# **Bibliography**

ADAS, Farming in London's Green Belt, 2005.

Andersson, J, Gallent, N, Oades, R and Shoard, M, Urban Fringe – Policy, Regulatory and Literature Research. Report 2.3: Green Belts, Bartlett School of Planning Report for the Countryside Agency, June 2003, p. 13.

Atkins, Saltaire World Heritage Site Environmental Capacity Study, July 2005. Accessed from www.bradford.gov.uk on 16 December 2009.

Barker K, Review of Land Use Planning – Final Report, HM Treasury December 2006.

Bath and North East Somerset Council, City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan, September 2004, Appendix 5 – Planning & Policy Framework, paragraph 18. Accessed from www.bathnes.gov.uk on 16 December 2009.

BBC News, 'National Parks target Ethnic Minorities', downloaded from <a href="http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4558809.stm">http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4558809.stm</a> on 21 October 2009.

Bristol Evening Post 19 September 2008, 'Carrot Crunch - Grow Your Own on my Farm'.

Catherine Bickmore Associates, 'The State and Potential of Agriculture in the Urban Fringe', 2003.

Commission of the European Communities, Towards a Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment. COM(2004)60 Final, 2004.

Commission of the European Communities, Commission Staff Working Document: Annex To The Communication From The Commission To The Council And The European Parliament On Thematic Strategy On The Urban Environment Impact Assessment, SEC (2006) 16, p.36. Downloaded from <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/environment/urban/pdf/sec">http://ec.europa.eu/environment/urban/pdf/sec</a> 2006 16 en.pdf on 3 November 2009.

Communities and Local Government (CLG), Local Planning Authority Green Belt Statistics: England 2008/09 www.communities.gov.uk/publications/corporate/statistics/lagreenbelt2008

England's Community Forests, Quality of place, Quality of life: England's Community Forests, November 2004, downloaded from <a href="https://www.communityforest.org.uk/resources/qop">www.communityforest.org.uk/resources/qop</a> qol.pdf January 2010.

Cookson R, 'Chew Magna: Is this greenest village in Britain?, Independent 6 March 2006. Accessed from www.independent.co.uk on 10 October 2009.

Country Landowners & Business Association, A Living Working Green Belt, 2002.

Country Life, 28 July 2008.

CPRE et al, A Countryside Friendly Smart Grid, March 2009.

CPRE, 2026 Vision for the Countryside, May 2009, p.6.

CPRE, The Great Landbanking Carve-Up, December 2006.

David Suzuki Foundation, Ontario's Wealth, Canada's Future: Appreciating the Value of the Greenbelt's Eco-Services. September 2008.

DEFRA 2004/5 Farm Business Survey figures.

DEFRA, England biodiversity strategy climate change adaption principles, 2008.

Eftec / Ecotec, Valuing the External Benefits of Undeveloped Land: Main Document, ODPM 2004, paragraphs 7.3.1 and 7.3.6.

Elson M, Green Belts: Conflict Mediation on the Urban Fringe, Heinemann 1986.

Elson, M, The Effectiveness of Green Belts, HMSO 1993.

Friends of the Ontario Green Belt, Tour de Greenbelt Cycles into Final Weekend, <a href="https://www.greenbelt.ca/greenbelt/visit/tour-de-greenbelt-cycles-into-final-weekend-family-fun-and-fresh-local-food-expected">www.greenbelt.ca/greenbelt/visit/tour-de-greenbelt-cycles-into-final-weekend-family-fun-and-fresh-local-food-expected</a>, dated 25 September 2009, accessed 6 October 2009.

Gallent N, Juntti, S, Kidd, S & Shaw, D: Introduction to Rural Planning, Routledge, 2008.

Gallent, N, Andersson, J & Bianconi, M; Planning on the Edge: The Context for Planning at the Rural-Urban Fringe, Routledge 2006, p.107.

Gill, S; Handley, J; Ennos, R; and Nolan, P: 'Planning for Green Infrastructure: Adapting to Climate Change', in Davoudi, S et al (ed): Planning for Climate Change – Strategies for Mitigation and Adaptation for Spatial Planners, Earthscan 2009, p.251-2.

Greater London Assembly, Cultivating the Capital: Food growing and the planning system in London, January 2010.

Hall P, 2007. 'Rethinking the Mark Three Green Belt'. Town & Country Planning, August 2007, p.229.

Hanley, N. & Knight, J. 'Valuing the environment: Recent UK experience and an application to Green belt land, Journal of environmental planning and management, Vol. 35(2) 1992, pp 145-160

Howard, E, 1898. To-morrow: a Peaceful Path to Real Reform, (reissued in 1902 as Garden Cities of To-morrow). Kessinger Publishing.

Land Use Consultants with Kernon Countryside Consultants, The Nature and Potential of Agriculture Around Major Urban Areas in England, report for Countryside Agency and partners, July 2006.

Land Use Consultants with SQW: Evaluation of the Community Forest Programme, final report for Countryside Agency, March 2005.

Land Use Consultants with the University of the West of England and the Royal Agricultural College The Implementation of National Planning Policy Guidance (PPG7) in Relation to the Diversification of Farm Businesses, DTLR 2001.

Land Use Consultants, Bringing the Big Outdoors Closer to People. Improving the Countryside Around London: The Green Arc Approach, Project Report. April 2004.

London Borough of Harrow, Harrow Green Belt Management Strategy, downloaded from www.harrow.gov.uk on 8 October 2009.

London Planning Advisory Committee, Damaged Land in the Urban Fringe, Land Capability Consultants 1990.

Midgely, J: Best Before – How the UK should respond to food policy challenges, IPPR North June 2008, p.15.

Moggach T, 'Supermarkets? No thanks', The Guardian 10 December 2008.

Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (<u>www.magic.gov.uk</u>).

National Care Farming Initiative, www.ncfi.org.uk/news19-1-09.aspx, downloaded 12 October 2009.

Natural England, omnibus survey on people and the natural environment. Questions on Green Belt were asked over a two week period in July/August 2009.

Natural England, Policy on Housing Growth and Green Infrastructure, February 2008.

Natural England, Technical Information Note TIN055 An estimate of the economic and health value and cost effectiveness of the expanded WHI scheme 2009 <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/TIN055\_tcm6-12519.pdf">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/TIN055\_tcm6-12519.pdf</a>

Newson S. E., Siriwardena, G. & Chamberlain, D., A comparison of bird abundance, population trends and species richness in greenbelt, non-greenbelt urban fringe and in the wider countryside – unpublished report, British Trust for Ornithology 2009.

Nitchel, R and Popham, F, Effect of exposure to natural environment on health inequalities: an observational population study, The Lancet Vol 372, Issue 9650, pp1655-1660.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (PPS7), 2004, paragraphs 24-25.

Planning Inspectorate, appeal decision 5 November 2008, Planning Casework Service reference APP/L0635/A/07/2047477.

Roy, D.B & Harrower, C.A, Bespoke analysis using UK Butterfly Monitoring scheme data; Centre of Ecology and Hydrology and Butterfly Conservation 2009.

Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI), Modernising Green Belts: A Discussion Paper, 2002.

South West Regional Assembly, Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) Examination in Public Panel Report, January 2008. Downloaded from <a href="https://www.southwesteip.co.uk/downloads/FinalSouthwestEiP.pdf">www.southwesteip.co.uk/downloads/FinalSouthwestEiP.pdf</a> on 7 October 2009.

Surrey County Council / Purple Conference: Greening the Green Belt – Proceedings of conference at Sandown Park, Esher, Surrey, 5 – 7 October 2005.

Tang, B; Wong, S; and Lee, A: 'Green Belt in a compact city: A zone for conservation or transition?', Landscape and Urban Planning 79 (2007), p.358.

Town & Country Planning Association, Policy Position Statement – Green Belts, 2002.

United Nations Environment Programme, Global Environment Outlook GE04 – environment for development, 2007.

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN Habitat), Planning Sustainable Cities: Global Report on Human Settlements October 2009. Summary available from www.unhabitat.org.

Urban Task Force, Towards an Urban Renaissance, Spon Press 1999.

Van Eeten, M and Roe, E, 'When Fiction Conveys Truth and Authority: The Netherlands Green Heart Controversy', Journal of the American Planning Association, 66 (1) Winter 2000, p.58 at 60-61.

Vidal J, '10,000 acres of Green Belt under threat', The Guardian 12 March 2007.

# **List of Figures**

Figure 1 – Key dates in Green Belt history	11
Figure 2 – Green Belts and Ecosystem Services are mutually reinforcing	13
Figure 3 – Map of Green Belt and major urban areas in England	15
Figure 4 – Public awareness of Green Belt land	22
Figure 5 – Public associations with the words 'Green Belt'	22
Figure 6 – Responses to statements about need to develop undeveloped land	23
Figure 7 – Landowner and professional views on whether Green Belt land is under used	23
Figure 8 – Land Cover of Green Belt, Comparator Area and All England	27
Figure 9 – Rate of development in Green Belt areas compared to England and the urban fringe Comparator Areas	29
Figure 10 – West Midland Green Belt	32
Figure 11 – Country Parks in the Green Belt	34
Figure 12 – Open Access Land in the Green Belt	35
Figure 13 – Density of Public Rights of Way in the Green Belt	35
Figure 14 – Visits to Green Belt land in the last 12 months	41
Figure 15 – Opportunities for sport and recreation in the Green Belt	44
Figure 16 – Map of Green Belt and national landscape designations	48
Figure 17 – Character assessment for Green Belt land	50
Figure 18 – The percentage of SSSIs in favourable or recovering condition in Green Belt areas compared to England and the urban fringe comparator areas.	57
Figure 19 – Map of Green Belt and sites protected for biodiversity and geodiversity	58
Figure 20 – Proportion of SSSIs at different sizes when compared to the total population	59
Figure 21 – Summary of comparison of bird species abundance and population trends between Green Belt, Comparison Areas and lowland England	61
Figure 22 – Summary of comparison of butterfly species abundance and population trend between Green Belt, Comparison Areas and lowland England	62
Figure 23 – Extent of agriculture and forestry in the Green Belt	66
Figure 24 – Agricultural land quality	68
Figure 25 – Area of land subject to Environmental Stewardship	69
Figure 26 – Percentage of Utilisable Agricultural Area subject to Agri-environment schemes in the Green Belt compared to all England and urban fringe comparator areas.	70
Figure 27 – The amount of Green Belt land covered by Environmental Stewardship schemes compared to all England and the urban fringe comparator areas.	70
Figure 28 – Green Belt and Higher Level Stewardship targeting	72
Figure 29 – The types of food produced in a local Green Belt that respondents would be most interested in buying?	73
Figure 30 – Attitudes expressed in surveys to buying local food from farmers in the Green Belt	73
Figure 31 – Land manager and professionals views on potential to market food grown in the Green Belt with a Green Belt brand.	73
Figure 32 – Attitudes to changes in land use in the urban fringe	74
Figure 33 – Percentage of Green Belt land with woodland	77
Figure 34 – Woodland types in Green Belt areas	78
Figure 35 – Map of Green Belt and Community Forests	79

### **Annex 1**

### Methodology

#### 1. Green Belt area

Robust estimates of the area of Green Belt land in England by local planning authority were first published in 1997. The Department for Communities and Local Government collects the data annually from 197 planning authorities in England and compiles Green Belt statistics with updates released each year. The estimates have improved for 2008/09 due to improved measuring techniques from digitised data (using geographic information systems as opposed to measurements from paper maps) and the impact of Ordnance Survey's positional accuracy improvement exercise on some local authority data.

