etc) supplied to homes - household/meter point	<p>MV</p> <p>Gas (KWh –rounded)</p> <p>2005 = 23,260</p> <p>2007 = 21,810</p> <p>2009 = 19,580</p> <p>2010 =19,420</p> <p>Electricity (KWh-rounded)</p> <p>2005 = 5,520</p> <p>2007 = 5,440</p> <p>2009 = 5,170</p> <p>2010 = 5,170</p> <p>Total domestic gas and electricity</p> <p>2010 = 24,590</p>	<p>S East      GB</p> <p>Gas</p> <p>18,990      19,020</p> <p>17,800      17,610</p> <p>15,540      15,380</p> <p>15,380      15,160</p> <p>Electricity:</p> <p>4,890              4,600</p> <p>4,740              4,390</p> <p>4,480              4,150</p> <p>4,470              4,150</p> <p>Total domestic gas and electricity</p> <p>2010 =              19,130</p>		<p>1) MV average <u>gas</u> consumption has decreased by 16% between 2005 -2010. The national decrease was 20%. However at 2010 MV gas consumption is 28% higher than the national average.</p> <p>2) MV average <u>electricity</u> consumption has decreased by 6% between 2005 -2010. The national decrease was 10%. However at 2010 MV electricity consumption is 25% higher than the national average.</p>	<p><b>Positive</b> – as MV energy consumption rates are decreasing.</p> <p><b>Negative</b> – given that consumption is still significantly above the national average.</p>	<p><a href="http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/energy_stats/regional/regional.aspx">http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/energy_stats/regional/regional.aspx</a></p>						
bi. Number and percentage of new build homes meeting the required Code Level	<p>MV:</p> <p>1) Completed dwellings meeting Code Level:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>No</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2010-11 = 43</td> <td>29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12 = 118</td> <td>45</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No	%	2010-11 = 43	29	2011-12 = 118	45		100% of eligible applications should meet the target	Increasing proportion meet the code level – however completions for the next few years will continue to include dwellings permitted prior to the requirement to meet the code..	<b>Positive</b> – increasing number and proportion of completions are meeting the code level.	AMR PDI 38a Monitoring of Core Strategy Policy CS19
No	%											
2010-11 = 43	29											
2011-12 = 118	45											
bii. Number of completed schemes and floorspace which met BREEAM “ very good”	No completions of schemes which were required to meet the requirement.				<b>N/A</b> – However the AMR 2011-12 comments positively that schemes permitted in the year have been conditioned to meet the BREEAM requirements.	AMR PDI 38b Monitoring of Core Strategy Policy CS19						
c. Waste collected per household (kilograms = kg)	<p>MV</p> <p>2008-09 = 427 kg</p> <p>2009-10 = 427</p> <p>2010-11 = 390</p> <p>2011-12 = 365</p>	<p>England</p> <p>571kg</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>431</p>		The amount of waste collected per household is decreasing	<b>Positive</b>	<a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/environment/waste/wfq23-wrmsannual/">http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/environment/waste/wfq23-wrmsannual/</a>						

SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>						
d. % of waste sent for re-use, recycling and composting	MV 2008-09 = 51% 2009-10 = 50% 2010-11 = 55% 2011-12 = 58%	England 36.4% - 41.5% 43%	1) Surrey Strat. Partnership 40% by 2011 and 50% by 2015 2) European target is 50% by 2020	Mole Valley has met the 2015 target	Positive	<a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/environment/waste/wrfq23-wrmsannual/">http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/environment/waste/wrfq23-wrmsannual/</a>  Formerly NI192
e. Household per capita / consumer consumption (PCC) of water	Sutton & ESWC supply most of the districts water. - average domestic household use per day 2005 = 700 litres 2008 = 475 litres Average consumer use has decreased from 185 litres to 160 litres per day.	Litres per day per capita/consumer: S East: 2006/07 = 152 2007-08 = 158 Nationally: 2007 = 150 (Ofwat)	To stabilise PCC of water at current levels. Long term target to reduce PCC consumption to 130 litres per day by 2030.	Domestic water consumption is decreasing. Mole Valley per capita water consumption is higher than regional and national levels.	Positive	See Sutton and East Surrey Water website for local data and key facts <a href="http://www.waterplc.com/pages/about/key-facts/">http://www.waterplc.com/pages/about/key-facts/</a>
f. The number of water meters installed	No MV specific data. However all new dwellings S&ESWC supply have meters fitted. Plan to retrofit 32,000 properties with meters in period 2010-15	S&ESW area: % of households with metered water supplies: 2006/07: = 23% 2011-12 = 38%		A planned slow increase in the amount of households with a metered water supply.	Positive	Sutton and East Surrey Water plc www.waterplc.com See also S&ESW Water Resources Management 3 <sup>rd</sup> Review June 2012
g Number and % of new properties linked to sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)	Completed dwellings with SuDS condition.  No % 2010-11 = 14 9 2011-12 = 81 32		Policy CS20 =100% of eligible applications.	Increasing proportion of completions as developments with SuDS condition are implemented.	Positive	AMR PDI 42 Core Strategy Policy CS20 Env Agency suggested using the national SuDS database to provide a baseline for the number and performance of SuDS schemes.
<b>19. To increase energy efficiency and the production of energy from low carbon technologies, renewable sources and decentralised generation systems.</b>						
a. Number of homes incorporating CHP heating	Howard Close, Ashtead - 35 flats completed Feb 2010				N/A – No recent trend data	(nb Refurbished Leatherhead Leisure Centre also has CHP)



SA Objectives and Indicators	Mole Valley Quantified Data	Comparators	Targets	Trend	Direction of Trend	Source and Problems/ Constraints/ Comments
<b>Prudent use of natural resources</b>						
bi. Installed capacity for energy production from renewable sources (KWe).  (Biomass, biogas/sewage gas, solar PV, wind, hydro)	2007 = 56 kWh	Surrey 2007: = 1,466 kWh  South East 2007: = 343,633 kWh	SE Plan NRM13 – by 2016 8% of electricity generation should be from renewable resources.. NRM14 – by 2016 Thames Valley and Surrey should generate 209MW electricity from renewables.		N/A – No recent trend data	<a href="http://www.see-stats.org/thamesvalley.htm">http://www.see-stats.org/thamesvalley.htm</a> Recent data combines Surrey with Thames Valley so no local data available  Mole Valley AMR lists sites with a condition to supply 10% of energy from renewables.
bii. Installed capacity for heat generation from renewable sources (KWth)	New Unilever HQ, Leatherhead = ground source heat pumps				N/A – No recent trend data	AMR 2011-12 para 4.95 lists major schemes with condition requiring 10% energy requirement from renewables. Annex 7 lists completed schemes.
c. Annual electricity production from renewable sources (GWh)	2006 = 1.03 MW  Mainly from electricity generation from landfill gas at Clockhouse Brickworks. [NB. A number of smaller schemes are generating 86 kw in total.]	<u>GWh</u> S East UK  2006 = 2,050 18,133 2011 = 3,029 34,410			N/A – No local trend data. Regional and national data shows continuing increase in electricity from renewables.	<a href="https://restats.decc.gov.uk/cms/historic-regional-statistics/">https://restats.decc.gov.uk/cms/historic-regional-statistics/</a>