

Plan Policy DP1 : Layout and Design													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Scale		Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	Good design and layout can help to improve the vitality of town centres, and therefore has a positive impact on this objective. The impact is expected to be local for most developments (unless it is a landmark building).
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	The policy supports rural communities by respecting existing patterns of development and encouraging appropriate new development.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	The impacts on the urban areas are similar to those for rural areas above.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	The policy can help to promote tourism by encouraging good quality development. However, it is not clear whether the tourism will be sustainable, and the policy could be cross-referenced with UAP7.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	The policy is not expected to have a direct impact on meeting housing needs.
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	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	The policy requires incorporation of existing features, including features of the natural environment. This is included to some extent in the text, but is more explicit in the reasoned justification than in the policy. The policy concentrates on maintaining and protecting existing features, rather than enhancing them, and the policy could be strengthened through inclusion of text on improvements in part j, e.g. 'improve, where possible existing features and...'. The policy could also be cross-referenced to the Supplementary Planning Guide and to DP3 in the reasoned justification.
		Condition of protected species	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend									
		Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.									

Plan Policy DP1 : Layout and Design													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Scale		Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	The policy is not directly concerned with sustainable transport, although there are links between good design and sustainable transport, and links between this and other policies. The link between sustainable design and transport could be made more explicit by including an additional statement in part h indicating the relationship between access and good design and promoting further opportunities for sustainable transport. The policy could also be cross-referenced to SC10.
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 for the objective on sustainable transport, the policy could have impacts on the need to travel through the relationship between transport design and development design. The policy could be modified to include an additional statement for (h) that includes relationship between access and good design and promoting further opportunities for sustainable transport, and the reasoned justification could include cross-reference to SC10.
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	✓	✓	→ →	→	✓	✧	→ →	→ →	The policy has a strongly positive contribution towards this objective. This will be further enhanced by the amendments suggested above to include improvements to the natural and built environments, as well as maintenance.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✧	✓	→	→	This policy offers some support for the objective to reduce the impacts of climate change through opportunities for good design, and this will be enhanced if the policy is strengthened to include improvements in sites. There is also potential for greater cross-referencing with DP10, DP11 and DP12.
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	✓	✓	→ →	→	✓	✧	→ →	→ →	The policy requires protection of existing features, including historic features, and therefore has a strong positive association with this objective.

Plan Policy DP1 : Layout and Design													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Scale		Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)  PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	This policy does not have an impact on this objective.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	This policy does not have a direct relationship with land quality.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Waste management issues should be addressed through reference to DP12 with potential to amend DP12 to include emphasis on preferential use of recyclable materials and potential extension of residential design guide to include provision of receptacles for domestic waste arisings.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓		➔	➔	This has a minor positive effect because of the positive impact on townscape through good design. However, it has potential to be significantly improved through reference to sustainable construction, at least in the reasoned justification, and through cross-referencing to other policies such as D11 and DP 12. There is also potential for inclusion of references to recognised standards such as Eco-homes or BREEAM within the accompanying text.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓		➔	➔	This policy will have a small positive impact through use of appropriate materials and impacts on waste, climate change, transport, and air quality.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	This policy does not have an effect on availability of housing.

Plan Policy DP1 : Layout and Design													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Scale		Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
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	77.3% (14)	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available	✓	✓	➔ ➔	➔	✓		➔ ➔	➔ ➔	This policy will help to support transport improvements, but will also have a direct impact through retention (and enhancement?) of existing footpaths. Enhancing streets and squares may also have a positive impact, encouraging movement within the development. There could also be a supporting impact in terms of designing out crime.
		Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend									
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	Data not available at district level	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy has a positive contribution due to quality of design and promotion of more physically active transport. However, it could be improved with greater reference to sustainable transport options.
		Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness	15.4% (3)	Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends									
		Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available	Unable to identify situation									
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	This may have a minor positive impact through improved access to jobs. This may be supported if improving the design quality of the area helps to attract businesses.
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Part k of this policy should help to support reductions in crime through designing out opportunities. This should also be cross-referenced to DP13.
		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 has broadly positive impacts, although these could be strengthened by including statements to encourage improvement as well as to prevent harm through design and layout. The positive impacts of the policy also rely on implementation alongside other policies in the plan, and the reasoned justification could be improved by greater reference to these.													

Plan Policy DP2 : Amenity													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale				Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
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	✓	✓	➔	✧	➔	✧	✧	➔	Considered to be a minor positive impact. Development that maintains amenity could be said to help ensure balanced and mixed development.
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 DP2 : Amenity													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale				Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
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	✓	✓	➡ ➡		➡ ➡	✧	➡	➡	Loss of amenity is defined in the policy to include loss of outlook and visual intrusion. Therefore, ensuring that development does not have an unacceptable adverse impact should have a strong positive impact to maintain townscapes and landscapes. The policy could be further strengthened by including options for encouraging improvements to amenity as well as preventing damage.
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
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	➡	➡	➡	✧	➡	✧	➡	➡	The policy has a minor positive impact by preventing unacceptable adverse impacts on air pollution. However, this is considered minor as it does not encourage improvements.

Plan Policy DP2 : Amenity													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale				Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
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	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	Likely to have a minor positive impact, The actual impact will depend in part on the definition of acceptable/ unacceptable. This is a highly subjective term, which does not appear to be defined.
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	✓	✓	➔	✧	✧	✧	➔	➔	Amenity and human health are strongly linked. Loss of amenity could mean an increase in noise and this has been shown to be harmful to human health. A policy that promotes amenity as opposed to simply reducing it would mean that there would be a strongly positive relationship. Again question of meaning of acceptable/ unacceptable sheds doubt on how policy can be interpreted in practice.

Plan Policy DP2 : Amenity													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale				Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	There is a link between reducing poverty/ social exclusion and amenity but it is not necessarily a direct one in relation to this particular 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
<b>Summary:</b> The policy has some positive impacts by preventing unacceptable harm to amenity, which includes issues associated with community wellbeing and environmental quality. However, the policy does not encourage improvement in amenity, and its impacts will depend in part on the definition of the term “unacceptable”.													



Plan Policy DP3 : Natural and Historic Environment and Landscape													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale				Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
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	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➡➡	⬢?	➡	⬢?	➡	➡	There is a strong positive relationship for this [policy, which is likely to improve the natural environment on and close to development sites.
		Condition of protected species	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend									
		Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.									
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

Plan Policy DP3 : Natural and Historic Environment and Landscape													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale				Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
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	✓	✓	→ →	⬢	✓	✧	→	→	Strong relationship between policy and objective. Likely to improve landscape and ecological character of countryside. Also, protection of historic environment may help maintain townscapes.
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 a minor positive impact on reducing risk of flooding by incorporating natural features.
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	✓	✓	→→	?	✓	✧	→	→	One of primary aims of policy is to protect and enhance the historic environment. Policy promotes protection/ enhancement of historic environment to a high degree.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)	Higher than national average and getting worse	✓	✓	→	⬢	✓	✧	→	→	Local air quality likely to be protected through protection of natural environment, since air pollution is likely to be less in these areas.
		Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Favourable situation getting better									
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	✓	✓	→ →	⬢	✓	✧	→	→	Likely to help minimise development on greenfield land, and likely to help retain best quality agricultural land

Plan Policy DP3 : Natural and Historic Environment and Landscape													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale				Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
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	✓	✓	➔	⬢?	✓	✧	➔	➔	The policy will help to enhance townscapes and landscapes by incorporating the natural and historic environment within developments.
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	Data not available at district level	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➔	⬢?	✓	✧	➔	➔	Policy does not promote healthy lifestyles but it could help to encourage outdoor leisure pursuits such as walking and cycling. Similarly it enhances provision of open spaces which could be said to improve human health by providing spaces for informal recreational activities.
		Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness	15.4% (3)	Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends									
		Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available	Unable to identify situation									
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed  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

Plan Policy DP3 : Natural and Historic Environment and Landscape													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale				Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary	Rural	Urban	
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 encourage integration and improvements of the natural and built environments within developments, and has positive associations with objectives relating to these issues.													



Plan Policy DP4 : Archaeology													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct link to policy
		Condition of protected species	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend									
		Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.									

Plan Policy DP4 : Archaeology													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	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 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 4861kWhr 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	✓	✓	→	✘	✓	✘	→	→	Strong positive association. Policy seeks to protect archaeology and to limit development that is likely to harm it.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct 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 DP4 : Archaeology													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	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 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	Data not available at district level	Unable to identify trend	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct link to policy
		Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness	15.4% (3)	Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends									
		Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available	Unable to identify situation									
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct link to policy



Plan Policy DP4 : Archaeology													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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 has positive impacts on protecting archaeology, although it is not expected to have many significant impacts on other objectives.													
Plan Policy DP5 : Density													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✂	✂	→	This policy has a minor positive impact by increasing the density of housing in the urban centres and therefore helping to support their vitality (see objective below on vitality of town centres). The impact is considered to be minor because the policy does not have impacts on other aspects of economic growth.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals	8 in 2004 (15)	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	✂	✓	✂	✓	✂	There may be a minor positive impact through increasing the number of people living in rural areas where housing is built.

Plan Policy DP5 : Density														
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary	
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary				
	Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of service closures in rural areas	District level data not available	Unable to identify trend										
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	✓	✓	➡	➡	✓	⚡	⚡	➡		The policy has a strongly positive impact in terms of the contribution towards town centre allocations and ensuring that land within the urban areas are used in preference to the urban fringe. The policy requires best use of land, which is defined in accompanying paragraph 4.30.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡		The policy is not expected to have an impact on sustainable tourism.
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	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡		Increasing the density of development will not have a direct impact on meeting housing needs.
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 policy is expected to have a positive impact by maximising the use of existing previously developed land in preference to greenfield sites.
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➡	➡	✓	⚡	➡	➡		The policy will help to encourage walking and use of sustainable transport where it increases the density of development in urban centres close to amenities.
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 for promoting sustainable transport, the policy is expected to have strong positive impacts through encouragement of use of land within urban centres which have good access to other amenities.

Plan Policy DP5 : Density														
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary	
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary				
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	✓	✓	←	⇄	✓	⇄	←		There is a potential risk that the policy will encourage development that is more dense than the surrounding developments, and will have a negative impact on the character of the rural area.	
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	⇄	⇄	→	→	⇄	⇄	→	→	This policy is considered to have a positive due to impact on travel demand. However, it is uncertain whether this can be extended to energy demand and dwelling design characteristics.	
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	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	This policy has an uncertain impact since increasing the density of development will have different impacts depending on the density and characteristics of the surrounding areas, and may be different in urban centres and rural areas.	
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)  PM <sub>10</sub> : none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	Increasing dwelling densities has an uncertain impact on 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? 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	⇄	→	→	This policy has a positive impact as it seeks to optimise the use of existing land through increasing dwelling densities.	
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	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	Increasing the density of developments is not expected to have a direct impact on the generation of waste.	

Plan Policy DP5 : Density														
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary				
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→		This policy seeks to improve the use/reuse of existing buildings either through demolition and conversion.
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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗		Density does not have a direct relationship with the prudent use of natural resources.
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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗		Density does not have a direct relationship with the number of homes built or their affordability.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→		Provided that the policy is linked with sustainable transport SC10
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 impact expected on this objective.
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 impact expected on this objective.
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	✗	←	←	✗	←	✗	←	←		Increased density can be associated with increased anti-social behaviour where problem households are in closer proximity.

Plan Policy DP5 : Density													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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									although this should be mitigated in part by mixing development (SC1). However, there is less clear link on crime and fear of crime, with increased numbers of people living closer together. There should be a stronger link, at least in the reasoned justification, to DP13 on crime prevention.
Summary: Increasing the density of housing is expected to have positive impacts by reducing the demand for land for building. Where more people live close to amenities, it is also expected to reduce the need to travel, improve economic vitality and improve access to services. However, the impact of the policy on landscape and townscape is not known as it will depend on the existing patterns of development close to the site. There is also a potential risk that dense developments may increase complaints of antisocial behaviour.													