Based on this source, Green Belt boundaries on a 1 hectare grid were provided by the University of Sheffield for use in this study. The boundaries were created using data compiled in 2006 in order that it could be compared to other datasets available up to 2006, such as the Rural Land Registry and National Land Use Data.

The data used for this study includes the Green Belt land within the New Forest and Test Valley District Councils. The Green Belt designation was removed from 47,300 hectares of land in these areas when the New Forest was designated as a National Park later in 2006.

The total area of land included as Green Belt for this study is 1,619,835 hectares which is 12.4% of England (13,050,388 hectares at mean high water). The areas are presented in Figure 3. The process of creating the hectare square grid and the timing of data collection have resulted in discrepancy of 19,000 hectares (or approximately 1.1% of the total area) compared to the total area recorded by CLG which is 1,638,288 hectares (12.6% of England).

#### 2. Data analysis and reporting

Analysis was based on 1 hectare square polygon data. Data for each Green Belt area, and the total area of Green Belt in England has been benchmarked against non-Green Belt urban fringe areas (described as Comparator Areas through-out the report) and against all England.

Data in the report has been presented in two ways: it shows (i) the proportion of Green Belt land which has a particular land cover, use or feature; and (ii) it shows what proportion of a particular land cover, use or feature is found in Green Belt compared to other areas and England as a whole. So for Country Parks, as an example, the data shows that Country Parks cover 1% of Green Belt land but that 44% of the total area of Country Park across England is within Green Belt areas.

#### 3. National survey of public attitudes

In July and August 2009, questions regarding Green Belt land in England were included in Natural England's national in-home omnibus survey. The questions covered the following areas:

- awareness and attitudes towards Green Belt land;
- perceived importance of Green Belt land;
- use of Green Belt land;
- how Green Belt land should be used in the future.

1,754 interviews were undertaken during 2 weekly waves of the survey between 24 July 2009 and 11 August.

The national omnibus survey is conducted on behalf of Natural England by TNS UK Ltd. It is undertaken weekly with a representative sample of England's population. The survey aims to provide reliable longitudinal data to monitor levels of engagement with the natural environment over time, including:

- volume of visits to the natural environment;
- visit characteristics (duration of visit, main activity, origin, destination, group composition, distance travelled, mode of travel);
- profiles of visitors and non-visitors to the natural environment;
- reasons for not visiting the natural environment;
- other measures of engagement with the natural environment.

The survey uses an in-home, face to face omnibus survey method. Every week surveying is undertaken across England with interviews in at least 100 locations. A quota sampling approach is used to ensure that results are representative of the English adult population.

The survey method allows for additional questions to be added providing a measure of the English adult population's behaviour and opinions relating to other areas of interest.

The full results of the survey are available on the Natural England and CPRE web sites with this report.

#### 4. Local surveys

Between April and August 2009 CPRE carried out a survey of attitudes to the Green Belt in three areas where the designation is in force. These areas were Avon; London and the areas of the London Green Belt closest to London but outside the GLA area; and Merseyside. Survey questions were altered to make them regionally specific.

Within each region, separate surveys were provided for the public, and for landowners, farmers and those involved in the management of the countryside, respectively. The survey was carried out by Sustain – the alliance for food and farming in Avon and London; and by Myerscough College in Merseyside. Two separate surveys were produced, aimed respectively at the general public and at landowners or professionals (such as planners and surveyors) directly involved in managing Green Belt land.

The questionnaires were available to fill out online, through SurveyMonkey. Paper copies were also available. Any paper copies received were entered directly into the relevant online questionnaire to ensure all data was consistently recorded. Incomplete paper surveys were discarded.

The CPRE survey was publicised in Planning magazine and distributed via activist and professional email networks and at country fairs and shows such as the Commonwork Open Day and Knowsley Flower Show. 1026 responses were received, with 967 being from members of the public and 59 from land professionals.

The total number of full responses received is set out below.

	London	Bristol	Mersey
Public	435	395	137
Landowner	29	19	11

The national survey incorporated eight of the questions used in the CPRE survey. This aimed to provide a comparison with the findings of the CPRE survey in terms of attitudes to the Green Belt across all English regions and social / demographic cleavages of sex, age, class, disability and ethnicity.

The full results of the survey are available on the Natural England and CPRE web sites with this report.

#### 5. Literature Review and Expert Interviews: Analysis

CPRE carried out a review of academic and professional literature on Green Belt policy and land management during summer 2008. Key sources used are listed in the bibliography and findings were integrated into subsequent survey work and the final report of this project.

The literature review was followed by 26 in-depth interviews during autumn 2008, with the objectives of (i) testing the findings of the literature review and (ii) identifying priorities for the surveys of the general public which followed. A number of national organisations and academics with an interest in Green Belt policy and some local organisations based in Avon and Merseyside, where subsequent public survey work was carried out, were involved. A combination of face to face and telephone interviewing was used.

Interviews were based around a series of set questions. These were intended to guide discussion although participants were encouraged to raise any issues considered relevant to the project. The list of questions is provided on the web page with the report.

#### List of participants in interviews

#### Avon

- Bath & North East Somerset Council (planning department)
- Duchy of Cornwall (Eastern region)
- Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group (FWAG)
- Forest of Avon
- Sustain

#### Merseyside

- Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council (Integrated Countryside Management team)
- Liverpool City Council (Parks Department)
- Liverpool City Council (planning department)
- Mersey Forest
- Merseyside Environmental Service
- St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council (planning department)

#### London

- Corporation of London
- Greater London Authority (planning team)

#### **National organisations and academics**

- Cardiff University (Professor Kevin Morgan)
- Federation of City Farms and Community Gardens
- Groundwork

- Heriot Watt University (Sarah McIntosh)
- Land Use Consultants
- Land Restoration Trust
- Liverpool University (Professor David Shaw)
- Manchester University (Professor John Handley, Joe Ravetz)
- Soil Association
- University of the West of England (Dr Richard Spalding)

#### Others

- Edinburgh Green Spaces Trust
- Ontario Friends of the Greenbelt Foundation

# **Annex 2**

### **List of data tables**

Table 1a	Land Cover Map 2000 – aggregated
Table 1b	Land Cover Map 2000 – aggregated
Table 2	Extent of Land Use Zones
Table 3a	Development Indicators
Table 3b	Summary Development Indicators 2000 –2006
Table 4	Relative house prices and change in relative house prices, 2000 –2004
Table 5	Extent of Green Belt and Undeveloped Land Conversion 1985 –2006: West Midlands illustration
Table 6	Recreational Opportunities (non linear)
Table 7	Recreational opportunities: Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and National Cycle Network
Table 8	Sport and recreational – sports pitches and golf courses
Table 9	Sport and recreation facilities – businesses and attractions
Table 10	Agri-Environment Agreement Holders with Educational Access Options
Table 11	Landscape Designations
Table 12	Dominant character areas of the 14 Green Belts
Table 13a	Vacant brownfield land in the Green Belt
Table 13b	Derelict brownfield land in the Green Belt
Table 14	Sites protected for nature conservation
Table 15	Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats
Table 16a	Sites of Special Scientific Interest Condition
Table 16b	SSSIs in Unfavourable Condition: Adverse Conditions
Table 16c	SSSIs in Unfavourable Condition: Mechanisms for Improvement
Table 16d	SSSIs in Unfavourable Condition: Organisations responsible for improvement
Table 17	Bird abundance and population trends
Table 18	Butterfly population trends
Table 19	Category 1 & 2 Pollution incidents in 2001 – 2008
Table 20a	Extent of farmed land
Table 20b	Number and size of farm holdings, 1990 and 2007
Table 21	Farm tenure
Table 22	Robust Farm Type: number of holdings
Table 23	Livestock numbers and density
Table 24	Agricultural Land Quality
Table 25	Agri-Environment Scheme Uptake
Table 26	Natural England target areas for Higher Level Stewardship
Table 27	National Inventory of Woodland and Trees (2002 data)
Table 28	Community Forests
Table 29	Flood Risk Areas

Table 1a – Land Cover Map 2000 – aggregated

				Area by Land	d Cover Class	sification (he	ectares)			
Green Belt Areas	Arable and horticulture	Improved grassland	Semi- natural grass	Mountain, heath, bog	Broad- leaved / mixed woodland	Coniferous woodland	Built up areas and gardens	Standing open water	Coastal	Total
Avon	16,005	32,005	4,778	404	8,855	1,079	3,520	180	38	66,864
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	257	270	85	1	17		83	1		714
Cambridge	19,494	1,083	3,375	180	1,232	30	921	25		26,340
Gloucester & Cheltenham	2,149	2,573	944	33	480	23	484	8		6,694
London (Metropolitan)	186,960	80,982	67,940	5,166	86,834	13,467	37,468	4,547	795	484,159
North West	62,709	72,863	50,866	6,500	24,733	2,779	21,958	2,102	3,140	247,650
Nottingham & Derby	26,858	12,935	7,257	718	3,898	1,349	6,429	745		60,189
Oxford	15,167	7,341	4,345	193	4,304	418	1,563	397		33,728
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	13,234	16,691	7,088	11,721	18,425	7,645	3,745	136	266	78,951
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	87,706	50,331	41,505	13,287	35,138	2,983	15,769	1,522		248,241
Stoke-on-Trent	7,340	26,349	3,722	228	3,371	739	1,898	189		43,836
Tyne & Wear	31,167	15,361	8,379	2,036	6,693	4,303	3,568	336	11	71,854
West Midlands	89,006	52,238	30,162	2,735	25,531	5,890	17,786	1,606		224,954
York	13,941	4,050	3,732	525	1,374	422	1,474	35		25,553
Green Belt Total	571,993	375,072	234,178	43,727	220,885	41,127	116,666	11,829	4,250	1,619,727
Green Belt as % of England Total	12%	12%	13%	9%	20%	14%	8%	20%	2%	12%
Comparator Area Total	515,720	313,035	190,638	36,772	132,660	26,117	97,678	9,124	3,921	1,325,665
Comparator Area as % of England Area	11%	10%	10%	8%	12%	9%	7%	15%	2%	10%
All England Total	4,828,627	3,018,812	1,835,475	482,050	1,096,737	299,209	1,381,746	59,244	194,422	13,196,322

