

Plan Policy UAP4 : Protection of Local Shopping Centres													
	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	✓	✓	↔	→	→	↔	→	→	Meeting the needs of the local community is at the heart of this policy, which in turn could have a positive impact on local employment. Policy looks to preserve and protect local shopping centres. Proposals for new use need to demonstrate economic viability, that they clearly meet the needs of the local community and that will not detract from the predominance of A1 uses.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact anticipated
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	✓	→	→	↔	↔	→	Potential to ensure balanced development to a certain extent.
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.

Plan Policy UAP4 : Protection of Local Shopping Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Severely	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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Protection of local facilities should reduce the need to travel and public transport access to town centres is already available.
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 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 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 centres could reduce the need to travel by car. This 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?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact anticipated.

Plan Policy UAP4 : Protection of Local Shopping Centres													
	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	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	It is not clear how the policy will impact on this objective. Impact will depend on future use and development.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	Impact is not clear. There is potential to influence this through implementation with other policies e.g. DP11. It is also possible to build conditions into the policy itself that specify any future development will have to pay regard to sustainable design issues etc.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	As above. Potential to be dealt with in part through reference to DP12.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	No direct impact
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14) Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	⇌	→	→	Any change of use must meet a particular need of the local community (service and facility) and be subject to planning control.
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 apart from above comment.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	⇌	→	→	Minor positive impact may be realised. For example, potential positive access issues relating to retail and employment opportunities.

Plan Policy UAP4 : Protection of Local Shopping Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local			
Sustainable Development Objectives													
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4) Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available Better than county average and getting better	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	No direct impact- more of a design and layout issue.
<p>Summary:</p> <p>This policy has a generally positive impact on several of the sustainability objectives, with significant positive impacts on accessibility to services and facilities and maintaining high economic growth. It is important to note that, for a number of the sustainability objectives, the impact of the policy will depend on the particular circumstance of development and on implementation of policy in conjunction with others such as DP11 and DP12. Reference to these policies could be included in the reasoned justification.</p>													

Plan Policy UAP5 : Protecting Local 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.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact anticipated
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Potential to ensure balanced development to a certain extent.
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 may reduce the need to travel.

Plan Policy UAP5 : Protecting Local 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	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	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 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 centres could reduce the need to travel by car, therefore minimising 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 UAP5 : Protecting Local 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.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	Impact not clear, although there is potential to influence this through implementation with other policies e.g. D11.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	As above, however there is potential to be addressed in part through reference to DP12.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14) Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	☒	→	→	Core focus of the policy is 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 may be realised. For example, there may be positive access issues relating to retail and employment opportunities.

Plan Policy UAP5 : Protecting Local 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 crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4) Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available Better than county average and getting better	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	No direct impact- more of a design and layout issue.
Summary: This policy has a generally positive impact on a number of the sustainability objectives, with significant positive impacts on accessibility to services and facilities and maintaining high economic growth. It is important to note that, for some of the sustainability objectives, the impacts will depend on the particular circumstance of development and on implementation of policy in conjunction with others such as DP11 and DP12. Reference to these policies could be included in the reasoned justification.													

Plan Policy UAP6 : Motor vehicle Sales													
	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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Development will be confined to existing employment areas which will assist in making a positive contribution (but not direct) to 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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact anticipated
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	Impact uncertain. Although confines this type of development to one area.
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 anticipated
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	◇	→	→	↔	→	→	Priority will be given to any location being served by public transport. However policy is concerned with car sales and therefore could be seen to be promoting car use.

Plan Policy UAP6 : Motor vehicle Sales													
	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	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	Impact on this objective is uncertain
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	⇌	→	→	Policy does not deal directly with this, although impact can be 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)	Higher than regional average (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 or high for PM ₁₀ , ozone, etc.	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	←	←	←	⇌	←	←	Any development will involve car use / maintenance hence possible local air quality issues associated with exhaust fumes. Policy also concerned with car sales and therefore could be seen to be promoting 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	⇌	→	→	Policy is concerned with development on PDL and allocated employment areas. Will be implemented with other policies such as SSP1 and SC2.

Plan Policy UAP6 : Motor vehicle Sales													
	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. Impact will depend upon future use and development.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	Impact is not clear. There is potential to influence this through implementation with other policies e.g. DP11 and a possibility to build conditions into the policy itself that specifies any future development will have to pay regard to sustainable design issues.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	As above. Potential to be dealt with in part through reference to DP12.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	No direct impact
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14) Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available Unable to identify trend	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level 15.4% (3) Data not available	Unable to identify trend 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

Plan Policy UAP6 : Motor vehicle Sales													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local			
Sustainable Development Objectives													
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4) Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available Better than county average and getting better	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	No direct impact- more of a design and layout issue.
Summary: This policy contributes positively to the objective on improving land quality. However there is potential for the policy to have negative impact on sustainable transport and air quality as a result of promoting car use. Again, it is important to note that, for some of the sustainability objectives, the impacts will depend on the particular circumstance of development and on implementation of policy in conjunction with others such as DP11, DP12, SSP1 and SC2. Reference to these policies could be included in the reasoned justification.													