Plan Policy DP6 : Access													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term		Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct link to policy
		Condition of protected species	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend									
		Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.									

Plan Policy DP6 : Access													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	↔	✓	→	◇	→	↔	→	→	Priority access to sustainable transport modes may aid promotion of them in the long term. Road safety should also improve.
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	✓	✓	→	◇	→	↔	↔	→	The policy fits within good design and therefore can have a positive impact on townscapes. This is only considered to be a minor linkage since the policy should be seen in the wider context of good design which is covered in other policies (particularly DP1) and objectives.
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	↔	✓	→	◇	→	↔	→	→	Well designed access has the potential to aid reducing greenhouse emissions by encouraging use of sustainable transport modes, although this is considered to be only a minor 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 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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	✓	→	◇	→	↔	→	→	Priority access may lead to reduction in car use as people encouraged onto more sustainable modes of transport through making it more difficult to drive. This could have a knock-on effect of improving air quality, although this is considered to be a minor relationship.
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 DP6 : Access													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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	✓	✓	→	◇	→	↔	→	→	Well designed access is an important part of sustainable design in development. This is considered a minor impact, as it does not include sustainable design of the buildings themselves, which is covered elsewhere in the Plan.
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	✓	✓	→	◇	→	↔	→	→	This is considered to have a minor positive effect by improving physical access.
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	Data not available at district level	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	◇	→	↔	→	→	Good access that gives priority access to pedestrians and cyclists is likely to promote healthy lifestyles.
		Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness	15.4% (3)	Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends									
		Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available	Unable to identify situation									
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct link to policy



Plan Policy DP6 : Access													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 has positive impacts by encouraging sustainable transport, with benefits including for air quality, townscapes and healthy lifestyles.													

h:\projects\ga-210\#14000 project\14932 warwick dc sa\final docs sent\files to pdf\plan policy dp4 to dp6.doc

h:\projects\ga-210\#14000 project\14932 warwick dc sa\final docs sent\files to pdf\plan policy dp4 to dp6.doc

Plan Policy DP7 : Traffic Generation														
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary				
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			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary				
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇		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														
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary	
Sustainable Development Objectives					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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)  PM <sub>10</sub> : none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary				
	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	◇	→	✗	→	→	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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> : none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct 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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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  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 effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct link to policy

Plan Policy DP8 : Parking													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans- boundary			
		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 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.													

Plan Policy DP9 : Pollution Control													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	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 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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	→	✘	→	→	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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 effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct link to policy

Plan Policy DP9 : Pollution Control													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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\ga-210\#14000 project\14932 warwick dc sa\final docs sent\files to pdf\plan policy dp7 to dp9.doc



Plan Policy DP10 : Flooding													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	This policy may have a minor positive impact where minimising flood risk helps to protect businesses from adverse impacts of flooding. However, this is not considered to be significant in terms of other impacts on 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	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	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 policy may help to protect water quality as flood event can increase runoff and pollution in water courses. However, this is not considered to be a significant impact of this policy.
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

Plan Policy DP10 : Flooding													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	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 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	✓	✓	→	◇	→	⇐	→	→	There is a strong positive relationship between this policy and this objective. One of the potential impacts of climate change has been identified as an increased risk of flooding, and this policy helps to protect developments from the impacts of flooding. It also makes links to DP11 on drainage in the reasoned justification, which helps to improve the relationship to this objective.
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	No direct 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? 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	✓	✓	→	◇	→	⇐	→	→	The policy has a minor positive impact by helping to protect land used for flood defence and washlands.

Plan Policy DP10 : Flooding													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	◇	→	↔	→	→	The policy may have a minor positive impact on the quality of the built environment by ensuring development is steered away from areas prone to flooding.
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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct link to policy
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

Plan Policy DP10 : Flooding													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available									No direct link to policy
		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: The policy helps to minimise likelihood and impacts of flooding, and the link to DP11 on drainage helps to strengthen the positive impacts.													

Plan Policy DP11 : Drainage													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		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 impact anticipated
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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact anticipated.
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 anticipated
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 anticipated
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 policy will help to limit adverse impacts on watercourses by minimising the impacts of runoff.

Plan Policy DP11 : Drainage													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact anticipated
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact anticipated
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 anticipated
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 has a strong positive impact by helping to reduce flood risk through use of sustainable drainage,
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 anticipated
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact anticipated.
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 DP11 : Drainage													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		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									
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	✓	✓	→ →	→	✓	✗	→	→	The policy encourages recycling of water within new developments.
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 helps support sustainable design by encouraging water recycling.
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	✓	✓	→ →	→	✓	✗	→	→	The policy will help to reduce use of water by encouraging reuse and recycling of surface and domestic water in new developments.
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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact anticipated
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 anticipated.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DP11 : Drainage													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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.
Summary: The policy helps to reduce risk of flooding and pollution of watercourses by encouraging use of sustainable drainage systems. It also has a positive impact on water use, sustainable design and recycling by encouraging re-use and recycling of water in new developments.													



Plan Policy DP12 : Energy Conservation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact anticipated
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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact anticipated
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 anticipated
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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	There may be a minor impact if energy conservation designed into the buildings helps to reduce running costs for occupants. However, this is not considered to be significant.
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

Plan Policy DP12 : Energy Conservation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact anticipated
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact anticipated
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	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	✕	◇	◇	The policy may have an impact on the design and layout of developments, although it is not known whether this will enhance or detract from townscapes. It is also recognised in the reasoned justification that there may be conflicts between designs that are optimal for each policy in isolation. The reasoned justification could be explicit about related policies and include direct reference to DP1, DP5 and DP13.
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 is directly concerned with reducing energy consumption, thereby helping to reduce contributions to climate change.
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 anticipated
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	✕	✓	→	→	The policy may help to improve air quality by reducing demand for energy, although this is most likely to occur at a national level as electricity is largely generated at this scale. The effect is expected to be minor in comparison to other impacts on air quality.

Plan Policy DP12 : Energy Conservation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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.
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	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The policy helps to reduce waste by encouraging energy minimisation and use of recycled raw materials.
		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									
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 helps to encourage sustainable design of developments. This should also be supported by other policies, including DP1, DP5 and DP13.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The policy encourages energy minimisation and use of recycled raw materials, and is therefore associated with a significant positive 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 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	77.3% (14)	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact anticipated
		Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	
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 anticipated.

Plan Policy DP12 : Energy Conservation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 anticipated.
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 anticipated.
Summary: The policy helps to support conservation of resources and reduced contribution to climate change. Through inclusion of support for materials with reduced energy input, the policy also helps to encourage use of recycled products. There are potential conflicts between design for energy conservation and design for other objectives, including density, townscape, and crime prevention. This is mentioned in the reasoned justification, although specific links to other policies could be made.													

h:\projects\ga-210\#14000 project\14932 warwick dc sa\final docs sent\files to pdf\plan policy dp10 to dp12.doc

Plan Policy DP12a : Renewable Energy Developments													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact anticipated
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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact anticipated
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 anticipated
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 anticipated
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 policy helps to support natural environment by encouraging alternatives to traditional energy use that may have adverse environmental impacts. Some concerns are expressed about the environmental impact of renewable energy, although the policy requires that developments do not have an unacceptable effect on the natural environment.
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 is anticipated, although there may be a change in transport demand, see below.

Plan Policy DP12a : Renewable Energy Developments													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	Renewable energy facilities such as energy from waste may increase transport to deliver materials. However, it is not certain whether this will be relevant as it will depend on the way in which the policy is implemented.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The policy requires that renewable energy developments do not have unacceptable effects on landscape character, and therefore should help to prevent damage under this objective.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The policy has a strong impact through support for generation from renewable sources.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The policy requires that renewable energy developments do not have unacceptable effects on historic and archaeological interests, and therefore should help to prevent damage under this objective.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	The impact on this objective is uncertain as it depends on the facility- for example if increased transport is required (see above), there may hence adverse implications for air quality.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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 DP12a : Renewable Energy Developments													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?	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									The policy encourages reuse of resources for renewable energy generation.
	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)?	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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	
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 will help to encourage renewable energy in developments, which supports sustainable design.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	The policy should help to reduce demand for raw materials by encouraging use of renewable energy.
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?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities	77.3% (14)	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact anticipated
	Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend									
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles?	Length of new cycleways created	Data not available at district level	Unable to identify trend									No direct impact anticipated.
	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?	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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	
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 anticipated.



Plan Policy DP12a : Renewable Energy Developments													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 anticipated.
Summary: The policy supports renewable energy developments, and specifically protects against potential negative impacts on the natural environment and people. The policy may also help to support sustainable design and construction, and reuse of waste. However, depending on the type of development and location, there may be an increase in demand for transport of materials to the site.													

Plan Policy DP13 : Crime Prevention													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	⇌	✓	→	→	→	⇌	⇌	✓	There may be a minor positive effect on the vitality of urban centres where design that reduces risk of crime helps to promote the vitality of the area. This may be through reducing crime against businesses or by reducing fear of crime of people in the area. However, this is considered to be a minor impact as it does not include impacts on other aspects of 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 DP13 : Crime Prevention													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	There may be an impact on townscapes through changes in design. This is considered under the objective for townscape, and the policy is not considered to have additional impacts under this objective.
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 4861kWhr 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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct 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 DP13 : Crime Prevention													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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	✓	✓	→	◇	→	◇	→	→	The policy promotes good design of streets and can enhance townscapes. In conjunction with other DP policies, this should enhance the built environment in a strongly positive manner.
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 seeks to improve the design of the built environment, and as such may contribute to reductions in the fear of crime and so could contribute to individuals' sense of security and well-being.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	◇	→	↔	→	→	This policy seeks to improve the design of the built environment, and may help to improve areas currently associated with higher crime rates. This should have a

Plan Policy DP13 : Crime Prevention													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									positive impact on poverty and social exclusion.
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	✓	✓	→	◇	→	⇄	→	→	The primary purpose of the policy is to reduce crime through better design, and the policy therefore has a strong positive impact on this objective.
<b>Summary:</b> The policy has strong impacts on crime and anti-social behaviour, and is also expected to provide support for objectives related to townscape, social exclusion and sustainable design. As for DP12, it is acknowledged that the policy may conflict with others (including DP1, DP5, DP12, and DP14), although the specific policies could be indicated in the reasoned justification.													

Plan Policy DP14 : Accessibility and Inclusion													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	✗	◇	◇	It is not certain what the impact of the policy may be on economic vitality. Improving access may help to enhance vitality, although on the other hand it may be difficult for small businesses to meet these requirements. Therefore the policy impacts are considered to be uncertain.
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 for the maintenance of economic growth, this may help to support village services by improving access, but could be hard for some existing businesses looking to make changes. The reasoned justification acknowledges that for minor developments this policy may not be relevant, and requires consideration of a balance where this policy conflicts with others.
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	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	✗	◇	◇	As for economic growth above, the impacts on the vitality of town centres are uncertain.
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 DP14 : Accessibility and Inclusion													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	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 4861kWhr 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	✓	✓	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	This policy has an uncertain impact because, as acknowledged in the reasoned justification, the policy is designed to help improve access, but may conflict with objectives to protect older buildings.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct 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 DP14 : Accessibility and Inclusion													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	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	✓	✓	→	◇	→	↔	→	→	One of primary functions of the policy is to improve accessibility, and the policy is expected to improve access to local services and facilities.
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 link to policy
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	◇	→	↔	→	→	One of primary functions of this policy is reducing social exclusion. The policy should therefore have a major positive influence on reducing social exclusion.