Source: Land Cover Map 2000

Table 1b – Land Cover Map 2000 – aggregated

		Area	by Lar	d Cove	r Clas	sificatio	on (% p	ercent	tage)	
Green Belt Areas	Arable and horticulture	Improved grassland	Semi-natural grass	Mountain, heath, bog	Broad-leaved / mixed woodland	Coniferous woodland	Built up areas and gardens	Standing open water	Coastal	Total
Avon	24	48	7	1	13	2	5	0	0	100
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	36	38	12	0	2	0	12	0	0	100
Cambridge	74	4	13	1	5	0	3	0	0	100
Gloucester & Cheltenham	32	38	14	0	7	0	7	0	0	100
London (Metropolitan)	39	17	14	1	18	3	8	1	0	100
North West	25	29	21	3	10	1	9	1	1	100
Nottingham & Derby	45	21	12	1	6	2	11	1	0	100
Oxford	45	22	13	1	13	1	5	1	0	100
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	17	21	9	15	23	10	5	0	0	100
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	35	20	17	5	14	1	6	1	0	100
Stoke-on-Trent	17	60	8	1	8	2	4	0	0	100
Tyne & Wear	43	21	12	3	9	6	5	0	0	100
West Midlands	40	23	13	1	11	3	8	1	0	100
York	55	16	15	2	5	2	6	0	0	100
Total % of Green Belt area	35	23	14	3	14	3	7	1	0	100
Total % of comparator area	39	24	14	3	10	2	7	1	0	100
Total % of land area of England	37	23	14	4	8	2	10	0	1	100

Source: Land Cover Map 2000

**Table 2 – Extent of Land Use Zones** 

Green Belt Areas	Percentage of land associated with 'extensive dwellings and associated non-agricultural grazing' zone
Avon	20.5
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	30.6
Cambridge	13.0
Gloucester & Cheltenham	24.6
London (Metropolitan)	26.8
North West	25.0
Nottingham & Derby	21.9
Oxford	16.6
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	33.0
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	18.2
Stoke-on-Trent	21.2
Tyne & Wear	16.9
West Midlands	20.0
York	14.1
Green Belt Total	22.9
Comparator Area Total	21.5
All England Total	14.4
Rural England Total	12.2
Urban Area Total	10.8

Source: Rural Land Registry. Analysis by University of Sheffield, 2009.

**Table 3a – Development Indicators** 

	Land developed (for all uses)	land developed or redeveloped	Percentage of development on brownfield sites	Undev devel	reloped land opped use as a of total ar	percentage	Dwelling density (units per ha)
<b>Green Belts Areas</b>	(ha) <sup>´</sup>	(for all uses)		All uses	Commercial uses	Residential uses	, <b>,</b>
Avon	764	1.15	38.0	0.71	0.09	0.28	6.53
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	15	2.16	54.5	0.98	0.36	0.20	8.83
Cambridge	165	0.63	23.8	0.48	0.07	0.17	9.20
Gloucester & Cheltenham	115	1.73	24.6	1.30	0.04	0.23	17.11
London (Metropolitan)	7,186	1.50	42.1	0.87	0.08	0.31	7.15
North West	4,081	1.66	40.0	1.00	0.16	0.30	10.20
Nottingham & Derby	641	1.07	38.9	0.65	0.10	0.23	9.00
Oxford	319	0.95	36.8	0.60	0.04	0.21	9.46
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	828	1.06	24.7	0.80	0.03	0.31	4.47
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	3,354	1.36	40.5	0.81	0.08	0.24	11.88
Stoke-on-Trent	420	0.96	37.0	0.61	0.12	0.24	8.51
Tyne & Wear	596	0.83	32.5	0.56	0.03	0.18	9.56
West Midlands	3,510	1.57	34.6	1.03	0.09	0.33	8.84
York	374	1.47	28.5	1.05	0.16	0.30	8.40
<b>Green Belt Total</b>	22,370	1.39	38.6	0.86	0.09	0.28	8.64
<b>Comparator Area Total</b>	29,362	2.23	39.0	1.36	0.29	0.49	16.36
All England Total	283,342	2.17	53.4	1.01	0.15	0.53	19.17
Rural England Total	110,159	1.20	39.3	0.73	0.10	0.39	15.12
<b>Urban Area Total</b>	86,626	10.28	85.1	1.53	0.22	0.97	27.54

Source: CLG: Land Use Change Statistics, 1985 – 2006. Analysis by University of Sheffield, 2009.

Table 3a provides a series of long term development indicators which allow the rate and character of urban development in the Green Belt to be compared with that typical of other areas. Column 1 expresses the whole area being developed or redeveloped for built uses relative to the entire extent of the area. Patterns of change for the period 1985 – 2006 are analysed. The most recent years are not examined because of the lags which occur firstly between data collection by Ordnance Survey and transfer to CLG, and secondly because of the complex patterns of recording lags associated with Ordnance Survey map-updating priorities (Bibby and Shepherd 1997).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The term developed is used to indicate a change from an open land use to a built use, while the term 'redeveloped' is used to refer to a change between built uses.

Table 3b – Summary Development Indicators 2000 – 2006

	Area developed or redeveloped (hectare per sq.	Percentage of development on brownfield site	Undev Develo	Dwelling density		
	Km)		All uses	Commercial use	Residential use	(units per hectare)
Green Belt	0.4	48.3	0.2	0.0	0.1	9.6
Comparator Area	0.8	44.6	0.5	0.1	0.2	23.1
Urban Area*	5.4	68.9	1.7	0.8	0.7	34.4

Source: CLG: Land Use Change Statistics, 1985 – 2006. Analysis by University of Sheffield, 2009.

Table 3b confirms that the differentials that distinguish development patterns in the Green Belts and elsewhere over the long period have remained similar since 2000. The residential density differentials apparent in the 1980s and 1990s persist, albeit that densities have been levered up substantially, especially in the urban areas. This serves to underscore the very particular character of Green Belt residential development.

Table 4 – Relative house prices and change in relative house prices, 2000 – 2004

Green Belt Areas	House Price Index (a)	Change in House Price Index 00-04 (b)
Avon	126.0	13.3
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	106.9	-16.2
Cambridge	124.3	10.8
Gloucester & Cheltenham	127.1	4.6
London (Metropolitan)	142.0	12.5
North West	106.1	4.4
Nottingham & Derby	106.3	5.5
Oxford	137.7	17.3
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	142.5	21.9
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	100.6	4.9
Stoke-on-Trent	100.9	4.2
Tyne & Wear	101.7	7.3
West Midlands	118.6	10.4
York	107.5	13.8
Green Belt Total	120.2	8.5
Comparator Area	106.5	2.1
All England	100.0	0.0
Rural England	100.6	2.0
Urban	99.9	-0.7

Source: Her Majesty's Land Registry. Analysis by University of Sheffield.

Table 5 – Extent of Green Belt and Undeveloped Land Conversion 1985 – 2006

#### **West Midlands illustration**

		Rate of change as percentage of area									
Urban Area	% of margin subject to Green Belt controls	Overall	Green Belt	Comparator Area							
Nuneaton	50.4	1.8	0.6	1.3							
Rugby	48.3	1.8	0.4	1.8							
Droitwich	46.5	2.1	1.0	1.4							
Bridgnorth	44.3	0.5	0.3	0.3							
Birmingham	92.7	1.8	1.3	3.6							
Tamworth	51.5	2.7	2.4	1.4							

Source: CLG: Land Use Change Statistics, 1985 – 2006. Analysis by University of Sheffield, 2009.

The overall rate of undeveloped land conversion is expressed relative to the total urban area of the town together with its 5 km margin. Rates for the Green Belt and the Comparator Area are calculated relative to the total area of these areas. Note the size of the urban areas and the amount of land subject to Green Belt controls varies.

Table 6 – Recreational Opportunities (non linear)

Green Belt Areas	Country Parks (ha)	Percentage of Green Belt as Country Park	National Nature Reserves (ha)	Local Nature Reserves (ha)	Percentage of Green Belt as LNR	arks & G	Percentage of Green Belt as Reg' Parks/ Gardens	Open Access Land <sup>1</sup> (ha)	Percentage of Green Belt as Open Access Land <sup>1</sup>	Access Land <sup>2</sup> (e th Open Acces	Percentage of Green Belt as Dedicated Access Land	Common Land (ha)	Percentage of Green Belt as Common Land	Community Forest (ha)	Percentage of Green Belt as Community Forest	st Land (ha)	Percentage of Green Belt as National Trust land	Total area of Village, Doorstep and Millennium Greens (ha)	Percentage of Village, Doorstep and Millennium Greens	Woodland Trust Land Accessible to the Public (ha)	Percentage of Green Belt as Woodland Trust land
Avon	308	0.5	190	298	0.4	1,948	2.9	562	0.8	274	0.4	301	0.5	35,646	53.3	818	1.2	8.14	0.01	72	0.11
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	_	0	_	_	0	_	0		0.0		0.0		0.0	-	_	-	_	_	_		_
Cambridge	184	0.7	-	25	0.1	226	0.9	140	0.5		0.0	140	0.5	-	-	244	0.9	2.27	0.01	26	0.1
Gloucester & Cheltenham	56	0.8	_	-	0	_	0	37	0.6		0.0	8	0.1	_	-	25	0.4	0.51	0.01	17	0.25
London (Metropolitan)	6,475	1.3	1,895	4,473	0.9	17,724	3.7	14,944	3.1	1,532	0.3	13,606	2.8	23,735	4.9	9,398	1.9	378.48	0.08	1,882	0.39
North West	4,580	1.8	1,707	2,061	0.8	4,709	1.9	8,629	3.5	1,231	0.5	4,017	1.6	75,317	30.4	3,146	1.3	45.47	0.02	374	0.15
Nottingham & Derby	664	1.1	-	388	0.6	921	1.5	4	0.0	594	1.0	4	0.0	21,371	35.5	_	-	8.94	0.01	32	0.06
Oxford	113	0.3	1	-	0	639	1.9	241	0.7	136	0.4	241	0.7	_	-	1	0	15.77	0.05	22	0.07
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	458	0.6	1,344	519	0.7	1,093	1.4	19,871	25.2	1,675	2.1	1,046	1.3	_	-	3,393	4.3	16.35	0.02	1	0
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	1,266	0.5	_	2,187	0.9	4,753	1.9	15,805	6.4	123	0.0	7,600	3.1	27,984	11.3	1,454	0.6	23.60	0.01	258	0.1
Stoke-on-Trent	546	1.2	41	190	0.4	742	1.7	327	0.7		0.0	155	0.4	_	-	140	0.3	5.56	0.01	3	0.01
Tyne & Wear	447	0.6	-	252	0.4	1,361	1.9	112	0.2	816	1.1	81	0.1	-	-	279	0.4	19.18	0.03	196	0.27
West Midlands	3,358	1.5	72	1,278	0.6	4,685	2.1	2,509	1.1	1,843	0.8	2,027	0.9	17,056	7.6	2,285	1	30.03	0.01	321	0.14
York	11	0	21	20	0.1	11	0	193	0.8	119	0.5	178	0.7	-	-	_	-	3.87	0.02	9	0.04
<b>Green Belt Total</b>	18,466	1.1	5,271	11,691	0.7	38,812	2.4	63,374	3.9	8,343	0.5	29,404	1.8	201,109	12.4	21,183	1.3	558.17	0.03	3,213	0.2
Green Belt as % of England Total	44		5	33		23		7		6		8		41		11		13		29	
<b>Comparator Area Total</b>	9,114	0.7	3,229	7,089	0.5	20,193	1.5	49,325	3.7	6,174	0.5	14,395	1.1	91,310	6.9	16,961	1.3	450.59	0.03	1,999	0.15
Comparator Area as % of England Total	22		3	20		12		6		4		4		18		9		11		0	
All England Total	42,135	0.3	95,859	35,786	0.3	170,734	1.3	865,198	6.6	143,037	1.1	372,664	2.9	494,038	3.8	193,084	1.5	4,217.42	0.03	11,028	0.09

