

Plan Policy SSP1 : Employment Allocations													
	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	✓	✓	→ →	→	✓	✘	→	→ →	Provision of PDL within urban fringe comprising of a mix of sites for all B class classifications; however, there is an oversupply of land (4ha) which is argued will be adequate.
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. The sites are largely constrained to urban areas.
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 sites are within / adjacent to existing town centres to ensure the maintenance of viability 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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	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. However, if land which is suitable for housing is designated as employment land this may reduce the amount of available housing.
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.	✘	✘	←	✘	✘		✘	✘	Will not contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment, for example Site F is proposed on a part of a greenfield site. However, the focus of the development is on previously developed land which will help to minimise adverse effects.

Plan Policy SSP1 : Employment Allocations													
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	☒	☒	→	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	A number of the sites are within the town centre or near existing transport infrastructure, this will help to promote public transport and walking.
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	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	☒	→	↔	Land identified for development is within the urban confines and for the TTW requirements is likely to minimise the additional demand for travel; however, there will still be a net increase in travel and hence it will score both positively and negatively.
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	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	☒	→	↔	Involves re-use of under-used and previously developed sites.
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	☒	☒	?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	Uncertain 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	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Uncertain 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	☒	↔	Potential for the policy to have a significant positive impact on this objective with regard to use of previously used land/under used land. Additional potential to use this policy

Plan Policy SSP1 : Employment Allocations													
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 improve/remediate existing contaminated sites
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 explicit within the policy
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 here but not directly applicable to the policy.
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.
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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	No direct impact expected.
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 expected.
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 expected.

Plan Policy SSP1 : Employment Allocations													
	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 expected.
<b>Summary:</b> The production of Supplementary Planning Guidance for those sites without guidance would assist in identifying further planning restraints and opportunities and is strongly encouraged.													

Plan Policy SSP2 : Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt													
	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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	Does not make a direct contribution.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	→	→	Marginal positive, due to some of the sites focused on development of rural business (Stoneleigh Park)
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.	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	→	→	Marginally positive as most of the land is PDL

Plan Policy SSP2 : Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt													
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	✓	✓	↔	☒	✓	☒	↔	☒	Potential for additional trip generation will be significant due to location of the sites (in rural locations only accessible by road vehicle)
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	→	☒	Implied as redevelopment will need to be 'appropriate' - not clear though.
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	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Unclear- may increase road traffic and adverse effects 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	→	☒	Marginal positive.
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	✓	✓	↔	☒	✓	☒	↔	☒	Could lead to increased road traffic, hence adverse implications for local 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	✓	✓	↔	☒	✓	☒	↔	☒	Will lead to development on greenfield sites, although could enhance rather than disturb. (Positive and negative impacts).

Plan Policy SSP2 : Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt													
	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	✓	✓	←	☒	✓	☒	←	☒	Marginal negative due to the increase of waste arisings; however, that existing waste infrastructure has sufficient capacity to address additional demand
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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	Uncertain how local communities can and will benefit.
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- focus is on employment land.
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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	May improve employment opportunities- impact unclear.

Plan Policy SSP2 : Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt													
	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> May wish to consider ways in which the net loss of green belt (and open space) could be minimised, possibly through the creation/allocation of additional green belt and open space.													

Plan Policy SSP3: Stoneleigh Park													
	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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	→	☒	Makes reference to activities to promote agriculture- should have some positive economic impact on this sector.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	→	☒	Marginal positive, due to some of the sites focused on development of rural business
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 expected.
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.	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	→	☒	Marginally positive as most of the land is PDL

Plan Policy SSP3: Stoneleigh Park													
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	✓	✓	↔	☒	✓	☒	↔	☒	Potential for additional trip generation will be significant due to location of the site (rural locations only accessible by road vehicle)
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	→	☒	Implied as redevelopment will need to be 'appropriate' (cross reference with SSP1)
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 although may increase road traffic and adverse effects 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	→	☒	Marginal positive.
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	✓	✓	←	☒	✓	☒	←	☒	Could lead to increased road traffic, hence adverse implications for local 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	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	☒	→	☒	Will lead to development on some greenfield sites, although potential to enhance sites (Positive and negative impacts).

Plan Policy SSP3: Stoneleigh Park													
	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	✓	✓	←	→	✓	✘	→	✘	Marginal negative due to the increase of waste arisings; however, that existing waste infrastructure has sufficient capacity to address additional demand
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✘	✓	✘	Focuses on the well-being of the countryside and its inhabitants.
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									
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✘	✓	✘	May improve employment opportunities in agriculture.

Plan Policy SSP3: Stoneleigh Park													
	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> May wish to consider cross references to the Development Policies in Chapter 4.													