Plan Policy DP14 : Accessibility and Inclusion													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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
<b>Summary:</b> The policy is designed to improve access to services and facilities, and therefore has positive impacts on accessibility and social inclusion. Potential conflicts between this policy and others related to design and layout is already referenced in the reasoned justification, although it may be helpful to make this explicit.													

h:\projects\ga-210\#14000 project\14932 warwick dc sa\final docs sent\files to pdf\plan policy dp12a to dp14.doc

Plan Policy SC1 : Securing a Greater Choice of Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact on this objective.
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 impacts on this objective.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✕	✕	→	The policy may support this objective by encouraging a mixture of dwellings within developments. This will contribute in part of ensuring an overall mix of development, including community and commercial buildings.
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 impacts 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	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	✕	◇	◇	The policy will help to ensure a mix of dwelling types, although it is not clear whether this will increase affordability. If a mixture of developments also meets the requirements for housing, and this policy is implemented in conjunction with SC9, the impacts are likely to be positive.
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.	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	This policy is not expected to have a direct impact, although it may have some effect through links with UAP1, which directs housing development to previously developed land. This is not currently referenced in the reasoned justification, and is not considered to be significant for this policy.
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.

Plan Policy SC1 : Securing a Greater Choice of Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact on this objective
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✕	→	→	The policy encourages a mixture of development, which may have a positive impact on the character of developments by introducing greater variety of dwellings. It is considered to be a minor impact since the impact will also depend on design and density (other DP policies).
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 through this policy, as drainage issues are addressed through DP10 and DP11, and energy conservation regarding new development is dealt with in DP12.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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
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	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact

Plan Policy SC1 : Securing a Greater Choice of Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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									
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 does not include reference to design, although it could be strengthened by cross-referencing to other policies including DP1.
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 on this objective
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	✓	✓	→	→	↔	✓	→	→	The policy has the potential to increase affordability if building a mixture of homes meets housing needs (this is not a direct relationship). This will depend on implementation in conjunction with SC9. There is no clear impact however on reducing unfit or empty homes.
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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	Providing a range of development does not have a direct impact on access to community services.
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 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	There may be a minor positive impact realised through implementation of this in conjunction with other policies, although the impact will depend on how the policy is implemented in practice.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	There may be a minor positive impact on crime and anti-social behaviour by encouraging mixed developments, although

Plan Policy SC1 : Securing a Greater Choice of Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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									there is a less clear relationship with fear of crime.
<b>Summary:</b> The policy requires a mix of development, but for many of the sustainability objectives, the impacts will depend on the particular circumstance of development and on implementation of this policy in conjunction with others such as DP1, DP6, DP12, DP13, SC9 and UAP1. Reference to these policies could be included in the reasoned justification.													

Plan Policy SC2 : Protecting Employment Land and Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	⇄	→	→	The policy contributes positively to this objective as the policy deals with preserving existing or committed employment land and buildings.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	✓	⇄	→	→	The policy should ensure balanced development by focusing on retention of employment land and buildings.
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.

Plan Policy SC2 : Protecting Employment Land and Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	Potential permitted uses can include land for affordable housing in accordance with SC9 which may have some beneficial impact on increasing the level of affordable housing and meeting housing needs. However, the actual impacts of the policy are difficult to predict with certainty.
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 impact of the policy on the natural environment will be dependent on future development and future employment activities undertaken on the site, and should therefore be looked at in conjunction with other development and urban policies.
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car  Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9)  62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002  No trend available	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	The policy has an uncertain impact as the impact of land use on travel will depend on the specific location and use of the site. However, it may have positive impacts by retaining employment land within the urban area.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	The policy should ensure a minimum amount of loss of employment sites and reduce the need for further development of this type elsewhere. There is risk of a negative impact if retaining land for employment purposes left it under-utilised, although the policy includes consideration of this through reference to changes of use where employment is not economically viable.
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 per 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 expected

Plan Policy SC2 : Protecting Employment Land and Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)  PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact expected
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✕	→	→	The policy should help to reduce demand for employment development on greenfield sites. The policy could be given more explicit links with UAP2, which requires a sequential approach to providing employment sites.
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact expected
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 expected
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 expected
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✕	→	→	Redevelopment / change are allowed under the policy provided they are for affordable housing. The impacts of affordability depend upon implementation with SC9.



Plan Policy SC2 : Protecting Employment Land and Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 anticipated
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 anticipated
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	This policy may have a minor positive impact on poverty and social exclusion where it helps to maintain employment sites close to residential areas where there may be easier access for those without a car.
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 anticipated
<b>Summary:</b> <b>The policy has positive impacts by protecting redevelopment of employment land, with some exceptions. This helps to provide a mixture of uses and maintain economic growth. In conjunction with other policies, including UAP2 and SC9, the policy should also have positive impacts on provision of affordable housing and reuse of previously developed land.</b>													

Plan Policy SC3: Supporting Public Transport Interchanges													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	The policy will help to maintain and improve public transport and could therefore improve mobility (to town centres and to employment for example).
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	The policy may help to support town centres by improving access by public transport.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	The policy states that development will only take place should it outweigh any adverse impacts, although does not stipulate that it will take into account protection of the natural landscape. Therefore, the policy is considered to be uncertain, although if the natural environment is considered as potential impacts, the policy should have a minor positive effect through requiring protection.

Plan Policy SC3: Supporting Public Transport Interchanges													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→ →	→ →	✓	✗	→	→	This is likely to have a significant impact by making use of sustainable transport easier.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact on the need to travel.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	The impact of the policy on townscape is uncertain. It may have a positive impact if it helps to reduce congestion and cars, but could have a more negative impact if townscape is not included as one of the "unacceptable adverse impacts".
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	Although the policy does not deal with creation of public transport interchanges it does support them, which should contribute to lowering greenhouse gas emissions.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	Although the policy does not deal with direct creation of public transport interchanges it does support them. Any increase in public transport use will have positive implications for air quality in that it should contribute to a reduction in car and possibly lorry use.

Plan Policy SC3: Supporting Public Transport Interchanges													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 on land quality, although the policy may affect greenfield or brownfield land by allowing development of public transport interchanges.
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 on generation of waste
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 does not have a direct impact on sustainable design or the sustainability 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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	The policy does not have a direct impact on use of natural resources, although if it supports reduction in private transport this should help to reduce use of fossil fuels.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	As the policy is supportive of public transport, it is likely that these interchanges will be along major user routes and thus could contribute to accessibility improvements to community facilities.
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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected

Plan Policy SC3: Supporting Public Transport Interchanges													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact		Scale		Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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									
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	⇄	→	→	The policy could help to maintain and improve access to services and therefore support reduction of social exclusion. However, this is not expected to be a major impact.
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact
<b>Summary:</b> The policy helps to support development of public transport interchanges, and therefore provides support for use of public transport. This should also have positive impacts on reducing reliance on private transport and increasing access to services and facilities.													

Plan Policy SC4: Supporting Cycle and Pedestrian Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact specific to rural communities expected.
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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	The policy may improve mobility and access into town centres, although this is not expected to be a significant impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	The policy may increase sustainable transport options available for tourists, although this is not considered to be a significant impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	Limiting development that prejudices implementation of cycle / pedestrian corridors and helping to promote these modes will minimise impacts on the natural landscape associated with other modes of transport.
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The main purpose of the policy is to help protect options for sustainable transport modes, and is therefore seen to have a strong positive impact in relation to this objective. However, it could be strengthened by including promotion of such facilities.

Plan Policy SC4: Supporting Cycle and Pedestrian Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 is not expected to have an impact on the need to travel, although it should help to promote more sustainable modes (see 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 impacts, although the policy could be cross-referenced to DP1 and DP6 to encourage incorporation of cycling and pedestrian facilities within the layout of developments.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✖	→	→	Supporting sustainable transport choices should lead to reductions from harmful emissions, although the extent to which this occurs will depend on uptake and personal choice.
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 anticipated.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✖	→	→	Cleaner modes of transport should lead to some air quality improvements (or should not make the situation any worse), although this is dependent upon uptake / choice.
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	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	This policy is not expected to have a significant impact.

Plan Policy SC4: Supporting Cycle and Pedestrian Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2									No direct impact
		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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	Supporting better transport choices should in turn, reduce reliance upon car travel (although not directly through this policy) and hence reduce natural resource consumption (fuel use).
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities	77.3% (14)	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The policy provides potential to improve links to community facilities from more sustainable forms of transport, although the contribution is not clear within this policy and would need to be implemented in conjunction with other development policies in order to maximise positive impact.
		Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	Data unavailable	Unable to identify trend									
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	Data not available at district level	Unable to identify trend									Implementation of the policy will not have a direct impact (as it rests on personal choice) although supporting these networks will give people the opportunity to undertake more exercise and in turn, promote healthier lifestyles. The policy should focus on promoting this as well as supporting it.
		Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness	15.4% (3)	Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	
		Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available	Unable to identify situation									
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified									No direct impact expected.
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	



Plan Policy SC4: Supporting Cycle and Pedestrian Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact expected.
Summary: The policy should help to encourage travel by cycle or foot, with associated positive impacts on reducing demand for travel by car and transport emissions. The policy could be strengthened by encouraging developments to incorporate cycle and pedestrian facilities, or by cross-reference to relevant policies such as DP6.													

Plan Policy SC5: Protecting Open Spaces													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.
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 expected.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	↔	→	Preservation of open space could make a positive contribution towards balanced development, and is therefore considered to have a minor positive contribution to this objective.
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.
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.	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	Limiting development on open spaces may assist in natural habitat preservation.

Plan Policy SC5: Protecting Open Spaces													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact is expected here.
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 seeks to ensure that where open spaces are substituted, the new space is no less accessible. However, this is not considered to be a significant impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	✦	✦	✓	✘	✦	✦	Preservation of open spaces should serve to enhance the quality of local environments. However, reallocating open spaces may have an impact on the quality of townscapes- even if there is not a demonstrable need in terms of amenity. The policy could be extended to include reference to open space providing visual amenity as well as direct recreation.
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 per 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 expected.
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact expected.
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									

Plan Policy SC5: Protecting Open Spaces													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.
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 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 expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	Will sustain public open spaces.
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 will have a positive impact by protecting open space that can be used for exercise and recreation.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.

Plan Policy SC5: Protecting Open Spaces													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local			
Sustainable Development Objectives													
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	No direct impact expected.
Summary: The policy helps to protect open space used for recreation and leisure with associated benefits for community health and wellbeing. The policy has a less certain impact on townscapes as it allows changes in location of open space, which may have positive or negative impacts. The policy is largely concerned with protecting recreational amenity and could be strengthened through greater reference to visual amenity.													

Plan Policy SC6: Protecting Sport and Recreation Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact expected.
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 expected.
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 on the vitality of town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	The policy is primarily related to sports facilities for the local community and therefore it is not considered to be significant in relation to this objective.
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.	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	The policy may help to preserve natural habitats if these are on the site of the leisure building, as the policy limits opportunities for redevelopment. However, this is not considered to be a significant 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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact is expected here.

Plan Policy SC6: Protecting Sport and Recreation Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	Minimal impact expected although a positive aspect of the policy is that should alternative facilities need to be provided they will be accessible, which implies less reliance on car use.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	◇	✓	✗	◇	→	This policy includes the protection of open space and recreational facilities that can be a key component in the fabric of townscapes through the maintenance of existing accessible greenspace in the district.
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 expected.
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact expected.
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.

Plan Policy SC6: Protecting Sport and Recreation Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 expected.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	⇄	→	→	The policy has a small positive impact by reducing unnecessary changes of use and therefore associated resource use and development.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	⇄	→	→	Policy directly involves protection of public facilities and provision of suitable new ones (where necessary), which should help to maintain community access.
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 positively contributes to health by protecting sports facilities from inappropriate redevelopment and by requiring provision of alternative facilities to meet need.
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 expected.