Designated under Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Land dedicated for access using Section 1b of Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000

Table 7 – Recreational opportunities: Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and National Cycle Network

	PRoW Total	PRoW Density	National Cycle Network Length in km							
Green Belt Areas	Length in km	(metres per ha)	On Road	Traffic Free	Total					
Avon	1,694	25	454	109	563					
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	16	23	-	-	_					
Cambridge	248	9	19	34	53					
Gloucester & Cheltenham	191	29	1	-	1					
London (Metropolitan)	9,899	20	285	417	702					
North West	5,239	21	847	492	1,339					
Nottingham & Derby	1,050	17	11	41	52					
Oxford	567	17	47	51	98					
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	626	8	39	72	111					
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	5,167	21	246	430	676					
Stoke-on-Trent	833	19	47	28	76					
Tyne & Wear	1,063	15	133	172	306					
West Midlands	3,630	16	158	112	270					
York	209	8	21	64	84					
Green Belt Total	30,433		2,309	2,023	4,331					
Green Belt as % of England Total	17	19	23	33	27%					
Comparator Area Totals	22,552		2,796	4,049	6,845					
Comparator Areas as % of England Total	12	17	28	66	42					
All England Totals	181,891	14	10,137	6,164	16,301					

Table 8 – Sport and recreation – sports pitches and golf courses

	pito Cricket	sports thes , Rugby, tball	Golf course	s
Green Belts Areas	%	intensity	%	intensity
Avon	28.0	0.5	75.6	0.1
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	3.8	0.08	14.2	0.02
Cambridge	40.7	1.1	56.2	0.05
Gloucester & Cheltenham	9.3	0.18	32.1	0.03
London (Metropolitan)	18.3	0.25	54.6	0.07
North West	14.4	0.18	53.2	0.05
Nottingham & Derby	14.7	0.23	53.7	0.05
Oxford	22.3	0.56	51.4	0.06
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	20.0	0.24	47.6	0.07
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	20.0	0.31	71.1	0.07
Stoke-on-Trent	20.3	0.3	57.7	0.05
Tyne & Wear	10.4	0.14	54.9	0.03
West Midlands	15.4	0.2	54.2	0.05
York	27.9	0.55	84.6	0.1
Green Belt Total	17.6	0.25	56.4	0.06
Comparator Area Total	12.8	0.18	21.2	0.02
All England Total	100.0	1.67	100.0	0.13
Rural England Total	89.9	2.24	89.0	0.2
Urban Area Total	69.5	0.98	26.3	0.03

Source: Sports England Active Places, June 2009. Analysis by University of Sheffield, 2009

The number of pitches and golf courses within 10 kms of every household in the urban areas has been measured along with the number of those pitches that are within the Green Belt. This has been reported as the share of pitches that are accessible to residents of a particular urban area that are in fact in the Green belt (Measure 1 – percentage) and as the number of pitches within the Green Belt for every 1,000 residents within the urban area (Measure 2 – intensity).

**Table 9 – Sport and recreation – businesses and attractions**[by category per 1,000 households]

	Num	ber of facili	ities per 1,00	0 househ	olds
Green Belts Areas	Equestrian	Country houses	Caravan sites	Farm shops	Garden centres
Avon	4.0	0.9	0.7	0.3	0.5
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	0	0	0	0	0
Cambridge	3.5	0.4	1.6	0.8	0.4
Gloucester & Cheltenham	3.3	0	0.6	0	4.0
London (Metropolitan)	6.4	0.8	0.7	0.5	1.4
North West	3.9	0.4	1.2	0.4	1.3
Nottingham & Derby	3.1	0.3	1.1	0.2	1.6
Oxford	1.8	0.3	1.1	0.7	0.8
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	3.4	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.9
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	3.3	1.3	5.7	0.9	1.1
Stoke-on-Trent	4.7	0.2	0.9	0.6	1.2
Tyne & Wear	4.3	0.7	1.6	0.4	0.9
West Midlands	3.9	1.0	1.1	0.6	1.7
York	5.5	0.6	4.6	0	1.9
Green Belt Total	4.6	0.6	1.1	0.4	1.3
Comparator Area Total	1.9	0.3	1.0	0.3	0.6
All England Total	0.3	0.1	0.3	0	0.1
Rural England Total	0.7	0.2	1.1	0.1	0.2
Urban Area Total	0.1	0	0	0	0

Source: Valuation Office Rating List, 2006. Analysis by University of Sheffield, 2009.

Table 10 – Agri-Environment Agreement Holders with Educational Access Options

	Num		
Green Belt Area	Countryside Stewardship Scheme	Higher Level Stewardship	Total
Avon	7	4	11
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	0	0	0
Cambridge	2	1	3
Gloucester & Cheltenham	0	0	0
London (Metropolitan)	27	12	39
North West	14	6	20
Nottingham & Derby	2	2	4
Oxford	3	2	5
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	0	6	6
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	16	7	23
Stoke-on-Trent	5	0	5
Tyne & Wear	2	0	2
West Midlands	8	9	17
York	0	0	0
Green Belt Total	86	49	135
Green Belt as % of England Total	15	12	14
Comparator Area Total	56	50	106
Comparator Area as % of England Total	9	12	11
All England Total	592	407	999

**Table 11 – Landscape Designations** 

Green Belt Areas	AONB% of Green Belt	AONB (ha)	National Parks (ha)	Heritage Coast (ha)
Avon	21.8	14,549	_	_
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote		-	-	_
Cambridge		_	_	_
Gloucester & Cheltenham	14.5	970	-	_
London (Metropolitan)	24.7	119,561	_	_
North West	0.0	3	58	_
Nottingham & Derby		_	-	_
Oxford	0.0	1	-	_
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	4.2	3,342	45,006	502
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	1.1	2,838	26	_
Stoke-on-Trent		_	-	_
Tyne & Wear	0.0	6	-	35
West Midlands	2.6	5,917	-	_
York		-	_	_
Green Belt Total	9.1	147,187	45,090	537
Green Belt as % of England Total		7	4	0
Comparator Area Total	13.1	174,195	41,867	5,359
Comparator Area as % of England Total		8	4	2
All England Total	15.8	2,064,684	1,050,843	315,898

Table 12 – Dominant character areas of the 14 Green Belts

Green Belt Area	Dominant Character Assessment	Character Assessment	National Character Areas	% of GB	% of NCA
Avon	Neglected (59%)	Diverging	Seven and Avon Vales	9	3
	Enhancing (33%)	Enhancing	Cotswolds	33	8
		Neglected	Bristol, Avon Valleys and Ridges	57	45
		Neglected	Avon Vale	2	2
Burton-on-Trent/	Enhancing (67%)	Enhancing	Melbourne Parklands	37	2
Swadlincote	Maintained (33%)	Enhancing	Leicestershire and S Derby	30	1
		Maintained	Mease / Sence Lowlands	33	1
Cambridge	Maintained (95%)	Enhancing	The Fens	5	0
		Maintained	East Anglian Chalk	58	18
		Maintained	Beds and Camb Claylands	37	4
Gloucester &	Diverging (93%)	Diverging	Severn and Avon Vales	93	3
Cheltenham		Enhancing	Cotswolds	7	0
London	Maintained (55%)	Maintained	Greater Thames Estuary	3	19
(Metropolitan)	Diverging (42%)	Maintained	South Suffolk and North Essex Clayland	7	10
		Maintained	East Anglian Chalk	1	5
		Maintained	Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands	1	2
		Maintained	Bedfordshire Greensand Ridge	2	37
		Maintained	Chilterns	18	51
		Diverging	North Thames Plain	21	40
		Neglected	North Kent Plain	2	13
		Maintained	Thames Basin Lowlands	2	35
		Diverging	Thames Valley	8	45
		Maintained	North Downs	10	34
		Diverging	Wealden Greensand	10	32
		Maintained	Low Weald	9	23
		Maintained	High Weald	3	8
		Diverging	Thames Basin Heaths	4	16
North West	Diverging (70%)	Diverging	Morecambe Coast and Lune Estuary	1	13
	Neglected (21%)	Diverging	Lancashire and Amounderness Plain	18	44
		Diverging	Lancashire Valleys	8	34
		Diverging	Southern Pennines	9	18
		Maintained	Dark Peak	2	7
		Enhancing	South West Peak	2	11
		Diverging	Manchester Pennine Fringe	7	42
		Diverging	Manchester Conurbation	2	15
		Diverging	Lancashire Coal Measures	9	56
		Maintained	Sefton Coast	2	56
		Diverging	Merseyside Conurbation	2	18
		Diverging	Wirral	5	68
		Diverging	Mersey Valley	10	56
		Neglected	Shropshire, Cheshire and Staffordshire Plain	21	14
		Maintained	Cheshire Sandstone Ridge	3	30

Table 12 – continued

Nottingham &	Diverging (47%)	Maintained	Southern Magnesian Limestone	10	4
Derby	Neglected (36%)	Neglected	Notts, Derbys and Yorks Coalfield	22	8
		Diverging	Trent and Belvoir Vales	29	10
		Neglected	Sherwood	14	15
		Diverging	Derbyshire Peak Fringe and Lower Derwent	9	14
		Diverging	Trent Valley Washlands	8	13
		Maintained	Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire Wolds	9	8
Oxford	Maintained (99%)	Maintained	Upper Thames Clay Vales	63	11
		Maintained	Midvale Ridge	37	28
South Yorkshire &	Maintained (44%)	Maintained	Pennine Dales Fringe	5	14
West Yorkshire	Neglected (32%)	Maintained	Southern Magnesian Limestone	24	44
	Diverging (23%)	Diverging	Southern Pennines	17	36
		Maintained	Yorkshire Southern Pennine Fringe	14	58
		Neglected	Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire & Yorkshire Coalfield	32	46
		Diverging	Humberhead Levels	5	7
		Diverging	Derbyshire Peak Fringe and Lower Derwent	2	11
		Maintained	Dark Peak	1	3
SW Hampshire &	Maintained (65%)	Maintained	New Forest	65	69
SE Dorset	Neglected (35%)	Neglected	Dorset Downs and Cranborne Chase	7	5
		Neglected	Dorset Heaths	28	36
Stoke-on-Trent	Maintained (64%)	Neglected	Shropshire, Cheshire and Staffordshire Plain	36	4
	Neglected (36%)	Maintained	Potteries and Churnet Valley	56	46
		Maintained	Needwood and South Derbyshire Claylands	8	4
Tyne & Wear	Neglected (51%)	Maintained	North Pennines	11	4
	Maintained (43%)	Maintained	Tyne Gap and Hadrian's Wall	23	38
		Maintained	Mid Northumberland	9	10
		Neglected	South East Northumberland Coastal Plain	18	30
		Neglected	Tyne and Wear Lowlands	20	32
		Enhancing	Durham Magnesian Limestone Plateau	6	9
		Neglected	Durham Coalfield Pennine Fringe	13	14
West Midlands	Diverging (72%)	Neglected	Shropshire, Cheshire and Staffordshire Plain	5	3
	Maintained (22%)	Maintained	Mid Severn Sandstone Plateau	22	56
		Diverging	Cannock Chase and Cank Wood	15	46
		Diverging	Trent Valley Washlands	2	10
		Maintained	Mease / Sence Lowlands	1	4
		Diverging	Leicestershire Vales	4	12
		Diverging	Dunsmore and Feldon	7	22
		Diverging	Arden	39	60
		Diverging	Severn and Avon Vales	6	6
York	Neglected	Neglected	Vale of York	100	25

