

Plan Policy SSP6: Safeguarding Land for the Barford Bypass													
	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
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	✓	✓	←	→	✓	☒	→	→	Bypassing traffic may reduce trade for local retailers.
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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	No direct impact.
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.
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.
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.	✓	✓	←	→	✓	☒	→	→	A range of adverse environmental impacts associated with construction, development and use of bypass.

Plan Policy SSP6: Safeguarding Land for the Barford Bypass													
	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? 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	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	✧	→	→	Negative impact upon this objective- promotes road transport and car travel.
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	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	✧	→	→	Promotes car use.
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	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	✧	→	→	Negative impact- no positive benefits on landscape character and ecology.
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	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	✧	→	→	Encourages road transport use and adverse impacts associated with fuel consumption.
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	✓	✓	→ ↔ ↔	→	✓	✧	→	→	Could enhance character of Barford through limiting congestion although could also increase pollution (noise, visual, particulates).
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	✓	✓	←	→	✓	✧	→	→	Will encourage more road traffic in locality which will have negative implications for air quality.
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	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Uncertain impact.

Plan Policy SSP6: Safeguarding Land for the Barford Bypass													
	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	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Any development will have waste implications although it is not clear what the direct impact on this objective will be through implementing this policy- needs to give some attention to ensuring any development is resource efficient and minimises wastes.
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 have a positive influence on design and particularly to be sustainable in design although these considerations have not been made explicit within this policy and it would have to be implemented with other policies such as D12.
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	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	✧	→	→	Consumption of natural resources during construction phase.
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 expected
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	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Uncertain
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  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	✧	→	→	Will increase road traffic- adverse health implications associated with poorer air quality.
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

Plan Policy SSP6: Safeguarding Land for the Barford Bypass													
	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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> <b>This policy aims to safeguard land for development.</b>													

Plan Policy SSP7: Coventry Airport													
	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	✓	✓	→ →	☒	✓	☒	→	→	This policy supports appropriate development within Coventry Airport, which is a major employer and an important asset to the local and regional economy.
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.
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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	No direct impact.
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	✓	✓	⊕	☒	☒	☒	⊕	⊕	Uncertain impact. However, local tourism may be boosted from incoming visitors to the area by air travel.
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.
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- indirect impacts associated with road and air movements

Plan Policy SSP7: Coventry Airport														
Sustainable Development Objectives	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary	
					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local				Trans-boundary
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	✓	✓	→	→	☒	☒	→	→	The Policy does attempt to address the issue of promoting public transport for passengers using the airport.	
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	✓	✓			☒	☒			This policy does not help reduce the need to travel.	
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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	No direct impact, although development will not detract from this.	
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	✓	✓	←	←	☒	☒	☒	←	←	Increased air travel will increase the amount of greenhouse gases.
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, although development will not detract from this.	
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	✓	✓	←	←	☒	☒	☒	←	←	Increased air and road travel will increase the amount of greenhouse gases.
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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	No direct impact.	

Plan Policy SSP7: Coventry Airport													
Sustainable Development Objectives	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									
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	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? 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  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	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 there may be job creation opportunities and also improved accessibility to travel opportunities for those in most need i.e. good public transport links

Plan Policy SSP7: Coventry Airport													
	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									and cheap flights
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.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy and the supporting text could be made more clear and transparent. For example, there may be uncertainty as to what is meant by “unacceptable harm to the environment and local residents”.													

Plan Policy SSP8 : Hatton Country World													
	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	✓	✓	←	☒	☒	☒	←	←	New retail development will not be permitted under this policy. This is likely to have a negative impact on economic growth in the area.
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	✓	✓	?	☒	☒	☒	?	?	It is uncertain how restricting further retail development will affect the rural communities.
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	✓	✓	?	☒	☒	☒	?	?	It is uncertain how restricting further retail development will affect the vitality of 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	✓	✓	?	☒	☒	☒	?	?	The Council will not support proposals which would lead to an increase in visitor numbers. However, it may be that
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.
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.

Plan Policy SSP8 : Hatton Country World													
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? 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? 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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact.
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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact.
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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	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? 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.
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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact.

Plan Policy SSP8 : Hatton Country World													
	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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	No direct impact.
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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	No direct impact.
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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	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? 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  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	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.

Plan Policy SSP8 : Hatton Country World													
	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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary</b> The policy would be strengthened if it were to include all development types, and not just 'retail development'. The policy makes appropriate cross references in the supporting text to other policies including DAP1, DAP3 and RAP10.													