Plan Policy SC6: Protecting Sport and Recreation Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact expected.
Summary: The policy helps to prevent loss of sports and recreation facilities and therefore has positive impacts on access to facilities and community health.													

h:\projects\ga-210\#14000 project\14932 warwick dc sa\final docs sent\files to pdf\plan polycys4 to sc6.doc

Plan Policy SC7: Supporting Community Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	The policy is not expected to affect employment and 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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	The policy will help to support rural communities by allowing development of community facilities particularly within limited growth villages within rural areas.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	✧	➔	The policy may contribute positively to economy of town centres by providing facilities and contributing to a balanced development.
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 be limited in rural areas to Limited Growth Villages. Facilities (where possible) will be located on previously developed land.
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	The policy has a positive impact by supporting centrally located facilities that serve the needs of local communities and that are easily accessible. In rural locations it requires that the facility is accessible without a car.

Plan Policy SC7: Supporting Community Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	Policy supports location of facilities in central and accessible locations (by public transport and foot) and should therefore reduce need to travel. The essence of the policy is supporting local needs.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	The policy requires use of previously developed land (where possible).
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	Centrally located facilities as advocated by the policy should minimise car use and therefore reduce adverse impacts associated with fuel consumption.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay  Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored  Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11)  36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11)  90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998.  No trend available  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)  PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	Again, an expectation of the policy is that there will be less reliance upon car use, thus helping to reduce the impact of harmful exhaust emissions.
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 supports location on previously developed sites, although does not rule out development on greenfield land. However, this should help to minimise use of greenfield sites.

Plan Policy SC7: Supporting Community Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Uncertain- potential for the policy to encourage this.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	O 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 expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Policy directly involves supporting community facilities and addressing local needs.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Should have some positive contributions in that it supports community facilities- which could include a variety of health facilities.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	As for health, the policy may have an impact if the facility is used in a way that helps reduce social exclusion. However, this is not considered to be a significant impact of the policy.
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 SC7: Supporting Community Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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: The policy allows for development of community facilities, helping to enhance access to facilities. There are additional positive impacts as the policy prefers central and accessible sites, helping to minimise need to travel and the associated negative environmental impacts of private transport.													

Plan Policy SC8: Telecommunications													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✧	✓	→	→	Possible economic benefits in that development will consider future demands which should be supportive of business demand. However, the impacts of this are expected to be at a national rather than local level.
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 impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	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.	✓	✓	?	?	✓	✧	→	→	Although efforts to avoid any adverse environmental impacts are contained within policy, implementation of policy may still mean negative impacts on the countryside (visual intrusion for example).
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

Plan Policy SC8: Telecommunications													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car  Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9)  62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002  No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	⚡	⚡	✓	✧	➔	➔	Even though adverse environmental impacts will be considered, implementation of policy may still mean negative impacts on the countryside (visual intrusion for example).
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	The policy has a minor positive impact by encouraging particular protection from visual impacts in historic areas.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)  PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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 supports site sharing (where feasible) and therefore promotes limited development



Plan Policy SC8: Telecommunications													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 expected.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	⇌	➔	➔	Policy has a minor positive impact as it only promotes development that limits visual intrusion.
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 expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	⇌	No direct impact expected.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	⚠	⚠	✓	⇌	➔	➔	The policy requires adherence to government health guidelines. However, this does not necessarily prevent any negative health 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 expected.
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 expected.

Plan Policy SC8: Telecommunications													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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: The policy allows for new sites subject to consideration of other visual and health impacts. This is driven by economic consideration to support private and business demand for telecoms. However, since the policy allows development there may be negative visual and health impacts.													

Plan Policy SC8a : Managing Housing Supply													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	↔	→	The policy does not directly address this objective but could have implemented the impact of (in tandem with SC1 and SC12 and SC9 to ensure the balanced mix of development is achieved.
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	✓	✓	↔	↔	✓	↔	↔	↔	The policy has a significant positive contribution to make in meeting the housing needs of the community in both urban and rural settings. Depending upon specific locations of housing development could have positive or negative impacts (for example on whether a development reuses previously developed land).
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.	✓	✓	↔	↔	✓	↔	→	→	There are potentially positive and negative consequences from development, which will be dependent on the specific nature of individual developments. S106 agreements could be used to ensure habitat enhancement is made. The policy includes restricting development beyond 9,600 houses which should help to minimise negative impacts. The policy could be further strengthened through cross reference to UAP1 (directing new housing on previously developed land- in most cases).

Plan Policy SC8a : Managing Housing Supply													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact. The impacts on this objective will be achieved through implementation of other policies.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscape	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 policy does not directly contribute towards this objective. However there is potential to impact upon local distinctiveness through cross reference with layout and design / development policies (especially DP1) and on landscape through use of brownfield sites (UAP1).
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 4861KWhr 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 has no direct impact. However the policy could be cross referenced to DP10 and 11 to address drainage issues and DP12/12a for energy conservation.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✓	✓	◇	◇	✓	✓	◇	◇	This issue will be addressed through UAP1- which minimises development on greenfield land and promotes development on previously developed land. However this is

Plan Policy SC8a : Managing Housing Supply													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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									not explicit within this 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	✓	✓	◇	◇	✓	✓	◇	◇	Waste management issues could be addressed through reference to DP12 with potential to amend DP12 to include emphasis on preferential use of recyclable materials and potential extension of residential design guide to include provision of receptacles for domestic waste arisings. The extent of the impact is uncertain due to the uncertainties over the household composition of the new dwellings and uncertainties over whether the occupiers are already resident in the district or are new to the district.
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	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	This policy does not deal with sustainable design although there is significant potential by cross referencing to other policies such as D11 and DP 12
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	✓	✓	◇	◇	✓	✓	◇	◇	Building homes will increase demand for raw materials. However, if the policy constrains the overall number of homes, the policy will reduce impacts compared to unrestricted development.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✕	✓	→	→	Impacts of affordability depend upon implementation with SC9. No clear impact however on reducing unfit or empty homes.
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?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact.

Plan Policy SC8a : Managing Housing Supply													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available	Unable to identify situation									
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed  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? 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.
Summary: The policy allows for a specified growth in housing numbers, restricting development beyond this level. Therefore, while housebuilding will increase demand for materials and use land, the policy may also help prevent excessive growth. The policy could be strengthened through reference to policies on sustainable design and on balance of development.													

Plan Policy SC9: Affordable Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✕	→	✕	The policy may have a minor positive impact by encouraging a mixture of development in rural areas.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✕	✕	→	The policy may help to provide a more balanced mix of development in town centres and is therefore associated with a minor positive impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✕	→	→	The policy has a strong positive impact on this objective when implemented with SC8a, provided that the policy is met. However, housing completions noted in the accompanying text for the Policy indicate that there may be a significant shortfall between actuals and the policy target.
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 SC9: Affordable Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 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
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact.



Plan Policy SC9: Affordable Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	O 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The policy is designed to have positive impacts on affordability.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level 15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends Unable to identify situation	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The policy has a strong positive impact by increasing provision of affordable housing.

Plan Policy SC9: Affordable Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	✓	✓	→	→	✓		→	→	Again, as above. Also more of a layout and design / security issue that will be realised through the implementation of DP13
Summary: The policy has a positive impact on meeting housing needs and helping to reduce poverty resulting from housing costs. However, it could be strengthened by referencing policies or sustainable design to ensure these opportunities were also maximised.													

Plan Policy SC10: Sustainable Transport Improvements													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	The policy could maintain or improve access to employment, although this is not considered to be a significant impact.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	The policy could mean more sustainable transport modes available for tourists although this is not considered to be a significant impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13) 10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3. No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value Condition of protected species Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable Data unavailable 74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.

Plan Policy SC10: Sustainable Transport Improvements													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	The policy, in conjunction with SC3 and SC4 will have a significant positive impact on this objective.
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 supports the promotion of sustainable transport where development is likely to cause increased traffic on roads.
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 significant impacts.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	Supporting sustainable transport choices will have a positive impact on reducing harm associated with fuel consumption.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	The policy supports more sustainable transport choices which should lessen adverse impacts on air quality- although this is dependent upon uptake and choice.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.

Plan Policy SC10: Sustainable Transport Improvements													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	Supporting better transport choices should in turn, reduce reliance upon car travel (although not directly through this policy) and hence reduce natural resource consumption (fuel use) therefore the policy is associated with a minor positive 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 expected.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	The policy may help to link to community facilities with alternative forms of transport- although contribution is not clear within this policy and would be implemented in conjunction with other development policies. Therefore the impact is not considered to be significant.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	Implementation of the policy will not have a direct impact (rests on personal choice) although does support cycle networks which has positive health impacts. It may also improve access to social and health facilities, although this is not certain.

Plan Policy SC10: Sustainable Transport Improvements													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	The policy may have a minor positive impact by improving access e.g. to employment opportunities.
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact expected.
<b>Summary:</b> The policy requires provision for sustainable transport. Although many benefits will rely on uptake of any improvements, the policy does support benefits in terms of access, health and air quality.													

Plan Policy SC11: Open Space and Recreation Improvements													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.
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 specific to rural communities identified.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact 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 although addresses recreation and open space improvements within residential developments.
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.	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	Preserving and improving open spaces may preserve natural habitats and therefore the policy is associated with a minor positive impact.

Plan Policy SC11: Open Space and Recreation Improvements													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	The policy promotes access to facilities by sustainable transport modes.
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 has a minor positive impact by providing for recreation
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	Preservation and provision of open spaces should serve to enhance the quality of local environments.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	Ensuring sports facilities are accessible by foot, cycling and public transport may reduce adverse impacts associated with car use (e.g. CO <sub>2</sub> emissions).
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	→	As for the climate change objective, emphasis given to ensuring sports facilities are accessible by foot, cycling and public transport may reduce adverse impacts 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 impact.



Plan Policy SC11: Open Space and Recreation Improvements													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	Uncertain 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	Provision of space for recreation should help to improve the appearance of developments and contribution to townscape.
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 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 expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The policy has a positive impact through making sport / recreational facilities available to local communities.
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 has a strong positive impact through making sport / recreational facilities and areas of relaxation available to local communities.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.

Plan Policy SC11: Open Space and Recreation Improvements													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓		➔	➔	Some attention is given to safety / security issues through emphasis upon provision of visible play areas on housing developments.
Summary: The policy has positive impacts on visual amenity and community facilities through provision of local recreation areas.													

Plan Policy SC12: Community Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct impact.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	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 SC12: Community Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The policy does not directly address location but should have a positive impact when implemented with SC7 and SC7a which support centrally located facilities that serve the needs of local communities and that are easily accessible.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	Implementation with SC7/a should minimise car use / travel to facilities and therefore reduce adverse impacts associated with exhaust emissions. However, this is not a significant impact of this 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 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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	The policy may reduce car use and therefore exhaust emissions. However, this is not considered a significant impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.

Plan Policy SC12: Community Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	Policy directly involves supporting community facilities and addressing local needs.
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 has a positive impact by supporting community facilities, which could include a variety of health facilities.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.

Plan Policy SC12: Community Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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.
Summary: The policy helps improve provision of community facilities													

Plan Policy SC13: Public Art													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct impact
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct impact
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct impact
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	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 expected.

Plan Policy SC13: Public Art													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.
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	→	→	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	There is significant potential for providing a sense of local distinctiveness and identity.
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 4861kWhr 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 expected.
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.
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 expected.