Table 13a – Vacant brownfield land in the Green Belt

	Vacant brownfield land (hectares)												
Region	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003								
East Midlands	23.7	23.7	25.0	25.0	25.0								
East of England	13.3	12.7	13.5	14.1	9.0								
London	6.1	6.1	8.7	9.1	3.5								
North East	4.7	4.6	6.2	0.9	2.7								
North West	184.2	208.2	208.4	240.7	190.2								
South East	181.5	158.7	114.0	97.7	96.8								
South West	1.4	1.4	0.9	0.9	no sites								
West Midlands	109.9	96.2	12.9	33.2	31.4								
Yorkshire and Humberside	351.4	516.6	491.7	408.4	402.2								
Total	876.1	1,028.1	881.2	829.9	760.8								

Source: Homes and Communities Agency

#### **NOTE:**

Figures representing the stock of vacant brownfield land for housing has been derived from the National Land Use Database (NLUD) mixed vintage figures. This means that whilst the majority of the data returns were provided during the denoted year of data collection, but where no return was made, the most recent data was entered where previously available.

Figures have been derived from spatial analysis using NLUD sites as provided by Local Planning Authorities across England and the current Greenbelt sourced from Landmark. The centre points of NLUD sites have been used and therefore all figures are estimates.

The figures provided should be treated with caution as being on the dataset does **not** necessarily mean that a site is available for development.

**No** indication of how potential constraints and their effects on sites are factored in to the figures. Some of which could totally rule out any hard development (including housing or employment use).

Table 13b – Derelict brownfield land in the Green Belt

		Derelict brownfield land (hectares)												
Region	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003									
East Midlands	113.9	118.2	116.4	122.5	122.4									
East of England	12.2	14.6	14.6	17	17									
London	39.6	39.6	38.6	40.4	41.1									
North East	48.1	17.3	17.9	19.6	19.6									
North West	1,033.7	1,122.0	1,187.0	1,464.7	1,114.8									
South East	96.2	98.4	114.5	141.6	126.4									
South West	22.2	25.8	25.8	25.5	25.8									
West Midlands	248.8	265.4	334.3	350.0	348.5									
Yorkshire and Humberside	413.7	449.2	462.3	453.9	530.1									
Total	2,028.4	2,150.6	2,311.4	2,635.3	2,345.7									

Source: Homes and Communities Agency

Table 14 – Sites protected for nature conservation

						Sites of Sp	ecial Scient	tific Interes	t Condit	ion			
Green Belt Areas	National Nature Reserves (ha)	Local Nature Reserves (ha)	RSBP Reserves (ha)	Ancient Woodland Inventory (ha)	Favourable	Unfavourable Recovering	Unfavourable No Change	Unfavourable Declining	Part Destroyed	Destroyed	Not Assessed	SSSI Total (ha)	% Favourable or recovering
Avon	190	298		2,134	942	281	67	222				1,512	81
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	_	-		_								_	
Cambridge	_	25		45	199	109	70	14				392	79
Gloucester & Cheltenham	_	_		12	3	43		2				48	96
London (Metropolitan)	1,895	4,473	858	31,836	10,928	11,101	1,446	1,513	7			24,995	88
North West	1,707	2,061	285	2,468	3,000	1,617	2,266	259				7,142	65
Nottingham & Derby	_	388		849	104	267	53	5				429	86
Oxford	1	_	272	1,520	761	903	54	36				1,754	95
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	1,344	519	354	9,330	11,075	20,171	2,192	1,226	1	11	1	34,677	90
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	_	2,187	358	9,081	799	9,199	2,980	243		11		13,232	76
Stoke-on-Trent	41	190	12	1,250	136	171	32	71				410	75
Tyne & Wear	_	252		2,775	302	81	38	40				461	83
West Midlands	72	1,278	8	5,632	1,402	1,764	324	65		44		3,599	88
York	21	20		264	280	456	44					780	94
<b>Green Belt Total</b>	5,271	11,691	2,147	67,196	29,931	46,163	9,566	3,696	8	66	1	89,431	85
Green Belt as % of England Total	5%	33%	5%	19%	6%	10%	11%	8%	2%	28%	0%	8%	
Comparator Area	3,229	7,089		43,810	20,554	34,038	5,730	2,669	5	34		63,030	87
Comparator Area as % of England Total	3%	20%	2,059	12%	4%	7%	7%	6%	2%	15%	0%	6%	
All England Total	95,859	35,786	5%	353,590	469,855	477,740	83,895	44,080	332	232	844	1,076,978	88

**Table 15 – Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats** 

								Biodiv	ersity A	ction Pl	an Pric	rity Hal	bitats	(ha)								
Green Belt Area	Coastal sand dunes	Saline lagoons	Upland hay meadows	Coastal vegetated shingle	Lowland raised bog	Reedbed	Maritime cliff and slope	Upland calcareous grassland	Fens	Undetermined grassland	Purple Moor-grass and rush pastures	Lowland heathland	Lowland dry acid grassland	Blanket bog	Lowland calcareous grassland	Lowland meadows	Deciduous woodland	Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	Upland heathland	Mudflats	BAP area excluding overlaps	Percentage of Green Belt area
Avon	-	-	-	-	-	273	15	-	165	-	90	7	58	-	911	493	4,060	2,841	-	2	8,348	12
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	9	1
Cambridge	-	-	-	-	-	55	-	-	35	17	60	-	-	-	141	68	320	607	-	-	1,151	4
Gloucester & Cheltenham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	17	91	133	-	-	255	4
London (Metropolitan)	-	3	-	-	-	2,213	-	-	4,113	8,077	375	9,170	1,261	-	1,812	1,279	43,410	4,269	-	95	61,540	13
North West	1,620	-	26	-	994	645	23	9	1,116	562	699	2,234	1,914	4,140	129	1,340	8,743	5,838	467	48	25,304	10
Nottingham & Derby	-	-	-	-	-	221	-	-	17	64	6	909	64	-	71	273	2,566	370	-	-	4,368	7
Oxford	-	-	-	-	-	464	-	-	746	38	8	67	12	-	17	532	1,354	1,910	-	-	3,890	12
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	1	21	-	-	18	1,967	117	-	22,702	33	95	17,730	3,342	-	-	244	11,604	2,791	-	9	38,122	48
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	-	-	-	-	-	403	-	35	442	555	769	211	1,033	12,462	748	800	14,563	860	896	-	31,123	13
Stoke-on-Trent	-	-	-	-	24	2	-	5	203	143	35	255	9	-	11	47	1,930	218	25	-	2,545	6
Tyne & Wear	5	-	12	-	25	54	14	-	56	127	37	415	80	-	64	128	3,217	187	5	12	3,944	5
West Midlands	-	-	-	-	-	157	-	-	481	665	82	1,995	185	-	-	523	9,391	1,154	-	-	13,399	6
York	-	-	-	-	-	566	-	-	691	-	2	543	583	-	-	73	501	287	-	-	1,372	5
Green Belt Total	1,626	24	38	-	1,061	7,020	169	49	30,767	10,281	2,258	33,536	8,541	16,602	3,921	5,817	101,759	21,465	1,393	166	195,370	12
Green Belt as % of England Total	16%	2%	3%	0%	11%	11%	1%	0%	26%	24%	10%	36%	15%	7%	8%	16%	20%	9%	1%	0%	13%	
Comparator Area Total	850	148	15	75	154	6,896	1,093	121	9,062	9,049	2,299	12,582	6,628	17,200	2,161	4,440	65,633	36,595	8,805	498	158,097	12
Comparator Area as % of England Total	8%	10%	1%	3%	2%	10%	5%	1%	8%	22%	10%	13%	11%	7%	4%	12%	13%	16%	4%	1%	10%	

Table 16a – Sites of Special Scientific Interest Condition

			SSS	SSSI Condition												
Green Belt Areas	Favourable	Unfavourable Recovering	Unfavourable No Change	Unfavourable Declining	Part Destroyed	Destroyed	Not Assessed	Total	% Favourable or recovering							
Avon	942	281	67	222				1,512	81							
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote								_								
Cambridge	199	109	70	14				392	79							
Gloucester & Cheltenham	3	43		2				48	96							
London (Metropolitan)	10,928	11,101	1,446	1,513	7			24,995	88							
North West	3,000	1,617	2,266	259				7,142	65							
Nottingham & Derby	104	267	53	5				429	86							
Oxford	761	903	54	36				1,754	95							
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	11,075	20,171	2,192	1,226	1	11	1	34,677	90							
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	799	9,199	2,980	243		11		13,232	76							
Stoke-on-Trent	136	171	32	71				410	75							
Tyne & Wear	302	81	38	40				461	83							
West Midlands	1,402	1,764	324	65		44		3,599	88							
York	280	456	44					780	94							
Green Belt Total	29,931	46,163	9,566	3,696	8	66	1	89,431	85							
Green Belt as % of England Total	6%	10%	11%	8%	2%	28%	0%	8%								
Comparator Area	20,554	34,038	5,730	2,669	5	34		63,030	87							
Comparator Area as % of England Total	4%	7%	7%	6%	2%	15%	0%	6%								
Totals for England	469,855	477,740	83,895	44,080	332	232	844	1,076,978	88							

Table 16b – Sites of Special Scientific Interest Units in Unfavourable Condition:
Adverse Conditions

Adverse conditions affecting Unfavourable SSSI units	As % of Unfavourable land in Green Belt	As % of Unfavourable land in Comparator Area	As % of Unfavourable land in England
Over-grazing	28	28	25
Under-grazing	23	13	9
Inappropriate scrub control	21	13	9
Drainage	14	15	13
Moor burning	8	12	15
Other – specify in comments	8	6	7
Forestry and woodland management	7	10	5
Coastal squeeze	7	8	18
Water pollution – discharge	6	10	8
Fire – other	6	2	2
Inappropriate cutting/mowing	6	3	2
Inappropriate weed control	6	5	3
Water pollution – agriculture/run off	6	11	15
Inappropriate ditch management	5	4	3
Inappropriate water levels	5	6	5
Air pollution	4	0	1
Public access/disturbance	4	2	2
Vehicles – illicit	3	0	1
Invasive freshwater species	2	5	4
Siltation	2	3	3
Earth science feature obstructed	1	1	1
Water abstraction	1	5	3
Fertiliser use	1	0	3
Inappropriate coastal management	1	1	1
Inappropriate weirs dams and other structures	1	2	1
Inland flood defence works	1	0	1
Vehicles – other	1	0	0

