

Plan Policy DP7 : Traffic Generation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	A number of links have been made between transport and economic growth, both positively (for example where easy use of transport helps facilitate growth of goods markets) and negatively (for example, where congestion limits growth). Therefore, it is not known how this policy might affect economic growth.
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 link to policy
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	☒	→	→	→	→	☒	☒	→	One of the problems facing town centres is congestion, and this policy should help to minimise potential increases in congestion as a result of development in the Plan. However, this is only a minor impact because of the other influences on town centre vitality.
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 link to policy
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 link to policy
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 link to policy

Plan Policy DP7 : Traffic Generation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale				Commentary	
					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary		Rural
Sustainable Development Objectives													
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? 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	✓	✓	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	This policy does not include promotion of more sustainable transport modes, and is limited to mitigating the impacts of significant road transport movements. However, it may have an impact, either by not considering sustainable transport and implicitly endorsing private road transport, or positively by encouraging use of travel plans that include sustainable transport options. The policy could be improved by explicitly recognising the desire to increase sustainable transport options, either through cross-referencing to DP6 or by stating this in the description of travel plans.
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	✓	✓	←	◊	←	◊	←	←	The policy does not seek to reduce the need to travel, and is limited to minimising the negative impacts of increases. This is potentially a negative impact on this impact, as this could be seen as an implicit endorsement of transport growth. This could be reduced by making clear references to preference for reducing need to travel and using sustainable transport modes (see above), but using this policy to minimise impacts of transport growth where this cannot be prevented.
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 link to policy
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	✓	✓	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	The policy allows for increased traffic, which can contribute to climate change. However, emissions of greenhouse gases may be one of the adverse impacts that the policy seeks to limit, thereby helping to minimise the contribution to climate change. The policy could be strengthened by including examples of adverse impacts in the reasoned justification.
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	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct link to policy

Plan Policy DP7 : Traffic Generation													
Sustainable Development Objectives	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	90.3% in December 2004 (12)	No trend identified									
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	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	As for climate change above, the policy may allow increases in emissions to air from transport, but may also limit these increases. The policy could include more explicit reference to air quality as one of the adverse effects in the reasoned justification.
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 link to policy
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 link to 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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct link to 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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct link to policy
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 link to policy
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 link to policy
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and	Length of new cycleways created	Data not available at district level	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	As for climate change and air quality, the policy may help to minimise adverse impacts

Plan Policy DP7 : Traffic Generation														
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term			Severity	Cumulative	Local			
Sustainable Development Objectives														
	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?	Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	15.4% (3) Data not available	Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends Unable to identify situation										of traffic increases on health and wellbeing.
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 link to policy
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 link to policy
Summary: This policy allows for increases in traffic, but is intended to minimise the negative impacts associated with such increases. These negative effects could include impacts on health, air quality, and climate change, and the policy could be strengthened by explicit reference to these in the reasoned justification. It might also help to indicate links to DP6 and other policies that prioritise reductions in need to travel and use of sustainable transport.														

Plan Policy DP8 : Parking													
	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	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	There may be positive and negative impacts associated with this policy with regard to economic development. If on-street parking is reduced, this may damage businesses and stop new businesses opening up. However it is unclear whether or not this effect would occur given the policy.
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 link to policy
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	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	This policy allows for provision of parking but with some restrictions, and therefore it is not known whether this might have positive, negative or no impact on town centre vitality.
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 link to policy
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 link to policy
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 link to policy

Plan Policy DP8 : Parking													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local			
Sustainable Development Objectives													
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? 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	✓	✓	→	◇	→	⇌	→	→	Provision of parking does not promote sustainable transport modes. However, this policy only allows for parking that has regard for accessing the site by other transport modes, and therefore the policy has a minor positive impact, by considering sustainable transport in provision of parking.
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	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	⇌	◇	◇	It is not known whether the provision of parking, but with regard to access of sites by other modes will have impacts on the overall need to travel.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	⇌	◇	◇	Changes in the location and provision of parking in towns can affect the appearance of the area. However it is not clear what effect, if any, this policy will have on townscape.
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 link to policy, although there may be some impacts through changes in transport demand or mode (see above).
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 link to policy
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 link to policy
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	No direct link to policy

Plan Policy DP8 : Parking													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local			
Sustainable Development Objectives													
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2) 23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2 Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct link to 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	✓	✓	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	Parking can have an influence on the appearance of the built environment. However it is unclear if this will be positive or negative.
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 link to policy
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 link to policy
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14) Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	The policy may affect physical access by changing provision of parking in relation to public transport and also by taking into account other needs, particularly for disabled car users. However, it is not clear what effects this will have overall.
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 link to policy
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct link to policy

Plan Policy DP8 : Parking													
	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 link to policy
<p>Summary: The policy applies conditions to provision of parking that may have a number of impacts, including on town centre vitality, access, townscape and transport journeys and modes. Many of these are uncertain as they will depend on the way in which this policy results in changes in parking location and provision. However, there are opportunities for this policy to have positive impacts in these areas if parking is provided appropriately.</p>													

Plan Policy DP9 : Pollution Control														
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary				
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	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	No direct link to policy
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 link to policy
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 link to policy
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 link to policy
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 link to policy
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.	✓	✓	→	→	→	☑	→	→		The main aim of the policy is to prevent harm to sensitive receptors from pollution. However, the policy could also include encouraging improvements as well as preventing harm. This is covered to some extent in DP3 for ecology, although this does not include the same range of receptors. Encouraging improvements could also help to prevent deterioration in receptors not considered to be sensitive.

Plan Policy DP9 : Pollution Control													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
Sustainable Development Objectives													
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? 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 link to policy
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	No direct link to policy
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	☒	→	→	This has a minor positive impact on the quality of the countryside by preventing harm to sensitive receptors, although this is considered to be minor as it does not affect other aspects of character or distinctiveness.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4861kWh/ 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 link to policy
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 link to policy
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	☒	→	→	The policy has a minor positive impact as it aims to prevent air pollution that results in harm to sensitive receptors. However, it does not include improvements to 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	☒	→	→	As for air quality, the policy has a minor positive impact by preventing soil contamination that causes harm to sensitive receptors. However, some development

Plan Policy DP9 : Pollution Control													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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									may help to remediate contaminated land, and this scope for improvement is not recognised in the policy.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	As per air quality, this policy may have a positive contribution to achieving this objective as the mitigating or control measures proposed by the enforcement agencies may result in clean production techniques or methods that seek to minimise waste generation during each stage of plant operation.
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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	The policy may have an impact if it is extended to include improvements to development. However, as it stands, it is not considered to have an impact on the quality of the built environment.
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 link to policy
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 link to policy
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 link to policy
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	✓	✓	→	↔	→	↔	→	→	The policy is considered to have a minor positive impact as one of the sensitive receptors included in the reasoned justification is human health. It is considered minor as pollution from development is one of many potential sources of impact on human health and wellbeing.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct link to policy

Plan Policy DP9 : Pollution Control												
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale			Commentary
					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	
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 link to policy
Summary: The policy helps to prevent harm to sensitive receptors, and has a positive impact on the protection of the natural environment and human health and amenity. However, it does not recognise the scope for improvements in pollution through development, and the policy could be strengthened by including the potential for positive contributions.												

h:\projects\ca-210\#14000\project\14932\warwick dc sa\final docs sent\files to pdf\plan policy dp7 to dp9.doc