Plan Policy SC13: Public Art													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	✓	✓	This policy can have a positive impact on townscape.
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 expected.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No 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 impact
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No impact

Plan Policy SC13: Public Art													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct impact expected.
Summary: The policy has positive impacts on distinctiveness and townscape issues													

Plan Policy UAP1 : Directing New Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact on this DP
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Development will be restricted to previously developed land and buildings within the confines of the urban areas and is subject to SC8a. Other development will only be for affordable housing (implemented with Policy SC9) should contribute towards a balanced mix of development.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Not explicit within this policy although potential to have a positive impact on this policy when implemented with SC9.
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.	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Priority given to development on previously developed land

Plan Policy UAP1 : Directing New Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	As development will be permitted within existing urban areas and for affordable housing that meets local needs, it is likely that there will be existing access to public transport / key services and therefore the potential for less reliance on car use.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Housing will be predominantly directed on previously used land, potentially contributing to use of previously under-used land. There is also potential to impact upon local distinctiveness through cross reference with layout and design / development policies.
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 4861KWhr 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Potential to address drainage issues are addressed through DP10 and DP11. Energy conservation regarding new development is dealt with in 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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact, although location may have an indirect impact on reducing car use. This is, however, difficult to define.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	The policy will minimise development upon greenfield sites as it promotes development only on previously developed land, unless for affordable housing (which will be

Plan Policy UAP1 : Directing New Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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									according to policy SC9).
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	WM issues will be addressed in reference to DP12. There is potential to amend DP12 to include emphasis on preferential use of recyclable materials and a possibility to extend the residential design guide to include provision of receptacles for domestic waste arisings.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Potential to influence through cross reference with other policies such as D11 and DP 12
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.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Affordability is a priority and will be implemented according to SC9. However, there is no clear impact on reducing unfit or empty homes.
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 impact is likely to be positive, although the extent of this is unclear. New housing will be in areas that have good access to key services. It is also unclear as to the amount of pressure that will put on community services. Policy needs to be implemented with a range of policies including SC8a and SC7/7a.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Potential to make a positive contribution due to the quality and layout of design and access to key services. Needs to be implemented with a range of other design and layout, and social capital policies.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Minor positive impact is likely to be realised through implementation of this in conjunction with other policies (e.g. social capital).

Plan Policy UAP1 : Directing New Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	As above. Further potential to influence layout and design / security issues through the implementation of DP13
Summary: This policy has a generally positive impact on many of the sustainability objectives, with significant positive impacts on availability and affordability of housing and protecting and improving land quality. It is important to note that, for many of the sustainability objectives, the impacts will depend on the particular circumstance of development and on implementation of this policy in conjunction with others such as DP10, DP11, DP12, DP13, SC9, SC8a and SC77a. Reference to these policies could be included in the reasoned justification.													

Plan Policy UAP2 : Directing New Employment Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 preserving existing or committed employment land and buildings. Should also impact favourably on local employment.  However, policy should also consider possible displacement of small businesses and how this may be avoided and also, how diversification could be encouraged.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	⇌	→	→	There is potential to ensure balanced development as policy focuses on retention of employment land and buildings primarily for that purpose.
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.	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	It is not clear whether this will have a significant impact (positively or negatively). The impact will be dependent on future development and/or future employment activities undertaken on the site. However, as priority is given to development on PDL and buildings, development should be minimised on other sites. Policy should be considered in conjunction with other development and urban policies.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	⇌	→	→	Positively addresses sustainable transport modes and should serve the needs of the local workforce, hence reducing the need to travel.

Plan Policy UAP2 : Directing New Employment Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Maximises development on PDL / buildings which will reduce the need for further development of this type elsewhere
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 influenced 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	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Supports use of more sustainable modes of transport. Priority is given to small-scale offices, R&D and light industry development next to transport interchanges / areas highly accessible by walking and cycling. It could therefore have a positive impact on minimising poor air quality associated with exhaust emissions.
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 so will minimise development on greenfield sites. Policy to be implemented with other policies such as SSP1 and SC2.



Plan Policy UAP2 : Directing New Employment Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 depends 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. However, there is potential to influence this through implementation with other policies e.g. DP11 and by incorporating conditions into the policy itself that specify 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. However, there is 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Minor positive impact could be realised through implementation of this in conjunction with other policies. Policy may improve access to employment opportunities for a greater proportion of the population.

Plan Policy UAP2 : Directing New Employment Development													
	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 several of the sustainability objectives, with significant positive impacts on protecting and improving land quality, sustainable transport and reducing travel. It is possible that the policy could have a significant positive impact on maintaining high economic growth, however the potential impacts on small businesses could be negative. It is important to note that, for a number 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 SSP1, SC2, DP10, DP11 and DP12/ 12a. Reference to these policies could be included in the reasoned justification.													

Plan Policy UAP3 : Directing New Retail Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→ →	→	→	→	→	→	Only viable development will be permitted outside town centres. There is potential to contribute positively in terms of creating employment opportunities. Diversification development will only be permitted where there is a proven need and larger proposals will be subject to a Retail Impact Assessment.
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. Retail will be confined mainly to town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact 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, although policy looks to minimise development outside urban areas.

Plan Policy UAP3 : Directing New Retail Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→ →	→	→	✗	→	→	Priority given to town centre locations. These will be readily accessible by public transport, foot and cycling. Policy will also ensure that any development that is proven to be viable outside town centres will be easily accessible by sustainable modes of transport.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	✗	→	→	Priority given to development within town centres on previously developed land. Policy could include reference to limiting any development that does occur outside of town centres to brownfield / under-used sites. (Although this may be included in any assessment criteria).
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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> : none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	→	✗	→	→	Central locations means improved access by more sustainable modes of transport / any other development will need to be highly accessible by these as well. Therefore may have a positive impact on minimising poor air quality associated with exhausts.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	✗	→	→	Policy is concerned with development on PDL / buildings predominantly within town centres.

Plan Policy UAP3 : Directing New Retail Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	↕	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. 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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Minor positive impact may be realised through implementation of this in conjunction with other policies. May improve access to employment opportunities for a wider

Plan Policy UAP3 : Directing New Retail Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									proportion of the population.
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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available									No direct impact. More of a design and layout issue.
		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 has a generally positive impact on several of the sustainability objectives, with significant positive impacts on sustainable transport, reducing travel and maintaining high economic growth. It is important to note that, for a number 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 DP10, DP11 and DP12 / 12a. Reference to these policies could be included in the reasoned justification.													

Plan Policy UAP4 : Protection of Local Shopping Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	✗	→	→	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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	→	✗	→	→	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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  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 effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	↻	→	→	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					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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.
Summary: 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.													

Plan Policy UAP5 : Protecting Local Shops													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	→	✗	→	→	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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)	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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	←	←	←	⇌	←	←	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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.													

h:\projects\ga-210\#14000 projects\14932 warwick dc sa\final docs sent\files to pdf\plan policy nap4 to nap 6.doc

Plan Policy UAP7 : Directing New Tourism Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→ →	→	→	→	→	→	Indirect significant impact on the economic performance of the district
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Possibility to assist with the diversification of rural economy, however development will be restricted according to local environmental impact and access by sustainable modes of transport
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, although may be indirect impacts on viability of town centre through more visitors
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	✓	✓	→ →	→	→	→	→	→	Whilst policy has a significant positive impact, the performance of the policy could be improved through inclusion of reference to the opportunity of development to 'enhance existing natural features'
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 only be permitted where it does not harm the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment.

Plan Policy UAP7 : Directing New Tourism Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Development will only be permitted where the development is, or can be made accessible by foot, cycle and public transport. Also, extensions to existing facilities may have to produce a travel plan, which could address this objective.
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, however impact is, to an extent, uncertain as provision of alternative modes does not ensure use of these modes.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Development will only be permitted where it does not harm the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment. Performance of the policy could be further improved through inclusion of reference to the opportunity of development to 'enhance existing natural features'
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	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	Impact on this objective uncertain. Impact will depend on development and future use.
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	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	Impact on this objective uncertain. Impact will depend on development and future use.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	Impact on this objective uncertain. Impact will depend on development and future 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Development will only be permitted where it does not harm the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment.

Plan Policy UAP7 : Directing New Tourism Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	Impact on this objective uncertain. Impact will depend on development and future use.
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 expected, although potential impacts could be realised through new developments. Conditions could also be included to optimise sustainability of design.
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	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	Impact on this objective uncertain. Impact will depend on development and future use.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	✎	→	→	Possibility for positive impact on healthy lifestyle, depending on scope of development.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	✎	→	→	Possibility of greater employment opportunities, both directly in tourism developments and indirectly through potential increased foot flow to area.

Plan Policy UAP7 : Directing New Tourism Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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
Summary: Policy will have overall positive impact on the sustainability objectives, with particular benefits to promotion of sustainable transport, sustainable tourism and economic growth. There is potential to further increase positive impacts on some objectives through consideration alongside other policies.													

Plan Policy UAP8 : Directing New Visitor Accommodation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	May enhance vitality of urban centres through ensuring location of these facilities are within or adjacent to centres.
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 expected.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Will be centrally located so there are likely to be positive implications for this objective.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Supports sustainable tourism and accommodation must be located next to sustainable transport interchanges.
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. Although potential use of sites that could otherwise be used for affordable housing should be considered.
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 expected. Although development confined to town centre and existing sites so minimising impact in other areas.



Plan Policy UAP8 : Directing New Visitor Accommodation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Any permitted development will need to be adjacent to public transport interchanges or corridors.
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. However, must consider that provision of alternative modes does not ensure use of these modes.
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 expected, although development constrained to town centre and existing sites.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it 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 expected. Although could have impacts depending on development and future use.
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected. Although could have impacts depending on location of development (for existing sites).
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 development is constrained to town centre sites and existing developments, impact on greenfield sites is likely to be minimised

Plan Policy UAP8 : Directing New Visitor Accommodation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	Impact on this objective uncertain. Impact will depend on development and future use.
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 expected, although potential impacts could be realised through new developments. Conditions could also be included to optimise sustainability of design.
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	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	Impact on this objective uncertain. Impact will depend on development and future use.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	No direct impact expected.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	No direct impact expected.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends Unable to identify situation	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	No direct impact expected.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	No direct impact expected.

Plan Policy UAP8 : Directing New Visitor Accommodation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct impact expected.
Summary: This policy has positive impacts on the objectives overall, with particular contributions to economic growth and vitality of town centres. Again, it is important to note that positive impacts can be optimised through consideration with other policies.													

Plan Policy UAP9: Directing New Leisure Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.
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 specific to rural communities expected.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Protection of such facilities should support balanced development. Predominance given to development within town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact 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 expected.

Plan Policy UAP9: Directing New Leisure Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term		Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Restricting development to town centres implies ease of access by public transport, foot and cycling. Any development outside urban centres will need to demonstrate that it is or can be made highly accessible by these modes of transport.
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, however it is important to consider that provision of alternative modes of transport may not result in their use.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	Impact on this objective is uncertain. There is potential to have positive impact dependent on development and future use.
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 expected. However impact could be influenced by type of development.
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected. Although favouring developments with access to public transport may have indirect positive impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	Impact on this objective is uncertain. Although policy favours urban developments, it does not exclude developments in other areas.

Plan Policy UAP9: Directing New Leisure Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	Impact on this objective uncertain. Impact will depend on development and future use.
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 expected, although potential impacts could be realised through new developments. Conditions could also be included to optimise sustainability of design.
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	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	◊	Impact on this objective uncertain. Impact will depend on development and future use.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	No direct impact expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➡	➡	➡	✎	➡	➡	Should be implemented in conjunction with SC6 which directly involves protection of public facilities and provision of suitable new ones (where necessary).
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	✓	✓	➡	➡	➡	✎	➡	➡	Positively contributes to the health agenda particularly in conjunction with SC6.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	✎	No direct impact expected.

Plan Policy UAP9: Directing New Leisure Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact expected.
Summary: This policy has positive impacts on the objectives overall, with particular contributions to access to facilities and services and improving health. Again, it is important to note that positive impacts can be optimised through consideration with other policies.													