Note: Many SSSI Units are affected by more than one adverse condition

Table 16c – Sites of Special Scientific Interest in Unfavourable Condition:
Mechanisms for Improvement

Mechanisms for Improving Unfavourable SSSI Units	As % of Unfavourable Land in Green Belt	As % of Unfavourable Land in Comparator Area	As % of Unfavourable Land in England
Higher Level Stewardship	44	37	40
Direct management	15	14	8
Facilitate registration on Rural Land Register	13	15	11
Investigation	10	12	8
Conservation Enhancement Scheme / Wildlife Enhancement Scheme	7	9	8
Felling licence required	6	1	1
No mechanism	5	1	1
Compulsory withdraw/modify notice/consent	5	1	1
Flood Risk Management – capital/ improvement schemes	5	7	17
Catchment Sensitive Farming Delivery Initiative	4	7	7
Woodland Grant Scheme	3	9	3
Water level management plan	3	2	6
Regulatory Investigation	3	8	12
Higher Level Stewardship Special Project	3	2	1
Land drainage consent needed	3	0	0
Section 194 approval for fencing of common	3	0	1
Discharge/ Pollution Prevention Control consent – revoke/amend Access Management Scheme	3	1	2
Licences – revoke/ amend	3	0	0
Invasive species control programme	2	3	4
Direct management – other	2	0	0
Existing Local Project	2	1	1
Criminal damage (property)	2	0	0
Implement Access Management Plan Scheme	2	2	4
Undertake specific management works	1	0	1
River restoration project	1	1	2
Flood Risk Management – operational work	1	0	0

Table 16d – Sites of Special Scientific Interest in Unfavourable Condition:
Organisations responsible for improvement

Organisations Responsible for Improving Unfavourable SSSI Units	As % of Unfavourable Land in Green Belt	As % of Unfavourable Land in Comparator Area	As % of Unfavourable Land in England
Natural England	72	70	68
Forestry Commission	13	11	5
Environment Agency	17	17	30
Surrey Wildlife Trust	3	0	0
National Trust – Wessex	3	2	1
Common Land Branch	3	0	1
Yorkshire Water Services Ltd	2	3	2
Dorset Police	2	0	0
Herpetological Conservation Trust	2	0	0
Ministry of Defence	1	0	1
Sefton London Borough Council	1	0	0
City of London Corporation	1	0	0
Castle Point Borough Council	1	0	0
Wessex Water Services Ltd	1	0	1
Dorset County Council	1	0	0
Highways Agency	1	0	0
Poole Borough Council	1	0	0
Bournemouth And West Hampshire Water Plc	1	1	0
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	1	0	0
Hampshire County Council	1	2	0
Potteric Carr IDB	1	0	0
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	1	0	0
Surrey County Council	1	0	0

Table 17 – Bird abundance and population trends

	Bird abundance			Bird population trends		
Species	Green Belt compared to Comparator Area	Green Belt compared to Rural Lowland	Comparator Area compared to Rural Lowland	Green Belt compared to Comparator Area	Green Belt compared to Rural Lowland	Comparator Area compared to Rural Lowland
Blackbird, Turdus merula	<b>A</b>	▼	▼			
Blackcap, Sylvia atricapilla					▼	▼
Black-headed Gull, <u>Larus ridibundus</u>		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>		▼	▼
Blue tit, Parus caeruleus	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>			▼	
Bullfinch, Pyrrhula pyrrhula						
Buzzard, Buteo buteo		▼	▼			
Canada goose, Branta canadensis					▼	▼
Carrion crow, Corvus corone	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>			
Chaffinch, Fringilla coelebs	<b>A</b>		▼			
Chiffchaff, Phylloscopus collybita						
Coal tit, Parus ater						
Collared dove, Streptopelia decaocto		▼	▼		▼	
Coot, Fulica atra		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	
Cormorant, Phalacrocorax carbo					<b>A</b>	
Corn bunting, Miliaria calandra		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>			
Cuckoo <u>, Cuculus canorus</u>						
Curlew, <u>Numenius arquata</u>		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>			<b>A</b>
Dunnock, <u>Prunella modularis</u>						
Feral pigeon, <i>Columba livia</i>	<b>A</b>		▼		▼	
Garden warbler, Sylvia borin						
Goldcrest, Regulus regulus						
Goldfinch, Carduelis carduelis			▼		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
Greats. woodpecker, Dendrocopos major		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>		▼	
Great tit, Parus major	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>			
Green woodpecker, Picus viridis		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>			
Greenfinch, Carduelis chloris	<b>A</b>	▼	▼		<b>A</b>	
Grey heron, Ardea cinerea	▼		<b>A</b>			
Grey partridge, <u>Perdix perdix</u>	<b>A</b>			<b>A</b>	▼	<b>V</b>
Herring gull <u>, Larus argentatus</u>	▼	▼		▼		<b>A</b>
House martin, <u>Delichon urbica</u>	<b>A</b>		▼	<b>A</b>		<b>V</b>
House sparrow, <u>Passer domesticus</u>		▼	▼		<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>
Jackdaw, Corvus monedula			▼		<b>A</b>	
Jay, Garrulus glandarius		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>			
Kestrel, <u>Falco tinnunculus</u>				▼		<b>A</b>
Lapwing, <u>Vanellus vanellus</u>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>			
Lesser black ▼ backed gull, <i>Larus fuscus</i>					▼	▼

Table 17 – continued

Lesser whitethroat, Sylvia curruca						
Linnet, <u>Carduelis cannabina</u>						
Long-tailed tit, Aegithalos caudatus					▼	
Magpie, <i>Pica pica</i>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>			
Mallard, <u>Anas platyrhynchos</u>		<b>A</b>				
Meadow pipit <u>, Anthus pratensis</u>	▼	<b>A</b>		<b>A</b>		
Mistle thrush, <u>Turdus viscivorus</u>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>				
Moorhen, Gallinula chloropus	▼			<b>A</b>		▼
Nuthatch, Sitta europaea				<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	
Oystercatcher, <u>Haematopus ostralegus</u>	<b>A</b>		▼		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
Pheasant, Phasianus colchicus	▼	▼				
Pied wagtail, Motacilla alba	▼	▼		<b>A</b>		▼
Red-legged partridge, Alectoris rufa		▼	▼			
Reed bunting, Emberiza schoeniclus					▼	
Robin, Erithacus rubecula	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>				
Rook, Corvus frugilegus	▼	▼	<b>V</b>			
Sedge warbler, Acrocephalus	<b>A</b>				▼	
Skylark, <u>Alauda arvensis</u>						
Song thrush, <u>Turdus philomelos</u>	<b>A</b>		<b>V</b>		<b>A</b>	
Sparrowhawk, Accipiter nisus						
Starling, <u>Sturnus vulgaris</u>	<b>A</b>		▼	<b>A</b>	▼	▼
Stock dove, <u>Columba oenas</u>	▼				<b>A</b>	
Swallow <u>, <i>Hirundo rustica</i></u>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	▼		▼	
Swift, <u>Apus apus</u>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	▼	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	▼
Tree sparrow, <u>Passer montanus</u>		<b>A</b>		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	
Treecreeper, Certhia familiaris			▼			
Whitethroat, Sylvia communis					<b>A</b>	
Willow warbler, <u>Phylloscopus trochilus</u>				▼	▼	
Wood pigeon, Columba palumbus		▼	▼		▼	▼
Wren, Troglodytes troglodytes	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>			▼	
Yellowhammer, <u>Emberiza citronella</u>	▼	▼		<b>A</b>	▼	▼

Source: British Trust for Ornithology

▲ = statistically significant higher abundance or more positive trend in abundance.

▼ = statistically significant lower abundance or negative trend in abundance.

Gaps are non-significant.

Table 18 – Butterfly population trends

	Butter	fly population	trends
Species	Green Belt compared to Comparator Area	Green Belt compared to Rural Lowland	Comparator Area compared to Rural Lowland
Dark Green Fritillary		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
Silver-washed Fritillary		▼	▼
Green Hairstreak	<b>A</b>		▼
Small Blue	▼		<b>A</b>
Dingy Skipper	▼		<b>A</b>
White Admiral	<b>A</b>		
Chalk-hill Blue	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	
Grizzled Skipper			▼
Red Admiral			
Painted Lady			
Small Tortoiseshell		▼	▼
Orange Tip		▼	▼
Ringlet	<b>A</b>		▼
Brown Argus		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
Holly Blue		<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
Small Heath	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	
Brimstone	<b>A</b>		▼
Small Copper	▼	▼	<b>A</b>
Meadow Brown			
Gatekeeper			
Marbled White	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	
Peacock		▼	▼
Large Skipper		▼	▼
Speckled Wood	<b>A</b>		▼
Wall Brown	▼		
Large White			
Green-veined White			
Small White		<b>A</b>	
Comma			▼
Common Blue		▼	
Small Skipper			▼

Source: Butterfly Conservation Trust

 $\blacktriangle$  = statistically significant higher abundance or more positive trend in abundance.

▼ = statistically significant lower abundance or negative trend in abundance.

Gaps are non-significant.

Table 19 – Category 1 & 2 Pollution incidents in 2001 – 2008

Green Belt Areas	Total Incidents	Number of incidents per hectare	Incidents in Green Belt Areas as % of all incidents in England	Agricultural Materials and Wastes	Atmospheric Pollutants and Effects	Contaminated Water	General Biodegradable Materials and Wastes	Inert Materials and Wastes	Inorganic Chemicals / Products	Oils and Fuel	Organic Chemicals / Products	Other Pollutant	Pollutant Not Identified	Sewage Materials	Specific Waste Materials
Avon	46	0.07	1%	9	9	4	1	3	_	8	6	1	1	1	3
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	_	0	0%	_	_	-	_	_	_	-	-	_	-	_	-
Cambridge	13	0.05	0%	_	_	_	5	1	_	2	1	_	1	3	_
Gloucester & Cheltenham	5	0.07	0%	_	1	_	_	_	_		1	1	2	_	_
London (Metropolitan)	432	0.09	5%	16	55	25	24	59	10	69	18	14	24	62	56
North West	288	0.12	3%	28	27	20	16	23	10	28	14	16	27	48	31
Nottingham & Derby	39	0.06	0%	1	1	2	3	3	2	3	_	2	2	15	5
Oxford	21	0.06	0%	_	1	-	_	_	_	6	1	6	5	2	_
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	64	0.08	1%	3	10	_	2	7	_	8	5	2	4	7	16
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	510	0.21	6%	27	31	29	82	53	5	28	20	14	25	81	115
Stoke-on-Trent	15	0.03	0%	1	_	1	_	2	1	1	1	_	4	2	2
Tyne & Wear	60	0.08	1%	7	17	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	18	5
West Midlands	142	0.06	2%	5	11	7	13	10	6	20	9	8	13	20	20
York	22	0.09	0%	2	1	_	3	1	_	2	_	_	2	4	7
Green Belt Total	1,657	0.1	19%	99	164	90	151	164	35	177	77	65	112	263	260
Green Belt as % of England Total	19%			17%	15%	18%	23%	22%	16%	16%	19%	18%	19%	20%	22%
Comparator Area Total	1,257	0.09	14%	62	105	78	120	132	21	153	45	54	92	226	169
Comparator Area as % of England Total	14%			11%	10%	16%	19%	18%	10%	14%	11%	15%	15%	17%	14%
All England Total	8,723	0.07	100%	581	1,067	498	648	753	213	1,121	412	365	595	1,293	1,177

