

| Plan Policy RAP9 : Farm Diversification | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| | Questions | Indicators | Baseline Information | Targets and trends | Timescale | | Impact | Scale | | | Rural | Urban | Commentary |
| | | | | | Short term | Long term | | Severity | Cumulative | Local | | | |
| Sustainable Development Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 promotion of appropriate diversification activity. Should also impact favourably on local employment. Promotes farm diversification in conjunction with RAP7. |
| 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 | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | 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. | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ☒ | → | ☒ | Development will need to be in harmony with countryside. Limited development on land which is not previously developed. |
| 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? | Percentage of journeys to school by car | 40% in 2003 (9) | Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | As above |

| Plan Policy RAP9 : Farm Diversification | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | 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 minimise the need to travel? | Percentage of journeys to work by car | 62.8% in 2003 (3) | No trend available | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ⇌ | → | ⇌ | Puts a series of constraints upon development particularly when implemented with RAP7 and 8 / 8a. Limited development should ensure maintenance of landscape quality. |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ⇌ | → | ⇌ | Again, limiting development of this type will serve to protect and retain the character of rural villages etc. |
| 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 ₁₀ , ozone, etc. | 44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM ₁₀ - 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? 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ⇌ | → | ⇌ | Best quality agricultural land will be preserved. Overall, very restricted development, hence will have minimal adverse impact on land quality. Developments on greenfield land will not be permitted unless in exceptional circumstances. |
| To reduce the generation and disposal of waste | Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? | Amount of waste produced per capita | 362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2) | Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | Not clear how the policy will impact on this objective- depends upon future use and development. Potential generation of |

| Plan Policy RAP9 : Farm Diversification | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| 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 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)? | Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita | 23.4% (2003/4) (2) | Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2 | | | | | | | | | demolition and construction waste (not likely to be significant however). |
| 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 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | Not clear- there is potential to influence this through implementation with other policies e.g. D11 and to build conditions into the policy itself that specifies 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 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | Potential to be dealt with in part through reference to DP12, but 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 |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ☐ | → | → | Could have marginal impact through increasing job opportunities. |
| To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour | Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? | Number of crimes reported per 1000 population | 41.2 2004/5 to date (4) | Lower than county average (43). No trend available | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | No direct impact. |

Plan Policy RAP9 : Farm Diversification

| | 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 reduce noise levels? | Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime | Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5) | Better than county average and getting better | | | | | | | | | |

Summary:

Summary: This policy contributes favourably to the sustainability objectives, particularly relating to economic growth and enhancing the vibrancy of rural communities and also contributing to provision of employment opportunities. Farm diversification proposals should accord with Policy RAP9. Policy should also be linked to specific development policies to further enhance positive contribution to sustainability objectives.

| Plan Policy RAP10 : Safeguarding Rural Roads | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| | Questions | Indicators | Baseline Information | Targets and trends | Timescale | | Impact | Scale | | | Rural | Urban | Commentary |
| | | | | | Short term | Long term | | Severity | Cumulative | Local | | | |
| Sustainable Development Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | Uncertain impact- assumed that roads will be maintained in order to support local economy e.g. to allow flow of commercial transport. |
| 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 | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | 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. | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ☒ | → | ☒ | Limits development that will adversely impact upon countryside. |
| 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- inferred perhaps through not permitting major modifications. |

| Plan Policy RAP10 : Safeguarding Rural Roads | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| | 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 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → → | → | ✓ | ☒ | → | ☒ | Limited development should ensure maintenance of landscape quality. |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → → | → | ✓ | ☒ | → | ☒ | Again, limiting development of this type will serve to protect and retain the character of rural villages etc. |
| 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 ₁₀ , ozone, etc. | 44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM ₁₀ - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10) | Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ☒ | → | ☒ | Could ensure air quality does not worsen through increased road transport and emissions, associated with significant developments to roads. |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ☒ | → | ☒ | Overall restricted development, should have minimal adverse impact on land quality. |

| Plan Policy RAP10 : Safeguarding Rural Roads | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------|
| | 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 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 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 | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | No direct impact. |
| To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour | Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? | Number of crimes reported per 1000 population | 41.2 2004/5 to date (4) | Lower than county average (43). No trend available | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | No direct impact. |

Plan Policy RAP10 : Safeguarding Rural Roads

| | 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 reduce noise levels? | Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime | Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5) | Better than county average and getting better | | | | | | | | | |

Summary:

This policy contributes to the sustainability objectives relating to protection of the environment and feel and character of rural areas. Links to DP6 and other development policies should be made clear.

| Plan Policy RAP 11 : Rural Shops and Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | Questions | Indicators | Baseline Information | Targets and trends | Timescale | | Impact | Scale | | | Rural | Urban | Commentary |
| | | | | | Short term | Long term | | Severity | Cumulative | Local | | | |
| Sustainable Development Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → → | → | ✓ | ☒ | ☒ | → | Policy looks to preserve and protect local shops and services. |
| 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 | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | 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. | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | No direct impact. |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ☒ | → | → | Protection of local facilities should reduce the need to travel to a certain extent. |

| Plan Policy RAP 11 : Rural Shops and Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| | 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 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 | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | 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 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 ₁₀ , ozone, etc. | 44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM ₁₀ - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10) | Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ✘ | → | → | Protecting local shops could reduce the need to travel by car- could minimise poor air quality associated with car use. |
| 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 | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | No direct impact anticipated. |

| Plan Policy RAP 11 : Rural Shops and Services | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| | 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 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 anticipated. |
| 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 anticipated. |
| 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 anticipated. |
| 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 anticipated. |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | ➔ | ➔ | ✓ | ☒ | ➔ | ➔ | Core focus to meet local needs locally |
| 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 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 realised- potential positive access issues relating to retail and employment opportunities. |
| To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour | Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? | Number of crimes reported per 1000 population | 41.2 2004/5 to date (4) | Lower than county average (43). No trend available | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | No direct impact. |

Plan Policy RAP 11 : Rural Shops and Services

| | 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 reduce noise levels? | Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime | Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5) | Better than county average and getting better | | | | | | | | | |

Summary:

Policy protects and enhances vibrancy of rural areas, whilst at the same time protecting the local environmental and characteristics. New developments or expansions should be linked to development policies to ensure impacts associated with sustainable construction, waste management and water minimisation can be optimised.

| Plan Policy RAP 12 : Farm Shops | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| | Questions | Indicators | Baseline Information | Targets and trends | Timescale | | Impact | Scale | | | Rural | Urban | Commentary |
| | | | | | Short term | Long term | | Severity | Cumulative | Local | | | |
| Sustainable Development Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → → | → | ✓ | | | → | Policy looks to preserve and protect local shops. Emphasis is on sale of locally produced goods. Also, new developments may provide employment opportunities. |
| 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. Priority given to sustaining the local economy. |
| 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. | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ✗ | → | ✗ | Development will need to be in harmony with countryside. Limited development on land which is not previously developed. |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ✗ | → | → | Protection of local facilities should reduce the need to travel to a certain extent. |

| Plan Policy RAP 12 : Farm Shops | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| | 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 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ☒ | → | ☒ | Puts a series of constraints upon development particularly when implemented with RAP7 and 8 / 8a. Limited development should ensure maintenance of landscape quality. |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ☒ | → | ☒ | Again, limiting development of this type will serve to protect and retain the character of rural villages etc. |
| 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 ₁₀ , ozone, etc. | 44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM ₁₀ - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10) | Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ☒ | → | → | Protecting local shops could reduce the need to travel by car- could minimise poor air quality associated with car use. |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ☒ | → | ☒ | Overall, very restricted development, hence will have minimal adverse impact on land quality. |

| Plan Policy RAP 12 : Farm Shops | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | 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 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- depends upon future use and development. Generation however of demolition and construction waste from extension etc (not likely to be significant however). |
| 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 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | Not clear- there is potential to influence this through implementation with other policies e.g. D11 and to build conditions into the policy itself that specifies 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 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | Potential to be dealt with in part through reference to DP12, but 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 anticipated. |
| 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 | ✓ | ✓ | → | → | ✓ | ☐ | → | → | Core focus to meet local needs locally |
| 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 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 realised- potential positive access issues relating to retail and employment opportunities perhaps. |
| To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour | Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? | Number of crimes reported per 1000 population | 41.2 2004/5 to date (4) | Lower than county average (43). No trend available | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | No direct impact. |

Plan Policy RAP 12 : Farm Shops

| | 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 reduce noise levels? | Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime | Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5) | Better than county average and getting better | | | | | | | | | |

Summary:

Policy protects and enhances vibrancy of rural areas, whilst at the same time protecting the local environmental and characteristics. New developments or expansions should be linked to development policies to ensure impacts associated with sustainable construction, waste management and water minimisation can be optimised. Links to other rural policies should be made relating to employment and diversification.