

Plan Policy UAP1 : Directing New Housing													
	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? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact on this DP
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	As above
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Development will be restricted to previously developed land and buildings within the confines of the urban areas and is subject to SC8a. Other development will only be for affordable housing (implemented with Policy SC9) should contribute towards a balanced mix of development.
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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13) 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. No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Not explicit within this policy although potential to have a positive impact on this policy when implemented with SC9.
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? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value Condition of protected species Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable Data unavailable 74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Priority given to development on previously developed land

Plan Policy UAP1 : Directing New Housing														
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Severity	Cumulative	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term			Local	Trans-boundary				
<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? 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	As development will be permitted within existing urban areas and for affordable housing that meets local needs, it is likely that there will be existing access to public transport / key services and therefore the potential for less reliance on car use.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	As above
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	Housing will be predominantly directed on previously used land, potentially contributing to use of previously under-used land. There is also potential to impact upon local distinctiveness through cross reference with layout and design / development policies.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4861kWh per person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified		✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Potential to address drainage issues are addressed through DP10 and DP11. Energy conservation regarding new development is dealt with in DP12 / 12a.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high 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) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact, although location may have an indirect impact on reducing car use. This is, however, difficult to define.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	The policy will minimise development upon greenfield sites as it promotes development only on previously developed land, unless for affordable housing (which will be

Plan Policy UAP1 : Directing New Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local			
	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									according to policy SC9).
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? 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  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	WM issues will be addressed in reference to DP12. There is potential to amend DP12 to include emphasis on preferential use of recyclable materials and a possibility to extend the residential design guide to include provision of receptacles for domestic waste arisings.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Potential to influence through cross reference with other policies such as D11 and DP 12
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Potential to be dealt with in part through reference to DP12.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Affordability is a priority and will be implemented according to SC9. However, there is no clear impact on reducing unfit or empty homes.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	The impact is likely to be positive, although the extent of this is unclear. New housing will be in areas that have good access to key services. It is also unclear as to the amount of pressure that will put on community services. Policy needs to be implemented with a range of policies including SC8a and SC7/7a.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend level  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Potential to make a positive contribution due to the quality and layout of design and access to key services. Needs to be implemented with a range of other design and layout, and social capital policies.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?	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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Minor positive impact is likely to be realised through implementation of this in conjunction with other policies (e.g. social capital).

Plan Policy UAP1 : Directing New Housing													
	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? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	✓	✓	→	→	→	⇄	→	→	As above. Further potential to influence layout and design / security issues through the implementation of DP13
<b>Summary:</b> This policy has a generally positive impact on many of the sustainability objectives, with significant positive impacts on availability and affordability of housing and protecting and improving land quality. It is important to note that, for many of the sustainability objectives, the impacts will depend on the particular circumstance of development and on implementation of this policy in conjunction with others such as DP10, DP11, DP12, DP13, SC9, SC8a and SC77a. Reference to these policies could be included in the reasoned justification.													

Plan Policy UAP2 : Directing New Employment Development													
	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? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	◇	→	→	⇌	→	→	Should contribute positively to this objective as the policy deals with preserving existing or committed employment land and buildings. Should also impact favourably on local employment. However, policy should also consider possible displacement of small businesses and how this may be avoided and also, how diversification could be encouraged.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	No direct impact anticipated
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	⇌	→	→	There is potential to ensure balanced development as policy focuses on retention of employment land and buildings primarily for that purpose.
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	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	No direct impact expected.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13) 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. No trend identified	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	No direct impact expected.
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? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value Condition of protected species Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable Data unavailable 74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	It is not clear whether this will have a significant impact (positively or negatively). The impact will be dependent on future development and/or future employment activities undertaken on the site. However, as priority is given to development on PDL and buildings, development should be minimised on other sites. Policy should be considered in conjunction with other development and urban policies.
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? 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	⇌	→	→	Positively addresses sustainable transport modes and should serve the needs of the local workforce, hence reducing the need to travel.

Plan Policy UAP2 : Directing New Employment Development															
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact			Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary					
<b>Sustainable Development Objectives</b>															
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	As above
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	Maximises development on PDL / buildings which will reduce the need for further development of this type elsewhere
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	Policy does not deal directly with this, although impact can be influenced when implemented with other policies, namely DP10, DP11, DP12 / 12a.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact expected
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high 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) PM <sub>10</sub> none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	Supports use of more sustainable modes of transport. Priority is given to small-scale offices, R&D and light industry development next to transport interchanges / areas highly accessible by walking and cycling. It could therefore have a positive impact on minimising poor air quality associated with exhaust emissions.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7) No information available at district level	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified No trends identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	Policy is concerned with development on PDL and allocated employment areas so will minimise development on greenfield sites. Policy to be implemented with other policies such as SSP1 and SC2.

