

| Plan Policy TCP4: Primary Retail Frontages  |   |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
|   | Questions   | Indicators  | Baseline Information  | Targets and trends   | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban | Commentary   |
|   |   |   |   |  | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |       |  |
| <b>Sustainable Development Objectives</b>   |   |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
| To maintain high levels of economic growth  | Will it meet the employment needs of the local community?<br>Will it help diversify the economy?<br>Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres?<br>Will it support small businesses?   | Number of VAT registered businesses<br><br>Number of business start-ups net of closures<br><br>Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas | 4,965 in 2002 (2)<br><br>11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)<br><br>No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15) | Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000<br><br>Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000<br><br>Favourable situation, but no trend identified   | ✓          | ✓         | →<br>→ | →        | →          | ↔     | →     | →     | This policy will assist in helping to maintain in the long term, high and sustained levels of economic growth.                                       |
| To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities  | Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy?<br>Will it retain / enhance village services?   | Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals<br><br>Number of service closures in rural areas  | 8 in 2004 (15)<br><br>District level data not available   | Unable to identify trend<br><br>Unable to identify trend   | ↔          | ↔         | ↔      | ↔        | ↔          | ↔     | ↔     | ↔     | No direct impact expected.   |
| To enhance the vitality of town centres   | Will it improve the economic viability of town centres?<br>Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?  | Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages  | One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)  | No trend available   | ✓          | ✓         | →<br>→ | →        | →          | →     | ↔     | →     | Restricting the growth of food and drink outlets should help to enhance the vitality of town centres by protecting the retail character of the area. |
| To promote sustainable tourism  | Will it promote sustainable tourism?  | Number of tourists  | 1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)  | Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000  | ✓          | ✓         | →      | →        | →          | ↔     | ↔     | →     | Ensuring the retail character of the town centre is maintained will help to promote sustainable tourism.   |
| To meet the housing needs of the whole community  | Will it reduce homelessness?<br>Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?   | Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation<br><br>Percentage of population living in affordable housing   | 46 in 2004 (13)<br><br>10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)  | Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.<br><br>No trend identified   | ↔          | ↔         | ↔      | ↔        | ↔          | ↔     | ↔     | ↔     | No direct impact.  |
| To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters | Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside?<br>Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk?<br>Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?<br>Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality? | Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value<br><br>Condition of protected species<br><br>Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality       | Data unavailable<br><br>Data unavailable<br><br>74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)  | Unable to identify trend<br><br>Unable to identify trend<br><br>Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average. | ↔          | ↔         | ↔      | ↔        | ↔          | ↔     | ↔     | ↔     | No direct impact.  |

| Plan Policy TCP4: Primary Retail Frontages  |   |  |  |   |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
|---|---|--|--|---|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Sustainable Development Objectives  | Questions   | Indicators   | Baseline Information   | Targets and trends  | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban | Commentary   |
|   |   |  |  |   | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |       |  |
| To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport) | Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling?<br>Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?  | Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre   | District level data unavailable  | Unable to identify trend  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |
| To reduce the need to travel  | Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry?<br>Will it minimise the need to travel?   | Percentage of journeys to school by car<br>Percentage of journeys to work by car   | 40% in 2003 (9)<br>62.8% in 2003 (3)   | Slight reduction from 42% in 2002<br>No trend available   | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes                              | Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land?<br>Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside?<br>Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?   | Condition of landscape character areas   | No data available  | Unable to identify situation  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |
| To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change  | Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?<br>Will it minimise the risk of flooding?<br>Will it minimise the need for energy?<br>Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?   | Per capita consumption of electricity<br>Per capita consumption of gas<br>Land at risk of flooding   | Domestic consumption of 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8)<br>Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8)<br>Data unavailable   | Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified<br>Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), but no trend identified<br>No trend identified | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |
| To protect and enhance the historic environment   | Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value?<br>Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages?<br>Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value? | Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay<br>Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored<br>Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood | 5% (January 2005) (11)<br>36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11)<br>90.3% in December 2004 (12) | This has reduced from 10% in 1998.<br>No trend available<br>No trend identified   | ✓          | ✓         | →      | →        | →          | ☒     | ☒     | →     | The policy will help to protect the character of the town centre |
| To protect and improve air quality  | Will it maintain and improve local air quality?   | Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high<br>Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.  | 44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)<br>PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10) | Higher than national average and getting worse<br>Favourable situation getting better   | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |
| To protect and improve land quality   | Will it minimise development on greenfield land?<br>Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?   | Percentage of development on greenfield sites  | 76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)                              | Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |

| Plan Policy TCP4: Primary Retail Frontages   |  |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |   |
|--|--|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
|  | Questions  | Indicators  | Baseline Information  | Targets and trends   | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban | Commentary  |
|  |  |   |   |  | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |       |   |
| Sustainable Development Objectives   |  |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |   |
|  | Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?   | Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development  | No information available at district level                                      | No trends identified   |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |   |
| To reduce the generation and disposal of waste   | Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?<br>Will it encourage recycling?<br>Will it promote the re use of resources?<br>Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)? | Amount of waste produced per capita<br><br>Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita  | 362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)<br><br>23.4% (2003/4) (2)       | Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2<br><br>Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2                             | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment                          | Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes?<br>Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?  | Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard   | No data available   | No trend identified  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To ensure the prudent use of natural resources   | Will it minimise the use of water?<br>Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?   | Use of water per capita   | District level not available  | No trend identified  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To make housing available and affordable to everyone                                     | Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  | Percentage of homes unfit for use   | 1.59% in 2004 (13)  | Improved from 1.86% in 2001  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities | Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities?<br>Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities?<br>Will it improve access to local services and facilities?  | Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities<br><br>Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop | 77.3% (14)<br><br>Data unavailable  | Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available<br><br>Unable to identify trend  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To improve health and well being   | Will it promote healthy lifestyles?<br>Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services?<br>Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community?<br>Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?  | Length of new cycleways created<br><br>Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness<br><br>Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces  | Data not available at district level<br><br>15.4% (3)<br><br>Data not available | Unable to identify trend<br><br>Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends<br><br>Unable to identify situation | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To reduce poverty and social exclusion   | Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?  | Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed  | 1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)                   | Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified   | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact. Although protecting the long term viability of the town centre could contribute to reducing poverty and social exclusion. |

| Plan Policy TCP4: Primary Retail Frontages   |   |   |                         |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
|  | Questions   | Indicators  | Baseline Information    | Targets and trends                                 | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban | Commentary   |
|  |   |   |                         |  | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |       |  |
| Sustainable Development Objectives   |   |   |                         |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
|  |   | Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes | Data not available      | Unable to determine trends                         |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
| To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour  | Will it reduce actual levels of crime?<br>Will it reduce the fear of crime?<br>Will it reduce noise levels? | Number of crimes reported per 1000 population             | 41.2 2004/5 to date (4) | Lower than county average (43). No trend available | ✘          | ✘         | ✘      | ✘        | ✘          | ✘     | ✘     | ✘     | Although no direct impact, this policy may help to reduce antisocial behaviour, which can be associated with large numbers of food and drink outlets close together. |
| <b>Summary:</b><br><b>This policy will contribute to the objectives on economic growth and protecting the vitality and culture of the town centre.</b> |   |   |                         |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |

| Plan Policy TCP5: Secondary Retail Areas  |   |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
|   | Questions   | Indicators  | Baseline Information  | Targets and trends   | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban | Commentary   |
|   |   |   |   |  | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |       |  |
| <b>Sustainable Development Objectives</b>   |   |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
| To maintain high levels of economic growth  | Will it meet the employment needs of the local community?<br>Will it help diversify the economy?<br>Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres?<br>Will it support small businesses?   | Number of VAT registered businesses<br><br>Number of business start-ups net of closures<br><br>Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas | 4,965 in 2002 (2)<br><br>11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)<br><br>No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15) | Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000<br><br>Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000<br><br>Favourable situation, but no trend identified   | ✓          | ✓         | →<br>→ | →        | →          | ↔     | →     | →     | This policy will assist in helping to maintain in the long term, high and sustained levels of economic growth.                                       |
| To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities  | Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy?<br>Will it retain / enhance village services?   | Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals<br><br>Number of service closures in rural areas  | 8 in 2004 (15)<br><br>District level data not available   | Unable to identify trend<br><br>Unable to identify trend   | ↔          | ↔         | ↔      | ↔        | ↔          | ↔     | ↔     | ↔     | No direct impact expected.   |
| To enhance the vitality of town centres   | Will it improve the economic viability of town centres?<br>Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?  | Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages  | One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)  | No trend available   | ✓          | ✓         | →<br>→ | →        | →          | →     | ↔     | →     | Restricting the growth of food and drink outlets should help to enhance the vitality of town centres by protecting the retail character of the area. |
| To promote sustainable tourism  | Will it promote sustainable tourism?  | Number of tourists  | 1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)  | Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000  | ✓          | ✓         | →      | →        | →          | ↔     | ↔     | →     | Ensuring the retail character of the town centre is maintained will help to promote sustainable tourism.   |
| To meet the housing needs of the whole community  | Will it reduce homelessness?<br>Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?   | Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation<br><br>Percentage of population living in affordable housing   | 46 in 2004 (13)<br><br>10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)  | Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.<br><br>No trend identified   | ↔          | ↔         | ↔      | ↔        | ↔          | ↔     | ↔     | ↔     | No direct impact.  |
| To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters | Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside?<br>Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk?<br>Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?<br>Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality? | Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value<br><br>Condition of protected species<br><br>Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality       | Data unavailable<br><br>Data unavailable<br><br>74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)  | Unable to identify trend<br><br>Unable to identify trend<br><br>Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average. | ↔          | ↔         | ↔      | ↔        | ↔          | ↔     | ↔     | ↔     | No direct impact.  |