Plan Policy TCP1 : Protecting and Enhancing the Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	This policy will help to enhance the vitality of urban areas and diversify the economy.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	It is uncertain what effect protecting town centres will have on outlying rural communities.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	This is the aim of this policy. The supporting text also makes reference to not harming the vitality and viability of neighbouring town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Retail, entertainment and leisure facilities should encourage long-term tourism.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact.
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	◇	The impact of this policy is uncertain on this objective as, although encouraging developing in the town centre, it may mean that town centre areas become more congested because of increased user access.



Plan Policy TCP1 : Protecting and Enhancing the Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	Increased provision within existing town centres may increase the need to travel, however, as existing town centres are better served by public transport this may have an overall beneficial impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	↔	→	This policy promotes development that reflects or enhances the character and form of the town centre.
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 expected
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	↔	→	The supporting text notes that, because of the historic nature of the three town centres, that proposals will have to be of an appropriate scale and design quality in order not to have a detrimental impact of those environments.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	↗	↗	↗	↔	↔	↗	Increased development in the town centre is likely to create additional traffic and additional pollution. However, there is potential for increased use of public transport as town centre is accessible.
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	✓	✓	✓	✓	→	↔	→	→	This policy should help to avoid redevelopment of greenfield land by focusing development in existing town centres.

Plan Policy TCP1 : Protecting and Enhancing the Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	Impact on this objective uncertain. Impact will depend on development and future use.
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 expected, although potential impacts could be realised through new developments. Conditions could also be included to optimise sustainability of design.
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	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	Impact on this objective uncertain. Impact will depend on development and future use.
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	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	New town centre development will help to enhance the existing community facilities. However, it is uncertain whether this would improve the accessibility of the town centres.
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	⬇	✓	➔	✓	✓	↔	↔	➔	This policy may help to reduce poverty and social exclusion (particularly in urban areas) in the long term by providing local investment.

Plan Policy TCP1 : Protecting and Enhancing the Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Impact of policy is uncertain, it will be possible to incorporate design elements to overcome crime and community safety problems, however additional facilities in town centres may encourage increased antisocial behaviour and noise.
Summary: This policy generally has positive impacts on the objectives overall, with particular contributions to maintaining and enhancing the quality of landscapes and townscapes, vitality of town centres and promoting economic growth. Policy can optimise positive impacts through implementation with other development policies.													

Plan Policy TCP2: Directing Retail Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	↗	✓	→	→	→	↔	↗	→	In the long term the protection of the shopping function of the town centres should help to achieve sustained economic growth. However, this may have a number of short term disadvantages, since restricting certain development types may reduce the opportunities for other business types.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↔	It is uncertain what effect this policy will have on outlying rural communities.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	↔	→	This is the aim of this policy. The supporting text also makes reference to not harming the vitality and viability of neighbouring town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	↔	→	Retail, entertainment and leisure facilities should encourage long-term tourism in the area.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP2: Directing Retail Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	The impact of this policy is uncertain on this objective as it may mean that town centre areas become more congested because of increased user access.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	?	→	→	Increased provision within existing town centres may increase the need to travel, however, as existing town centres are better served by public transport this may have an overall beneficial impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	↔	→	This policy should help to maintain the character of the existing 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 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 4861kWhr 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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	This policy is unlikely to directly contribute to minimising the impacts of climate change.
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	←	↔	←	?	?	←	Increased development in the town centre could result in additional traffic and contribute to poor 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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected

Plan Policy TCP2: Directing Retail Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	No direct impact expected. Although new developments could contribute to this objective through consideration of other development policies.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	It is uncertain what effect this policy will have on sustainable design and construction. However there is potential for consideration to be made to sustainability in development proposals.
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 expected.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	No direct impact expected.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	✱	→	→	New town centre development will help to enhance the existing community facilities. However, it is uncertain whether this would improve the accessibility of the town centres.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends Unable to identify situation	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	✱	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✓	→	→	→	✱	✧	→	This policy may help to reduce poverty and social exclusion (particularly in urban areas) in the long term by providing local investment.

Plan Policy TCP2: Directing Retail Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	Impact of policy is uncertain, it will be possible to incorporate design elements to overcome crime and community safety problems, however additional facilities in town centres may encourage increased antisocial behaviour and noise.
Summary: This policy contributes particularly to the objectives on enhancing the quality of townscapes, the vitality of town centres. Some negative impacts could be realised on air quality as a result of increased traffic, however as the development will be located on existing public transport access routes, there is potential for this impact to be minimised.													

Plan Policy TCP3: Providing for Shopping Growth in Leamington Town Centre													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→ →	→	→	→	→	→	This policy will assist in helping to maintain high levels of 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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	It is uncertain whether this policy would help to promote and enhance rural communities. If it results in local services closing down, as a result of customers being drawn into larger town centres it may have a negative impact on smaller, outlying, rural communities.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→ →	→	→	→	→	→	This is the aim of this policy and the policy it cross-references to.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	Large scale shopping development may help to encourage increased tourism.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value Condition of protected species Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✓	✓	←	→	←	→	←	←	Large scale shopping development could have a negative impact on biodiversity.
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	→	→	→	The policy places adequate emphasis on the need for proposals to create strong and direct pedestrian links. It may also be beneficial for the policy to refer to the provision of cycleways.



Plan Policy TCP3: Providing for Shopping Growth in Leamington Town Centre													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→ →	◇	←	⇌	←	←	Large scale shopping centres are unlikely to reduce the need to travel or the movement of goods. Nevertheless, the policy does contain the need for development proposals to consider the impact upon traffic movements, public transport and the provision of car parking.
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 policy will contribute to enhancing the town centre.
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	✓	✓	←	←	←	←	←	←	This policy is unlikely to directly contribute to minimising the impacts of climate change. A large scale shopping development may increase the need for energy consumption.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	⇌	⇌	→	This policy cross refers to DP1 which requires development proposals to demonstrate that they reflect, respect and reinforce local architectural and historic distinctiveness.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	←	←	←	←	◇	←	Increased development may create additional traffic and additional pollution.
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 relates to development in town centre and is therefore likely to limit development on greenfield sites

Plan Policy TCP3: Providing for Shopping Growth in Leamington Town Centre													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 expected.
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 cross reference to Policy DP1 Layout and Design ensures that the character and quality of the built environment is considered.
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	✓	✓	←	←	←	←	←	←	New development will create an increased demand for resources including water and raw materials.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	This policy contains the requirement for proposals to consider the impact upon traffic movements and pedestrian links.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact expected.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed  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	◊	✓	→	→	→	↔	◊	→	This policy may help to reduce poverty and social exclusion (particularly in urban areas) in the long term by providing local investment.
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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP3: Providing for Shopping Growth in Leamington Town Centre													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
Summary: This policy has the potential to have negative impacts on a number of the sustainability objectives including use of natural resources, improving air quality, climate change impacts, reducing the need to travel and protection of the natural environment.													

Plan Policy TCP4: Primary Retail Frontages													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	➡ ➡	➡	➡	✧	➡	➡	This policy will assist in helping to maintain in the long term, high and sustained levels of 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 impact expected.
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	✓	✓	➡ ➡	➡	➡	➡	✧	➡ ➡	Restricting the growth of food and drink outlets should help to enhance the vitality of town centres by protecting the retail character of the 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	✓	✓	➡	➡	➡	✧	✧	➡	Ensuring the retail character of the town centre is maintained will help to promote sustainable tourism.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP4: Primary Retail Frontages													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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	✓	✓	➔	➔	➔	✧	✧	➔	The policy will help to protect the character of the town centre
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP4: Primary Retail Frontages													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact. Although protecting the long term viability of the town centre could contribute to reducing poverty and social exclusion.

Plan Policy TCP4: Primary Retail Frontages													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Although no direct impact, this policy may help to reduce antisocial behaviour, which can be associated with large numbers of food and drink outlets close together.
Summary: This policy will contribute to the objectives on economic growth and protecting the vitality and culture of the town centre.													

Plan Policy TCP5: Secondary Retail Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	➡ ➡	➡	➡	✧	➡	➡	This policy will assist in helping to maintain in the long term, high and sustained levels of 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 impact expected.
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	✓	✓	➡ ➡	➡	➡	➡	✧	➡ ➡	Restricting the growth of food and drink outlets should help to enhance the vitality of town centres by protecting the retail character of the 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	✓	✓	➡	➡	➡	✧	✧	➡	Ensuring the retail character of the town centre is maintained will help to promote sustainable tourism.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.



Plan Policy TCP5: Secondary Retail Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary		
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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	✓	✓	➔	➔	➔	✧	✧	➔	The policy will help to protect the character of the town centre
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP5: Secondary Retail Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact. Although protecting the long term viability of the town centre could contribute to reducing poverty and social exclusion.

Plan Policy TCP5: Secondary Retail Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Although no direct impact, this policy may help to reduce antisocial behaviour, which can be associated with large numbers of food and drink outlets close together.
Summary: Similarly to the policy on primary retail areas, this policy will contribute to the objectives on economic growth and protecting the vitality and culture of the town centre.													

Plan Policy TCP6: Café Quarters													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	➔ ➔	➔	➔	✧	➔	➔	This policy will assist in helping to maintain high and sustained levels of economic growth by providing visitors with attractions to complement shopping and leisure related journeys.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	➔ ➔	➔	➔	✧	✧	➔ ➔	The provision of a specific area for food and drink uses will enhance the vitality of the town centre.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✓	✓	➔	➔	➔	✧	✧	➔	The provision of a specific area for food and drink uses may help to promote sustainable tourism.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP6: Café Quarters													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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. Although policy may help to protect the character of the town centre.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP6: Café Quarters													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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	✓	✓	←	←	←	↻	↻	←	Food and drink uses may create additional locally generated waste, however this can normally be dealt with through the adequate provision of refuse and litter facilities.
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.

Plan Policy TCP6: Café Quarters													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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? Will it reduce noise levels?	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.
<b>Summary:</b> Policy will contribute to the sustainability objectives on economic growth, enhancing the vitality of the town and helping to promote sustainable tourism. However, it is important to recognise that the policy may have negative impacts on increased waste and litter production.													

Plan Policy TCP7: Opportunity Sites in Old Town, Leamington Spa													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→ →	→	→	→	→	→	This policy will assist in helping to encourage regeneration in areas which have fallen into decline.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact. Although specific developments may contribute to availability and affordability of housing.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	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	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact.



Plan Policy TCP7: Opportunity Sites in Old Town, Leamington Spa													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	→	✗	→	→	Regeneration of specific sites and a network of arts and cultural industry will help to maintain and enhance the quality of landscape and townscapes.
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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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. Although specific developments may contribute to enhancing the culture of the area and historic character of the environment.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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.

Plan Policy TCP7: Opportunity Sites in Old Town, Leamington Spa													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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.

Plan Policy TCP7: Opportunity Sites in Old Town, Leamington Spa													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	No direct impact.
Summary: This policy contributes to the sustainability objectives on enhancing the quality of landscapes and townscapes and maintaining economic growth. Other positive impacts could be realised through developments being implemented with consideration to other development and sustainability policies.													

Plan Policy TCP8: Warwick Town Centre Mixed Use Area													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	This policy will contribute to economic growth and should help to diversify the economy.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	This policy will help to maintain a balanced mix of development within town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13) 10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3. No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact. Although 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 impact.

Plan Policy TCP8: Warwick Town Centre Mixed Use Area													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Policy refers to development in the town centre, which is likely to be accessible by public transport, walking and cycling.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	↔	→	→	Mixed development in the town centre is likely to minimise the need to travel.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	↔	→	↔	↔	→	→	The wide range of development types in the area the policy relates to may help to provide an identity and local 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 4861 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact. Although development in the town centre is not likely to add to traffic related pollution.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP8: Warwick Town Centre Mixed Use Area													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact. Although could be addressed through specific developments in relation to development and sustainability policies.
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. Although policy indicates that development should not be at the expense of residential development.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP8: Warwick Town Centre Mixed Use Area													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy contributes positively to promoting economic growth and enhancing the vitality of the town centre, and particularly to enhancing the townscape.													