Source: Environment Agency

Table 20a – Extent of farmed land

	Including Min	nor Holdings			Excluding Mi	inor Holdings			Rural Land Registry
Green Belt Areas	Total Farmed Area (ha)	Percentage of each Green belt	Number of Holdings	Percentage of total farmed area	Total Farmed Area (ha)	Percentage of each Green belt	Number of Holdings	Percentage of total farmed area	Percentage of total farmed area
Avon	48,007	72	1,693	0.5	47,060	70	967	0.5	72
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	687	96	16	0.0	687	96	12	0.0	68
Cambridge	21,672	82	268	0.2	21,601	82	205	0.2	85
Gloucester & Cheltenham	5,997	90	172	0.1	5,918	88	99	0.1	72
London (Metropolitan)	274,564	57	6,377	3.0	271,633	56	4,114	3.0	58
North West	171,914	69	6,189	1.9	169,022	68	3,964	1.8	66
Nottingham & Derby	43,227	72	1,046	0.5	42,808	71	691	0.5	72
Oxford	24,253	72	351	0.3	24,073	71	237	0.3	76
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	31,971	40	1,186	0.3	31,316	40	674	0.3	40
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	176,656	71	5,328	1.9	173,656	70	3,180	1.9	71
Stoke-on-Trent	33,473	76	1,542	0.4	32,666	75	876	0.4	74
Tyne & Wear	49,698	69	819	0.5	49,416	69	550	0.5	73
West Midlands	160,873	72	4,004	1.7	158,946	71	2,533	1.7	72
York	20,651	81	443	0.2	20,424	80	302	0.2	82
Green Belt Total	1,063,645	66	29,434	11.4	1,049,227	65	18,404	11.4	65
Green Belt as % of England Total	11%		14%		11%		15%		
Comparator Area Total	930,435	70	21,208	10	985,649	74	13,387	10.7	70
Comparator Area as % of England Total	10%		10%		11%		11%		
All England Total	9,291,357	71	208,166	100	9,186,542	70	124,552	100	71

Source: June Agricultural Survey 2007 and Rural Land Registry in final column.

Green Belts: a greener future

Table 20b – Number and size of farm holdings, 1990 and 2007

	Holding Size (number of holdings excluding minor holdings)												
	<5 h	ıa	5 <20 ha		20 <50 ha		50 <10	0 ha	>=10	0 ha	Tot	al	
Green Belt Areas	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007	
Avon	263	110	327	325	328	229	192	170	119	133	1,229	967	
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	0	0	#	5	#	#	#	#	#	#	9	12	
Cambridge	35	10	24	45	65	43	41	35	72	72	237	205	
Gloucester & Cheltenham	36	14	#	29	#	#	#	#	#	#	133	99	
London (Metropolitan)	1590	503	1258	1377	1005	919	596	558	733	757	5,182	4,114	
North West	1268	481	1572	1366	1381	1052	734	689	245	376	5,200	3,964	
Nottingham & Derby	113	69	176	212	196	174	119	115	120	121	724	691	
Oxford	43	22	54	55	37	53	40	28	88	79	262	237	
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	229	155	242	257	108	120	72	70	63	72	714	674	
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	835	327	1247	1146	937	746	541	513	350	448	3,910	3,180	
Stoke-on-Trent	195	91	398	337	319	239	152	148	35	61	1,099	876	
Tyne & Wear	80	50	114	135	139	96	152	102	156	167	641	550	
West Midlands	619	267	805	764	745	617	531	393	444	492	3,144	2,533	
York	61	24	71	72	88	80	83	70	51	56	354	302	
Green Belt Total	5,367	2,123	6,324	6,125	5,387	4,396	3,272	2,908	2,488	2,852	22,838	18,404	
Green Belt as % of England Total	18%	16%	17%	17%	15%	16%	13%	14%	11%	11%	15%	15%	
Comparator Area Total	3,153	1,338	4,035	4,020	3,720	3,116	2,621	2,288	2,345	2,625	15,874	13,387	
Comparator Area as % of England Total	11%	10%	11%	11%	11%	11%	10%	11%	10%	10%	11%	11%	
All England Total	29,728	13,187	37,034	36,280	35,320	27,179	25,830	21,309	22,740	26,597	150,652	124,552	

<sup>#</sup> Cells containing information about less than five holdings are suppressed to avoid disclosure of personal information

**Table 21 – Farm tenure** 

Green Belt Areas	No Farmed Land or Tenure Unknown	Percentage with no Farmed Land or Tenure Unknown	Owned >= 75%	Percentage Owned	Rented >= 75%	Percentage Rented	Mixed	Percentage Mixed	Total
Avon	248	15	1,133	67	146	9	166	10	1,693
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	2	13	6	38	5	31	3	19	16
Cambridge	27	10	135	50	73	27	33	12	268
Gloucester & Cheltenham	26	15	116	67	18	10	12	7	172
London (Metropolitan)	948	15	4,173	65	858	13	398	6	6,377
North West	807	13	3,873	63	979	16	530	9	6,189
Nottingham & Derby	142	14	650	62	153	15	101	10	1,046
Oxford	44	13	221	63	59	17	27	8	351
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	210	18	724	61	186	16	66	6	1,186
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	746	14	3,303	62	766	14	513	10	5,328
Stoke-on-Trent	245	16	1,010	65	158	10	129	8	1,542
Tyne & Wear	100	12	484	59	166	20	69	8	819
West Midlands	565	14	2,501	62	604	15	334	8	4,004
York	35	8	322	73	40	9	46	10	443
Green Belt Total	4,145	14	18,651	63	4,211	14	2,427	8	29,434
Green Belt as % of England Total	14%		14%		15%		15%		14%
Comparator Area Total	2,810	13	13,641	64	2,969	14	1,788	8	21,208
Comparator Area as % of England Total	9%		10%		11%		11%		10%
All England Total	30,378	15	134,208	64	27,283	13	16,297	8	208,166

**Table 22 – Robust Farm Type: number of holdings** 

		Farm Type (number of holdings)																		
	Cer	eals	Gen crop		Horticu	lture	Speci pigs pou	s &	Da	niry	Graz lives (Le favoi are	tock ess ured	Graz lives (lowl	tock	Mix	æd	Other	types	To	tal
Green Belt Areas	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007	1990	2007
Avon	92	118	24	11	82	63	41	26	259	108	0	0	334	261	90	69	307	311	1,229	967
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	#	#	#	0	0	0	0	0	#	#	0	#	#	5	#	#	#	#	9	12
Cambridge	127	124	52	26	17	10	8	5	0	#	0	0	10	13	9	#	14	#	237	205
Gloucester & Cheltenham	#	#	#	0	8	9	7	#	#	6	0	0	#	27	#	10	#	28	133	99
London (Metropolitan)	935	928	267	114	687	348	248	121	283	92	0	0	1,045	695	340	194	1,377	1,622	5,182	4,114
North West	334	349	660	381	521	273	254	153	1,012	425	352	445	811	537	287	162	969	1,239	5,200	3,964
Nottingham & Derby	155	182	85	45	41	27	32	27	102	41	0	0	112	117	96	62	101	190	724	691
Oxford	75	71	12	7	15	12	7	#	17	5	0	#	49	42	33	10	54	88	262	237
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	21	44	18	16	88	50	27	20	81	26	0	0	240	172	42	34	197	312	714	674
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	512	544	256	135	128	113	212	105	569	234	660	677	550	294	291	191	732	887	3,910	3,180
Stoke-on-Trent	15	35	11	9	33	32	39	39	423	190	98	164	233	119	44	22	203	266	1,099	876
Tyne & Wear	157	163	26	10	21	13	17	10	70	27	87	62	88	66	92	59	83	140	641	550
West Midlands	377	527	409	225	188	123	130	85	347	134	0	0	767	543	342	172	584	724	3,144	2,533
York	61	98	99	60	15	14	20	12	29	12	0	0	48	36	43	29	39	41	354	302
Green Belt Total	2,873	3,200	1,924	1,039	1,844	1,087	1,042	609	3,210	1,302	1,197	1,348	4,336	2,927	1,726	1,017	4,686	5,875	22,838	18,404
Green Belt as % of England Total	14%	14%	13%	13%	18%	16%	18%	13%	14%	13%	11%	12%	14%	13%	15%	13%	20%	19%	15%	15%
Comparator Area Total	2,437	2,731	1,201	694	1,120	697	599	451	2,491	1,092	756	754	3,182	2,515	1,371	848	2,717	3,605	15,874	13,387
Comparator Area as % of England Total	12%	12%	8%	8%	11%	10%	11%	10%	11%	11%	7%	7%	11%	11%	12%	11%	11%	12%	11%	11%
All England Total	20,154	22,690	14,316	8,245	10,503	6,951	5,635	4,627	22,792	10,076	11,286	10,883	30,222	22,767	11,890	7,720	23,854	30,593	150,652	124,552

# Cells containing information about less than five holdings are suppressed to avoid disclosure of personal information.

Table 23 – Livestock numbers and density

			Livestock num	Livesto	ck density		
Green Belt Areas	Total Cattle	Total Sheep	Total Pig	Total Poultry	Total other eg horses, goats, farmed deer, donkeys, llamas	Livestock density including pigs & poultry (animals per ha of farmed area)	Livestock density excluding pigs & poultry (animals per ha of Green Belt area)
Avon	47,774	41,140	312,941	10,829	3,259	1.92	1.38
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	1,099	315	12	-	31	2.10	2.02
Cambridge	1,765	4,502	157,519	639	258	0.30	0.25
Gloucester & Cheltenham	4,176	3,986	54,121	5,991	325	1.42	1.27
London (Metropolitan)	80,372	148,094	1,211,014	41,314	24,976	0.92	0.52
North West	145,661	228,897	2,878,081	48,513	15,880	2.27	1.58
Nottingham & Derby	22,221	25,247	283,359	27,777	2,815	1.16	0.84
Oxford	5,904	11,061	5,966	3,528	1,736	0.77	0.55
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	19,861	13,062	175,639	4,391	5,657	1.21	0.49
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	122,933	253,178	869,997	81,626	12,219	2.20	1.56
Stoke-on-Trent	51,713	29,569	33,562	9,441	2,334	2.50	1.91
Tyne & Wear	27,679	101,486	97,092	3,483	2,586	2.65	1.83
West Midlands	85,194	235,841	1,650,981	38,498	10,749	2.06	1.47
York	9,924	12,360	773,251	34,011	715	1.11	0.90
Green Belt Total	626,274	1,108,739	8,503,534	310,041	83,540	1.71	1.12
Green Belt as % of England Total	11%	7%	7%	8%	20%		
Comparator Area Total	565,623	1,250,036	10,281,775	354,545	52,196	2.01	1.41
Comparator Area as % of England Total	10%	8%	8%	9%	12%		
All England Total	5,597,559	15,436,577	128,742,687	3,943,444	423,793	2.31	1.64