| Plan Policy TCP5: Secondary Retail Areas  |   |  |  |   |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
|---|---|--|--|---|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
|   | Questions   | Indicators   | Baseline Information   | Targets and trends  | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban | Commentary   |
|   |   |  |  |   | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |       |  |
| <b>Sustainable Development Objectives</b>   |   |  |  |   |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
| To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport) | Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling?<br>Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?  | Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre   | District level data unavailable  | Unable to identify trend  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |
| To reduce the need to travel  | Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry?<br>Will it minimise the need to travel?   | Percentage of journeys to school by car<br>Percentage of journeys to work by car   | 40% in 2003 (9)<br>62.8% in 2003 (3)   | Slight reduction from 42% in 2002<br>No trend available   | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes                              | Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land?<br>Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside?<br>Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?   | Condition of landscape character areas   | No data available  | Unable to identify situation  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |
| To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change  | Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?<br>Will it minimise the risk of flooding?<br>Will it minimise the need for energy?<br>Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?   | Per capita consumption of electricity<br>Per capita consumption of gas<br>Land at risk of flooding   | Domestic consumption of 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8)<br>Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8)<br>Data unavailable   | Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified<br>Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), but no trend identified<br>No trend identified | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |
| To protect and enhance the historic environment   | Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value?<br>Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages?<br>Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value? | Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay<br>Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored<br>Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood | 5% (January 2005) (11)<br>36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11)<br>90.3% in December 2004 (12) | This has reduced from 10% in 1998.<br>No trend available<br>No trend identified   | ✓          | ✓         | →      | →        | →          | ☒     | ☒     | →     | The policy will help to protect the character of the town centre |
| To protect and improve air quality  | Will it maintain and improve local air quality?   | Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high<br>Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.  | 44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)<br>PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10) | Higher than national average and getting worse<br>Favourable situation getting better   | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |
| To protect and improve land quality   | Will it minimise development on greenfield land?<br>Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?   | Percentage of development on greenfield sites  | 76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)                              | Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.  |

| Plan Policy TCP5: Secondary Retail Areas   |  |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |   |
|--|--|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
|  | Questions  | Indicators  | Baseline Information  | Targets and trends   | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban | Commentary  |
|  |  |   |   |  | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |       |   |
| Sustainable Development Objectives   |  |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |   |
|  | Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?   | Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development  | No information available at district level                                      | No trends identified   |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |   |
| To reduce the generation and disposal of waste   | Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?<br>Will it encourage recycling?<br>Will it promote the re use of resources?<br>Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)? | Amount of waste produced per capita<br><br>Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita  | 362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)<br><br>23.4% (2003/4) (2)       | Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2<br><br>Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2                             | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment                          | Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes?<br>Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?  | Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard   | No data available   | No trend identified  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To ensure the prudent use of natural resources   | Will it minimise the use of water?<br>Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?   | Use of water per capita   | District level not available  | No trend identified  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To make housing available and affordable to everyone                                     | Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  | Percentage of homes unfit for use   | 1.59% in 2004 (13)  | Improved from 1.86% in 2001  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities | Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities?<br>Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities?<br>Will it improve access to local services and facilities?  | Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities<br><br>Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop | 77.3% (14)<br><br>Data unavailable  | Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available<br><br>Unable to identify trend  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To improve health and well being   | Will it promote healthy lifestyles?<br>Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services?<br>Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community?<br>Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?  | Length of new cycleways created<br><br>Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness<br><br>Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces  | Data not available at district level<br><br>15.4% (3)<br><br>Data not available | Unable to identify trend<br><br>Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends<br><br>Unable to identify situation | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To reduce poverty and social exclusion   | Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?  | Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed  | 1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)                   | Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified   | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact. Although protecting the long term viability of the town centre could contribute to reducing poverty and social exclusion. |