Plan Policy TCP9: Protecting Employment Land and Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	↔	→	↔	→	→	This policy will assist in helping to maintain in the long term, high and sustained levels of 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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	It is unknown what indirect impact this policy will have on rural communities
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	↔	→	↔	↔	→	The policy should help to encourage greater diversification within town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No significant impact. However, may help to release some land for housing.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.



Plan Policy TCP9: Protecting Employment Land and Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it 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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay  Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored  Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11)  36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998.  No trend available No trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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.

Plan Policy TCP9: Protecting Employment Land and Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	↔	↔	↔	→	→	Will help to improve the design of townscapes.
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 significant impact, however, may help to release some land for housing.
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? Will it reduce noise levels?	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 TCP9: Protecting Employment Land and Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
Summary: This policy contributes positively to the sustainability objectives relating to economic growth and enhancing the vitality of the town centre.													

Plan Policy TCP10: Protecting the Residential Role of Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact, although protecting a mix of use within the town centre may indirectly contribute to 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 impact
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	↔	→	→	↔	→	The policy should help to maintain a balanced mix of development.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✓	✓	→	↔	→	→	↔	→	This policy helps to protect land for housing.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	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	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact. Although town centre developments are likely to be more accessible by public transport.

Plan Policy TCP10: Protecting the Residential Role of Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it 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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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. Although policy refers to protecting residential developments in the town centre, which may therefore minimise developments on Greenfield sites

Plan Policy TCP10: Protecting the Residential Role of Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	↔	→	↔	→	→	Policy will protect land for residential use,
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? Will it reduce noise levels?	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 TCP10: Protecting the Residential Role of Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
Sustainable Development Objectives													
Summary This policy contributes positively to the sustainability objectives relating to protecting the vitality of town centres and meeting housing needs.													

Plan Policy TCP11: Protecting Residential Uses on Upper Floors													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact, although protecting a mix of use within the town centre may indirectly contribute to 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 impact
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	↔	→	→	↔	→	The policy should help to maintain a balanced mix of development.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✓	✓	→	↔	→	→	↔	→	This policy helps to protect available housing.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value Condition of protected species Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.



Plan Policy TCP11: Protecting Residential Uses on Upper Floors													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	✗	✓	✓	✗	→	This policy will encourage the use of public transport, by providing residential spaces within town centres.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓	→	✗	✓	✓	✗	→	This policy will reduce the need to travel, by providing residential spaces within town centres.
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 4861 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP11: Protecting Residential Uses on Upper Floors													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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 330 kg 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	✓	✓	→	✗	✓	✓	✗	→	Will help to provide space for housing.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP11: Protecting Residential Uses on Upper Floors													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✓	✓	→	⇄	✓	✓	⇄	→	Can help to provide natural surveillance and reduce people's fear of crime and the actual levels of crime.
Summary: Similarly to policy TCP11, this policy contributes positively to sustainability objectives relating to vitality of town centres and provision of housing. Further positive impacts could be realised in promoting sustainable transport/reduction in travel and reduction in crime/fear of crime.													

Plan Policy TCP12: Upper Floors within Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	◇	◇	◇	✗	✗	◇	May help to diversify the economy and enhance the vitality of town centres. However, may also restrict certain types of development.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	→	✗	✗	→	The policy should help to encourage greater diversification within town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	→	✗	✗	→	This policy will help to protect residential spaces.
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 TCP12: Upper Floors within Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	✗	✓	✓	✗	→	This policy will encourage the use of public transport, by protecting development/residential spaces within town centres.
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 4861 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP12: Upper Floors within Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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 330 kg 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	✓	✓	→	↗	✓	↗	↗	→	Will help to protect space for housing.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends Unable to identify situation	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	No direct impact.

Plan Policy TCP12: Upper Floors within Town Centres													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✓	✓	→	⇄	✓	⇄	⇄	→	Can help to provide natural surveillance and reduce people fear of crime and the actual levels of crime.
Summary: This policy contributes positively to the sustainability objectives relating to vitality of town centre, promotion of sustainable travel modes/reduction of travel, and may also contribute to the provision of housing needs. There is potential for this policy to contribute to economic growth, however it may be viewed that the policy has a negative impact on economic growth in some cases.													

Plan Policy TCP13: Design of Shopfronts													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	⇄	✓	⇄	→	→	Will contribute to the character and attractiveness of the town centres and help to enhance the vitality of them.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	⇄	✓	✓	→	→	The policy will enhance the vitality of the town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact. Although may indirectly contribute to tourism through maintaining attractiveness of town centre.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact.
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.



Plan Policy TCP13: Design of Shopfronts													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it 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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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	✓	✓	↔	✓	✓	↔	↔	↔	Policy particularly relates to protecting the character of, for example, listed buildings, thus protecting the look and feel of the towns.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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.

Plan Policy TCP13: Design of Shopfronts													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 330 kg 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? Will it reduce noise levels?	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 TCP13: Design of Shopfronts													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
Summary: This policy contributes to the sustainability objectives relating to enhancing the vitality of town centre, promoting economic growth and, particularly, to protecting and enhancing the historic nature of the area.													

Plan Policy RAP1 : Development within Rural Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	<b>Policy is overarching and does not directly impact on each objective in isolation.</b> Should contribute positively to this objective in conjunction with other RAP policies. Limits development to employment land. Promotes farm diversification activities.
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. Promotes diversification and safe-guarding of local business when looked at with other policies (RAP 9 and 12).
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct impact
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	Relevant policies cover land protection (e.g.RAP15) where used for tourist related activities.
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	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	Housing needs addressed within RAP 5 and 6.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	A range of policies are associated with the protection of the countryside and complementary development.
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- not covered

Plan Policy RAP1 : Development within Rural Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Should have positive impact when implemented with other policies that deal with protecting the character of areas e.g. RAP8
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	No direct impact expected
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	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Policies deal directly with protection of land and landscape.

Plan Policy RAP1 : Development within Rural Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 related policies will impact on this objective- depends 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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	Again, as above- although significant potential- particularly in policies concerning development.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	As above
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	Dealt with in housing policies (RAP5/6)
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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	Policies in existence to deal with protection of local services (RAP11)
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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	Greater access to open spaces due to location. Policies concerning promotion (but limitations to recreation and leisure development) e.g. RAP13.
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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	Policies to address some of these issues, including affordable housing provision.

Plan Policy RAP1 : Development within Rural Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	Impact uncertain
Summary: This policy is overarching but has the potential to positively contribute to the sustainability objectives when interpreted in relation to policies RAP2-16 (already referred to)													

Plan Policy RAP2 : Directing New Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact, although additional housing could help to support viability of rural services
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Will permit limited development of affordable housing if clear need is identified.
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 be on PDL
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



Plan Policy RAP2 : Directing New Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct impact
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	→	✖	→	✖	Housing will be predominantly directed on previously used land. Also and in conjunction with other policies, should ensure development is in harmony with character of area.
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	✓	✓	→	→	→	✖	→	✖	Should ensure (in conjunction with other RA policies) development is in-keeping with local character and setting.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	No direct impact. However, actual location of development may have some impact on reducing 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	✓	✓	→	→	✖	✓	→	✖	Will minimise development upon greenfield land and promotes development on previously developed land.

Plan Policy RAP2 : Directing New Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✕	✓	→	✕	Potential to be dealt with through cross referencing to other policies such as D11 and DP12
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.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✕	✓	→	✕	Affordable housing will be provided where there is a demonstrable need in accordance with RAP5, 6 and 8.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	✕	Uncertain impact. Although, as growth is limited, impact should not be significant.
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 affected?	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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✕	→	→	Affordable housing will be provided where there is a demonstrable need in accordance with RAP5, 6 and 8.

Plan Policy RAP2 : Directing New Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Summary: Although, generally limiting development, this policy contributes positively to sustainability objectives relating to meeting housing needs, particularly requirements for affordable housing. This policy must be interpreted in accordance with RAP 5,6 and 8 and further benefits could be realised if links are made to development policies, which could influence sustainable design, waste reduction and minimising water use. Policy should perhaps refer to this link in addition to other RAP policies.													

Plan Policy RAP3 : Extensions to Dwellings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact 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.	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	The purpose of this policy is to protect the natural environment.
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.

Plan Policy RAP3 : Extensions to Dwellings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Should ensure development is in harmony with (or even enhances) the character of the area.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Should ensure (in conjunction with other RA policies) development is in-keeping with local character and setting.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Contributes to protection of Greenfield sites through limiting development and through setting a limit to proportion of area extension.

Plan Policy RAP3 : Extensions to Dwellings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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, although potential to be dealt with through cross referencing to other policies such as D11 and DP 12
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	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	Again, 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 expected.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact expected.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	No direct impact.
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 RAP3 : Extensions to Dwellings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Summary: This policy allows development in a way that does not have adverse impacts on the surrounding environment, therefore contributing positively to objectives on protection of land, landscapes and environment. The policy will realise additional positive impacts when interpreted in accordance with other development policies.													

Plan Policy RAP4 : Replacement Dwellings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	No direct impact
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	No direct impact
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	No direct impact 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 expected.
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.



Plan Policy RAP4 : Replacement Dwellings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 (8) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Should ensure development is in harmony with and enhance character of the area.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Should ensure (in conjunction with other RA policies) development is in-keeping with local character and setting.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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, although, as development must be of the same area as the previous dwelling, additional development will be limited.

Plan Policy RAP4 : Replacement Dwellings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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, although potential to be dealt with through cross referencing to other policies such as D11 and DP12
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	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	Again, 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 expected.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	No direct impact expected.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	No direct impact.
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  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 RAP4 : Replacement Dwellings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Summary: This policy limits development to that which will maintain or enhance the feel and impact on an area. It contributes positively to objectives on protecting landscapes and the environment. It is important that this policy links directly to development policies, which could further contribute to achieving sustainability objectives.													

Plan Policy RAP5: Providing Rural Affordable Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	No direct impact
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15) District level data not available	Unable to identify trend Unable to identify trend	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	It is not clear what impact it will have on rural services as it will be a very restricted type of development.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	No direct impact
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	No direct impact on this DP
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↗	→	↗	Addresses provision of affordable housing where there is a clear, demonstrable need (links back to RAP2). Much stricter conditions / limitations placed on this type of development compared to urban counterparts.
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.	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↗	→	↗	Limited development should ensure character / quality of countryside is maintained.
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	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	Uncertain.

Plan Policy RAP5: Providing Rural Affordable Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 (8) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	As above- although this housing will only be provided where there is a clear need for people to live in rural areas, hence it could be assumed that it will be adjacent to their places of work (e.g. farm workers).
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 and controlled development is likely to cause minimal disruption to rural areas.
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, although will be positively addressed through implementation with DP10 and DP11 and 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, Limited and controlled development is likely to cause minimal disruption to rural areas- thus should not have adverse impact upon character of 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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	No direct impact
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	→	→	→	Should be implemented with RAP2 to achieve maximum positive gain.

Plan Policy RAP5: Providing Rural Affordable Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Potential to influence with reference to DP12.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Significant opportunities here. Potential to be dealt with through cross referencing to other policies such as D11 and DP 12
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.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Will have a positive impacts on affordability (albeit a limited supply) depends. No clear impact however on reducing unfit or empty homes.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop.	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	Uncertain.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Providing affordable homes in rural areas will give better access to open space and the positive health implications this brings with it.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Should have a positive impact in supply of affordable housing. Will be realised through implementation of this in conjunction with other policies.

Plan Policy RAP5: Providing Rural Affordable Housing													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	No direct impact expected.
<b>Summary:</b> Policy has generally positive impact on sustainability objectives. Limited development should protect feel and character of the area and the natural environment. However, policy should be linked to RAP2 for optimum impact and, as specific development will be related to development policies, which will further add to positive impacts.													