Plan Policy UAP2 : Directing New Employment Development													
	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 reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? 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  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	It is not clear how the policy will impact on this objective. Impact depends upon future use and development.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? 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	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	Impact is not clear. However, there is potential to influence this through implementation with other policies e.g. DP11 and by incorporating conditions into the policy itself that specify any future development will have to pay regard to sustainable design issues.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	As above. However, there is potential to be dealt with in part through reference to DP12.
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? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend level  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends 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  Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)  Data not available	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified  Unable to determine trends	✓	✓	→	→	→	✕	→	→	Minor positive impact could be realised through implementation of this in conjunction with other policies. Policy may improve access to employment opportunities for a greater proportion of the population.

Plan Policy UAP2 : Directing New Employment Development													
	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 crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	No direct impact - more of a design and layout issue.
<p><b>Summary:</b>  This policy has a generally positive impact on several of the sustainability objectives, with significant positive impacts on protecting and improving land quality, sustainable transport and reducing travel. It is possible that the policy could have a significant positive impact on maintaining high economic growth, however the potential impacts on small businesses could be negative. It is important to note that, for a number of the sustainability objectives, the impacts will depend on the particular circumstance of development and on implementation of policy in conjunction with others such as SSP1, SC2, DP10, DP11 and DP12 / 12a. Reference to these policies could be included in the reasoned justification.</p>													

Plan Policy UAP3 : Directing New Retail Development														
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary	
					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local				Trans-boundary
<b>Sustainable Development Objectives</b>														
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	Only viable development will be permitted outside town centres. There is potential to contribute positively in terms of creating employment opportunities. Diversification development will only be permitted where there is a proven need and larger proposals will be subject to a Retail Impact Assessment.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact anticipated
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	Potential to ensure balanced development. Retail will be confined mainly to town centres.
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	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact expected.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13) 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. No trend identified	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact expected.
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? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value Condition of protected species Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable Data unavailable 74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact, although policy looks to minimise development outside urban areas.

Plan Policy UAP3 : Directing New Retail Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Severely	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? 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Priority given to town centre locations. These will be readily accessible by public transport, foot and cycling. Policy will also ensure that any development that is proven to be viable outside town centres will be easily accessible by sustainable modes of transport.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	As above
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Priority given to development within town centres on previously developed land. Policy could include reference to limiting any development that does occur outside of town centres to brownfield / under-used sites. (Although this may be included in any assessment criteria).
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Policy does not deal directly with this, although impact can be maximised when implemented with other policies, namely DP10, DP11, DP12 / 12a.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact expected
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high 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) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Central locations means improved access by more sustainable modes of transport / any other development will need to be highly accessible by these as well. Therefore may have a positive impact on minimising poor air quality associated with exhausts.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Policy is concerned with development on PDL / buildings predominantly within town centres.

Plan Policy UAP3 : Directing New Retail Development													
	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? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? 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  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	Not clear how the policy will impact on this objective. Impact will depend upon future use and development.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? 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	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	Impact is not clear. There is potential to influence this through implementation with other policies e.g. DP11. It is also possible to build conditions into the policy itself that specify any future development will have to pay regard to sustainable design issues etc.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	As above. Potential to be dealt with in part through reference to DP12.
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? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend level  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends Unable to identify situation	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	No direct impact
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?	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	✓	✓	→	→	→	◊	→	→	Minor positive impact may be realised through implementation of this in conjunction with other policies. May improve access to employment opportunities for a wider

Plan Policy UAP3 : Directing New Retail Development													
	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									proportion of the population.
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better									No direct impact. More of a design and layout issue.
<p>Summary:</p> <p>This policy has a generally positive impact on several of the sustainability objectives, with significant positive impacts on sustainable transport, reducing travel and maintaining high economic growth. It is important to note that, for a number of the sustainability objectives, the impacts will depend on the particular circumstance of development and on implementation of policy in conjunction with others such as DP10, DP11 and DP12 / 12a. Reference to these policies could be included in the reasoned justification.</p>													