| Plan Policy TCP5: Secondary Retail Areas   |   |   |                         |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
|  | Questions   | Indicators  | Baseline Information    | Targets and trends                                 | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban | Commentary   |
|  |   |   |                         |  | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |       |  |
| Sustainable Development Objectives   |   |   |                         |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
|  |   | Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes | Data not available      | Unable to determine trends                         |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
| To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour  | Will it reduce actual levels of crime?<br>Will it reduce the fear of crime?<br>Will it reduce noise levels? | Number of crimes reported per 1000 population             | 41.2 2004/5 to date (4) | Lower than county average (43). No trend available | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | Although no direct impact, this policy may help to reduce antisocial behaviour, which can be associated with large numbers of food and drink outlets close together. |
| <b>Summary:</b><br>Similarly to the policy on primary retail areas, this policy will contribute to the objectives on economic growth and protecting the vitality and culture of the town centre. |   |   |                         |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |

| Plan Policy TCP6: Café Quarters   |   |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |        |   |
|---|---|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|--------|---|
|   | Questions   | Indicators  | Baseline Information  | Targets and trends   | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban  | Commentary  |
|   |   |   |   |  | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |        |   |
| <b>Sustainable Development Objectives</b>   |   |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |        |   |
| To maintain high levels of economic growth  | Will it meet the employment needs of the local community?<br>Will it help diversify the economy?<br>Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres?<br>Will it support small businesses?   | Number of VAT registered businesses<br><br>Number of business start-ups net of closures<br><br>Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas | 4,965 in 2002 (2)<br><br>11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)<br><br>No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15) | Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000<br><br>Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000<br><br>Favourable situation, but no trend identified   | ✓          | ✓         | →<br>→ | →        | →          | ↔     | →     | →      | This policy will assist in helping to maintain high and sustained levels of economic growth by providing visitors with attractions to complement shopping and leisure related journeys. |
| To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities  | Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy?<br>Will it retain / enhance village services?   | Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals<br><br>Number of service closures in rural areas  | 8 in 2004 (15)<br><br>District level data not available   | Unable to identify trend<br><br>Unable to identify trend   | ↔          | ↔         | ↔      | ↔        | ↔          | ↔     | ↔     | ↔      | No direct impact.   |
| To enhance the vitality of town centres   | Will it improve the economic viability of town centres?<br>Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?  | Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages  | One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)  | No trend available   | ✓          | ✓         | →<br>→ | →        | →          | ↔     | ↔     | →<br>→ | The provision of a specific area for food and drink uses will enhance the vitality of the town centre.  |
| To promote sustainable tourism  | Will it promote sustainable tourism?  | Number of tourists  | 1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)  | Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000  | ✓          | ✓         | →      | →        | →          | ↔     | ↔     | →      | The provision of a specific area for food and drink uses may help to promote sustainable tourism.   |
| To meet the housing needs of the whole community  | Will it reduce homelessness?<br>Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?   | Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation<br><br>Percentage of population living in affordable housing   | 46 in 2004 (13)<br><br>10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)  | Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.<br><br>No trend identified   | ↔          | ↔         | ↔      | ↔        | ↔          | ↔     | ↔     | ↔      | No direct impact.   |
| To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters | Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside?<br>Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk?<br>Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?<br>Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality? | Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value<br><br>Condition of protected species<br><br>Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality       | Data unavailable<br><br>Data unavailable<br><br>74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)  | Unable to identify trend<br><br>Unable to identify trend<br><br>Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average. | ↔          | ↔         | ↔      | ↔        | ↔          | ↔     | ↔     | ↔      | No direct impact.   |

| Plan Policy TCP6: Café Quarters   |   |  |  |   |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
|   | Questions   | Indicators   | Baseline Information   | Targets and trends  | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban | Commentary  |
|   |   |  |  |   | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |       |   |
| Sustainable Development Objectives  |   |  |  |   |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |   |
| To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport) | Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling?<br>Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?  | Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre   | District level data unavailable  | Unable to identify trend  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To reduce the need to travel  | Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry?<br>Will it minimise the need to travel?   | Percentage of journeys to school by car<br>Percentage of journeys to work by car   | 40% in 2003 (9)<br>62.8% in 2003 (3)   | Slight reduction from 42% in 2002<br>No trend available   | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes                              | Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land?<br>Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside?<br>Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?   | Condition of landscape character areas   | No data available  | Unable to identify situation  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change  | Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?<br>Will it minimise the risk of flooding?<br>Will it minimise the need for energy?<br>Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?   | Per capita consumption of electricity<br>Per capita consumption of gas<br>Land at risk of flooding   | Domestic consumption of 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8)<br>Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8)<br>Data unavailable   | Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified<br>Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), but no trend identified<br>No trend identified | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To protect and enhance the historic environment   | Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value?<br>Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages?<br>Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value? | Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay<br>Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored<br>Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood | 5% (January 2005) (11)<br>36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11)<br>90.3% in December 2004 (12) | This has reduced from 10% in 1998.<br>No trend available<br>No trend identified   | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact. Although policy may help to protect the character of the town centre. |
| To protect and improve air quality  | Will it maintain and improve local air quality?   | Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high<br>Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.  | 44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)<br>PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10) | Higher than national average and getting worse<br>Favourable situation getting better   | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |
| To protect and improve land quality   | Will it minimise development on greenfield land?<br>Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?   | Percentage of development on greenfield sites  | 76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)                              | Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified  | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact.   |