**Table 24 – Agricultural Land Quality** 

		Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grade										
Green Belt Areas	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Non Agricultural	Urban	Total	% of G1 and G2			
Avon	3,144	4,138	49,689	7,428	14	1,289	1,090	66,792	11			
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote		95	318	244		4	53	714	13			
Cambridge	384	16,348	8,148	505		157	798	26,340	64			
Gloucester & Cheltenham	148	453	5,257	641		120	75	6,694	9			
London (Metropolitan)	8,428	57,853	284,551	43,762	128	74,400	14,619	483,741	14			
North West	28,038	26,810	116,627	44,811	16284	5,700	8,909	247,179	22			
Nottingham & Derby		9,454	32,110	14,587		2,656	1,382	60,189	16			
Oxford	384	6,062	14,036	10,810	1126	877	433	33,728	19			
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset		5,755	16,888	17,085	21015	17,740	382	78,865	7			
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire		39,615	109,168	67,670	17845	6,021	7,922	248,241	16			
Stoke-on-Trent		1,432	21,116	19,721	356	565	646	43,836	3			
Tyne & Wear		3,025	57,622	5,664	495	2,781	2,264	71,851	4			
West Midlands	1,232	41,267	153,061	16,031	80	8,872	4,411	224,954	19			
York		7,636	15,676	664	752	447	378	25,553	30			
Green Belt Total	41,758	219,943	884,267	249,623	58,095	121,629	43,362	1,618,677	16			
Green Belt as % of England Total	12%	12%	14%	14%	5%	19%	5%	12%				
Comparator Area Total	26,108	207,981	683,834	206,944	62,098	74,793	62,018	1,323,776	18			
Comparator Area as % of England Total	7%	11%	11%	11%	6%	11%	7%	10%				
All England Total	354,644	1,849,258	6,291,711	1,840,315	1,100,784	657,209	952,319	13,046,240	17			

Table 25 – Agri-Environment Scheme Uptake

	Envir	l land with A onment Scho eements (AE	eme		Classic Scheme Uptake Environmental Stewardship Uptake							1			
Green Belt Areas	AES uptake (Combined Classic Scheme and Environmental Stewardship)	Utilisable Agricultural Area within Green Belt (ha)	AES as % of all Green Belt land	AES as % of UAA	Environmentally Senstive Areaa or Countryside Stewardship Scheme Agreements	% of total area covered	Average spend on all Classic scheme land (£ per ha)	Entry Level Stewardship	Entry Level plus Higher Level Stewardship	Higher Level Stewardship	Organic Entry Level Stewardship	Organic Entry Level plus Higher Level Stewardship	Environmental Stewardship Total	% of land with Environmental Stewardship	Average spend on all ES land (£ per ha)
Avon	27,926	47,884	42	58	4,924	0.29	5	20,203	791	40	3,507	351	24,892	37	15
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	372	506	53	74	0	0	0	372	0	0	0	0	372	32	15
Cambridge	15,655	21,493	59	73	3,252	0.19	7	,	1,680	27	365	153	14,812	56	21
Gloucester & Cheltenham	2,159	4,845	32	45	396	0.02	3	1,798	3		50		1,851	28	9
London (Metropolitan)	144,741	284,636	30	51	32,511	1.9	5	104,109	11,018	5,380	4,740	908	126,155	26	11
North West	78,144	162,200	32	48	16,859	0.98	4	62,060	3,438	276	3,204	138	69,116	28	10
Nottingham & Derby	21,941	41,977	36	52	3,407	0.2	2	18,494	1,285	254	292	72	20,397	34	12
Oxford	17,810	25,555	53	70	7,058	0.41	21	12,476	1,431	61	83	184	14,235	42	21
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	34,781	48,019	44	72	20,574	1.2	13	9,644	2,641	2,866	595	18	15,764	20	24
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	77,758	178,369	31	44	16,307	0.95	5	59,977	3,776	2,541	722	109	67,125	27	11
Stoke-on-Trent	12,621	31,328	29	40	2,144	0.13	3	10,119	652	22	442	416	11,651	27	13
Tyne & Wear	35,127	50,898	49	69	6,051	0.35	5	30,253	1,072	35	1,087	332	32,779	46	15
West Midlands	89,873	159,887	40	56	18,237	1.06	4	73,514	5,868	1,785	2,593	274	84,034	37	16
York	11,628	20,218	46	56	2,411	0.14	4	10,902	152		31		11,085	43	14
Green Belt Total	570,536	1,077,815	35	53	134,131		5	426,508	33,807	13,287	17,711	2,955	494,268	31	13
Green Belt as % of England Total	9	12			8			10	6	21	6	4	10		
Comparator Area Total	551,458	916,279	42	58	137,784		10	388,954	45,371	6,727	21,821	4,044	466,917	35	16
<b>Comparator as % of England Total</b>	9	10			8			9	9	10	8	5	9		
All England Total	6,140,094	9,203,393	47	67	1,714,136		22	4,141,331	525,294	64,711	285,323	74,539	5,091,197	39	17

Table 26 – Natural England target areas for Higher Level Stewardship

Green Belt Areas	HLS Target Areas	% of all target areas in England	% of area which is targeted
Avon	16,168	0.3	24
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	114	0.0	16
Cambridge	13,840	0.3	53
Gloucester & Cheltenham	1,148	0.0	17
London (Metropolitan)	139,420	3.0	29
North West	25,772	0.6	10
Nottingham & Derby	20,653	0.4	34
Oxford	5,843	0.1	17
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	57,032	1.2	72
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	33,600	0.7	14
Stoke-on-Trent	4,015	0.1	9
Tyne & Wear	9,510	0.2	13
West Midlands	33,839	0.7	15
York	3,103	0.1	12
Green Belt Total	364,057	7.7	22
Green Belt as % of England Total	8		
Comparator Area Total	413,566	8. 8	31
Comparator Area as % of England Total	9		
All England Total	4,711,499	100.00	36

Source: Natural England

Table 27 – National Inventory of Woodland and Trees (2002 data)

## **Interpreted Forest Type**

Green Belt Areas	Broadleaved	Coniferous	Coppice	Coppice with standards	Felled	Ground prepared for planting	Mixed	Shrub	Young trees	Total Woodland	Total Woodland as % of Green Belt Area
Avon	3,961	1,120			16		225	99	395	5,816	9%
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	9								18	27	4%
Cambridge	286	22			4		255	34	101	702	3%
Gloucester & Cheltenham	88	13			7		2	3	37	150	2%
London (Metropolitan)	39,891	9,905	1,997	200	3,046	80	17,186	1,322	2,530	76,157	16%
North West	8,577	1,661	7		344	8	1,990	159	1,570	14,316	6%
Nottingham & Derby	2,560	1,452			124		482	6	442	5,066	8%
Oxford	1,310	307			60		1,063	44	170	2,954	9%
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	11,175	7,284	51	13	1,110	38	4,444	366	538	25,019	32%
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	14,474	2,319			99		2,682	89	891	20,554	8%
Stoke-on-Trent	1,902	685			52		457	28	108	3,232	7%
Tyne & Wear	3,181	4,510			297		1,277	37	606	9,908	14%
West Midlands	9,251	5,165			360	14	2,034	140	1,041	18,005	8%
York	496	394			9		159	5	75	1,138	4%
Green Belt Total	97,161	34,837	2,055	213	5,528	140	32,256	2,332	8,522	183,044	11%
Green Belt as % of England Total	20%	12%	19%	9%	15%	3%	23%	16%	13%	17%	
Comparator Area Total	61,109	22,898	1,845	251	4,600	99	18,668	2,430	8,612	120,512	9%
Comparator Area as % of England Total	13%	8%	17%	11%	12%	2%	13%	16%	13%	11%	
All England Total	482,512	301,020	10,656	2,305	37,976	4,054	140,752	14,819	65,669	1,059,764	8%

Source: Forestry Commission

**Table 28 – Community Forests** 

Green Belt Areas	Forest Area	Green Belt as Community Forest %
Avon	35,646	53.3
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	_	0.0
Cambridge	_	0.0
Gloucester & Cheltenham	_	0.0
London (Metropolitan)	23,735	4.9
North West	75,317	30.4
Nottingham & Derby	21,371	35.5
Oxford	_	0.0
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	_	0.0
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	27,984	11.3
Stoke-on-Trent	_	0.0
Tyne & Wear	_	0.0
West Midlands	17,056	7.6
York	-	0.0
Green Belt Total	201,109	12.4
Green Belt as % of England Total	41	
Comparator Area Total	91,310	6.9
Comparator Area as % of England Total	18	
All England Total	494,038	3.8

Source: Natural England

Table 29 – Flood Risk Areas

	Flood Risk Type				
Green Belt Areas	Fluvial	Fluvial/Tidal	Tidal	Total	Land with flood risk
Avon	3,003	29	3,173	6,205	9.3
Burton upon Trent & Swadlincote	28			28	3.9
Cambridge	2,306			2,306	8.8
Gloucester & Cheltenham	496			496	7.4
London (Metropolitan)	31,909	518	9,193	41,620	8.6
North West	15,279	921	8,704	24,904	10.1
Nottingham & Derby	7,464			7,464	12.4
Oxford	6,920			6,920	20.5
SW Hampshire & SE Dorset	5,590	273	1,426	7,289	9.2
South Yorkshire & West Yorkshire	14,395			14,395	5.8
Stoke-on-Trent	1,445			1,445	3.3
Tyne & Wear	4,050	44	23	4,117	5.7
West Midlands	10,788			10,788	4.8
York	2,621			2,621	10.3
Green Belt Total	106,294	1,785	22,519	130,598	8.1
Green Belt as % of England Total	14	2	4	9	
Comparator Area Totals	92,590	10,428	47,859	150,877	11.4
Comparator Areas as % of England Total	12	11	9	11	
All England Total	758,412	98,951	539,195	1,396,558	10.7

Source: Environment Agency

## Front cover photograph:

Looking Towards Birmingham from Frankley Beeches
© Peter Langley, CPRE West Midlands



## **Campaign to Protect Rural England**

128 Southwark Street London SE1 0SW

Tel: 020 7981 2800 Fax: 020 7981 2899

Email: info@cpre.org.uk

www.cpre.org.uk

CPRE is a company limited by guarantee, registered in England, number 4302973. Registered charity number: 1089685



## **Natural England**

Head Office 1 East Parade Sheffield S1 2ET

Tel: 0845 600 3078 Fax: 0300 060 1622

Email: enquiries@naturalengland.org.uk

www.naturalengland.org.uk

Natural England is here to conserve and enhance the natural environment, for its intrinsic value, the wellbeing and enjoyment of people and the economic prosperity that it brings.

© CPRE/Natural England 2010

ISBN 978-1-84754-160-4

Catalogue Code: NE196

A PDF of this document is available from: <a href="https://www.naturalengland.org.uk/publications">www.naturalengland.org.uk/publications</a> and also from the CPRE website at: <a href="https://www.cpre.org.uk">www.cpre.org.uk</a>

Printed on Defra Silk comprising 75% recycled fibre.