| Plan Policy TCP6: Café Quarters  |  |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
|  | Questions  | Indicators  | Baseline Information  | Targets and trends   | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban | Commentary   |
|  |  |   |   |  | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |       |  |
| Sustainable Development Objectives   |  |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
|  | Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?   | Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development  | No information available at district level                                      | No trends identified   |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |  |
| To reduce the generation and disposal of waste   | Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?<br>Will it encourage recycling?<br>Will it promote the re use of resources?<br>Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)? | Amount of waste produced per capita<br><br>Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita  | 362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)<br><br>23.4% (2003/4) (2)       | Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2<br><br>Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2                             | ✓          | ✓         | ←      | ←        | ←          | ✧     | ✧     | ←     | Food and drink uses may create additional locally generated waste, however this can normally be dealt with through the adequate provision of refuse and litter facilities. |
| To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment                          | Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes?<br>Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?  | Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard   | No data available   | No trend identified  | ✧          | ✧         | ✧      | ✧        | ✧          | ✧     | ✧     | ✧     | No direct impact.  |
| To ensure the prudent use of natural resources   | Will it minimise the use of water?<br>Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?   | Use of water per capita   | District level not available  | No trend identified  | ✧          | ✧         | ✧      | ✧        | ✧          | ✧     | ✧     | ✧     | No direct impact.  |
| To make housing available and affordable to everyone                                     | Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  | Percentage of homes unfit for use   | 1.59% in 2004 (13)  | Improved from 1.86% in 2001  | ✧          | ✧         | ✧      | ✧        | ✧          | ✧     | ✧     | ✧     | No direct impact.  |
| To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities | Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities?<br>Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities?<br>Will it improve access to local services and facilities?  | Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities<br><br>Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop | 77.3% (14)<br><br>Data unavailable  | Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available<br><br>Unable to identify trend  | ✧          | ✧         | ✧      | ✧        | ✧          | ✧     | ✧     | ✧     | No direct impact.  |
| To improve health and well being   | Will it promote healthy lifestyles?<br>Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services?<br>Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community?<br>Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?  | Length of new cycleways created<br><br>Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness<br><br>Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces  | Data not available at district level<br><br>15.4% (3)<br><br>Data not available | Unable to identify trend<br><br>Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends<br><br>Unable to identify situation | ✧          | ✧         | ✧      | ✧        | ✧          | ✧     | ✧     | ✧     | No direct impact.  |

| Plan Policy TCP6: Café Quarters   |   |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |                   |
|---|---|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------|
|   | Questions   | Indicators  | Baseline Information  | Targets and trends   | Timescale  |           | Impact | Scale    |            |       | Rural | Urban | Commentary        |
|   |   |   |   |  | Short term | Long term |        | Severity | Cumulative | Local |       |       |                   |
| Sustainable Development Objectives  |   |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |                   |
| To reduce poverty and social exclusion  | Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?                                   | Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed<br><br>Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes | 1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)<br><br>Data not available | Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified<br><br>Unable to determine trends | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact. |
| To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour   | Will it reduce actual levels of crime?<br>Will it reduce the fear of crime?<br>Will it reduce noise levels? | Number of crimes reported per 1000 population   | 41.2 2004/5 to date (4)   | Lower than county average (43). No trend available   | ☒          | ☒         | ☒      | ☒        | ☒          | ☒     | ☒     | ☒     | No direct impact. |
| <b>Summary:</b><br>Policy will contribute to the sustainability objectives on economic growth, enhancing the vitality of the town and helping to promote sustainable tourism. However, it is important to recognise that the policy may have negative impacts on increased waste and litter production. |   |   |   |  |            |           |        |          |            |       |       |       |                   |