Plan Policy RAP6: Housing for Rural Workers													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term		Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Marginal positive impact in that it will support local businesses in terms of labour supply.
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- not clear what impact it will have on rural services as it will be a very restricted type of development.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13) 10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3. No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Possible positive impact in addressing housing needs of rural workers
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.	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Limiting development should ensure character / quality of countryside is maintained.



Plan Policy RAP6: Housing for Rural Workers													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	⬇	Uncertain.
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- although will minimise workers need to travel to their place of work.
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 and controlled development is likely to cause minimal disruption / visual intrusion to rural areas.
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 4961KWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428KWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717KWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163KWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	No direct impact, although will be positively addressed through implementation with DP10 and DP11 and 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, Limited and controlled development is likely to cause minimal disruption to rural areas- thus should not have adverse impact upon character of 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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)  PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	⌘	No direct impact
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	⌘	➔	⌘	Should be implemented with RAP2 to achieve maximum positive gain.

Plan Policy RAP6: Housing for Rural Workers														
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary	
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary				
	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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Potential to e.g. with reference to DP12.	
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Opportunities for positive impacts here. Potential to be dealt with through cross referencing to other policies such as D11 and DP 12	
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.	
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Will have a positive impacts on affordability for rural workers. No clear impact however on reducing unfit or empty homes.	
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop.	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	Uncertain.	
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Providing affordable homes in rural areas will give better access to open space and the positive health implications that brings with it.	
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	↔	Should have a positive impact in supply of affordable housing. Will be realised through implementation of this in conjunction with other policies.	

Plan Policy RAP6: Housing for Rural Workers													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available Better than county average and getting better	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact expected.
Summary: This policy limits rural development, thus protecting the feel and character of the area and the natural environment. However, by allowing development according to specific requirements and certain conditions, the policy also contributes to the sustainability objectives relating to meeting housing needs and provision of affordable housing. The links between this policy and RAP2 and development policies such as DP11 ad 12 should be reinforced to further add to positive impacts.													

Plan Policy RAP7 : Directing New Employment													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 preserving existing employment land and buildings. Should also impact favourably on local employment. Promotes farm diversification in conjunction with RAP9.
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, 38% 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

Plan Policy RAP7 : Directing New Employment													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 (8) 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 RAPPs 8a and 9. 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 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↔	→	→	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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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 when implemented in accordance with RAPPs. Overall, very restricted development, hence will have minimal adverse impact on land quality.

Plan Policy RAP7 : Directing New Employment													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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.
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. DP11 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  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 as still permits some employment development.

Plan Policy RAP7 : Directing New Employment													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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.
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. Policy should be linked clearly to RAP6, 8a and 9 and specific development policies.													

Plan Policy RAP8 : Converting Rural Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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, not clear what activities are likely to be. Conversion / reuse may be for individual residential or economic purposes.
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- although not clear on future / proposed use.
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, again, as above.
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 be in harmony with 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



Plan Policy RAP8 : Converting Rural Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 (8) 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. 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 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	✓	✓	→	→	✓		→	→	Policy does not deal directly with this, although impact can be maximised when implemented with other policies, namely DP10, DP11, DP12 / 12s.
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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 RAP8 : Converting Rural Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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. Although redevelopment rather than replacement may reduce waste.
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. DP11 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.  Also, redevelopment rather than new build may mean resource reduction.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	↗	→	→	Could have marginal impact if future activity leads to increased job opportunities, for example.

Plan Policy RAP8 : Converting Rural Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	⇐	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy 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. Policy should be linked to specific development policies. Also – would some purposes for re-development be viewed more favourably?													

Plan Policy RAP8a : Replacement of Rural Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
					Short term	Long term		Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
<b>Sustainable Development Objectives</b>													
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses Number of business start-ups net of closures Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2) 11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2) No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000 Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000 Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	✓	→	→	→	Should contribute positively to this objective as the policy deals with supplying buildings for employment / 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.

Plan Policy RAP8a : Replacement of Rural Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	No direct impact
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	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, 8, and 9. 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 4881kWh/ 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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✓	✓	➡	➡	✓	⚡	➡	➡	Best quality agricultural land will be preserved when implemented in accordance with RAP5. Over all, very restricted development, hence will have minimal

Plan Policy RAP8a : Replacement of Rural Buildings														
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary	
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary				
	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									adverse impact on land quality.	
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 (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  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact	
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	↔	➔	➔	Could have marginal impact through increasing job opportunities.	

Plan Policy RAP8a : Replacement of Rural Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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.
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. Employment proposals should accord with Policy RAP7 and 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 RAP9 : Farm Diversification													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)  PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 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													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	✧	Could 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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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.													

Plan Policy RAP 13: Directing New Outdoor Sport and Recreation Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	✧	Proposals will be supported that are part of farm diversification proposals.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	✧	Potential to contribute to this objective mainly through ensuring proposals will be accessible by sustainable modes of transport.
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 be limited in accordance with other policies- RAP9 in particular.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	Again, proposals must ensure that facilities can be accessed, particularly from urban areas by public transport, foot and cycling.



Plan Policy RAP 13: Directing New Outdoor Sport and Recreation Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Minimal impact expected although a positive aspect of the policy is that should alternative facilities need to be provided they will be accessible, which implies less reliance on car use.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	✧	Priority is given to such development within urban areas in order to preserve rural landscapes. However, any proposals within rural areas will need to demonstrate that they accord with RAP9 (for e.g.)
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 expected.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	✧	Development will be limited and restricted and thus ensure that character of villages / countryside is not compromised.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected.
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	✓	✓	➔ ➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	✧	Proposals will have to be in line with RAP9- which ensures preservation and retention of best quality agricultural land.

Plan Policy RAP 13: Directing New Outdoor Sport and Recreation Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	✧	Limiting development may also minimise associated waste
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 expected- although potential to incorporate sustainable design principles etc in extension / construction of buildings.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	✧	Will limit development, hence associated consumption of raw materials.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➔➔	➔➔	✓	✧	➔	✧	Policy directly involves protection of public facilities and provision of suitable new ones (where necessary).
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	✓	✓	➔➔	➔➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Positively contributes to the health agenda in that it involves preservation of open space that can be used for exercise and recreation.
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 expected.
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 expected.

Plan Policy RAP 13: Directing New Outdoor Sport and Recreation Development													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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									
<b>Summary:</b> Policy positively contributes to sustainability objectives relating to improving health, improving access to services and facilities, whilst at the same time limiting development so contributing to objectives on protecting land quality and the environment. The policy should be closely related to other RAP policies such as RAP8 and 9 and also development policies to maximise the positive impacts associated with new developments.													

Plan Policy RAP 14: Golf Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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- Could have positive impact on local economy although policy restricts development. Proposals for such facilities will only be supported where there is evidence of need.
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- potential to diversify the 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.	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✖	→	✖	Any development will be limited in accordance with other policies- RAP9 in particular.
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	Potential to have an impact should development take place. No direct impact expected under this policy- perhaps more detail required within the policy itself.

Plan Policy RAP 14: Golf Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	☒	➔	➔	Priority is given to such development within urban areas in order to preserve rural landscapes. However, any proposals within rural areas will need to demonstrate that they accord with RAP9, for example.
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 expected.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	☒	➔	☒	Development will be limited and restricted and thus ensure that character of villages / countryside is not compromised.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	No direct impact expected.
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	✓	✓	➔➔	➔	✓	☒	➔	☒	Proposals will have to be in line with RAP9- which ensures preservation and retention of best quality agricultural land.

Plan Policy RAP 14: Golf Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Limiting development may also minimise associated waste
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 expected- although potential to incorporate sustainable design principles should any development occur (in accordance with RAPs 7 to 9).
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	✧	➔	Will limit development, hence associated consumption of raw materials.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Could have positive impact on health agenda- but development is restricted.
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 expected.
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 expected.

Plan Policy RAP 14: Golf Facilities													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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 positively to the sustainability objectives relating to protecting the landscape and environment. However, other benefits are uncertain as the policy assumes no development unless conditions are met.													

Plan Policy RAP15 : Camping and Caravanning Sites													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	✗	Although the policy limits this type of development, it could still have a beneficial impact on the local economy, employment opportunities and diversification.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	✗	Could have some impact in that development will not be permitted where landscape / character of the countryside will be compromised. Locations will also need to be accessible to local facilities which could minimise car use.
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, again, as above.
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.	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	✗	Proposals will need to demonstrate that development will be in harmony with the 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



Plan Policy RAP15 : Camping and Caravanning Sites													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	↔	⬢	✓	✧	➔	✧	Will need to be located next to local facilities which should minimise car use.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	✧	Puts a series of constraints upon development. 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.  Will not reduce risk of flooding as such, but will restrict development in areas of flooding.
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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	⬢	⬢	⬢	⬢	⬢	⬢	⬢	⬢	Not clear how the policy will impact on this objective given that it is uncertain whether the policy could lead to an increase in visitor numbers to the district and whether the majority of these journeys could be by car which could lead to increases in emissions to air from road vehicles.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Over all, very restricted development, hence will have minimal adverse impact on land quality.

Plan Policy RAP15 : Camping and Caravanning Sites													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Not clear.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	As above.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	✧	Could boost local facilities through supporting (albeit limited) tourism
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Possible beneficial impacts- could enhance open space provision.
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 if future activity leads to increased job opportunities, for example.
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 RAP15 : Camping and Caravanning Sites													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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: The policy could make a positive contribution to the economic objectives of the area and there is acknowledgement within the accompanying text of the policy of the importance in providing appropriately sited and sympathetic sites within the district given the major visitor attractions available. Providing that siting is close to local facilities it should not be cause any significant adverse impacts.													

Plan Policy RAP16 : Directing New Visitor Accommodation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	✗	Permits some restricted development- will still have a beneficial impact on the local economy and diversification activities.
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- more applicable to urban policies.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✗	→	✗	In part will assist in sustaining longer-term tourism and in turn, limiting development should contribute to ensuring tourism itself is sustainable
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 be in harmony with countryside and in accordance with policies RAP7-8a
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

Plan Policy RAP16 : Directing New Visitor Accommodation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	←	←	✓	✧	←	✧	May generate additional visitor traffic, particularly if development is not linked with other policies to consider integration with public transport network.
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. 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 <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Not clear how the policy will impact on this objective given that it is uncertain whether the policy could lead to an increase in visitor numbers to the district and whether the majority of these journeys could be by car which could lead to increases in emissions to air from road vehicles.
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 should have minimal detrimental impact on land quality.

Plan Policy RAP16 : Directing New Visitor Accommodation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 expected.
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 expected.
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 expected.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
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 expected.
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 expected.

Plan Policy RAP16 : Directing New Visitor Accommodation													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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									
<b>Summary:</b> There is a strong presumption in this policy that development in a rural setting for visitor accommodation will not be permitted, unless it is of a small scale, low intensity and would not affect the existing character of the receiving community. Given these measures, if development does proceed, it is likely to contribute positively to the functioning of the rural economy.													

Plan Policy DAP1: Protecting the Green Belt													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary		
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	✓	⚡	⚡	⚡	This policy restricts certain forms of development and this may be seen as restricting economic growth. However, in the long-term this may help to protect the vitality and economy of existing urban centres.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	✓	⚡	⚡	⚡	It is uncertain what effect this policy will have on rural communities. The supporting text of this policy notes that the proposals for farm diversification within the Green Belt raise particular issues and RAP9 gives more details.
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	✓	✓	➡	⚡	✓	✓	⚡	➡	By avoiding development on the Green Belt and focusing development in existing built up areas the vitality of existing towns may be improved.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✓	✓	⬅	⚡	✓	⚡	⬅	⚡	Restricting development in the Green Belt means that land for possible housing development may be limited. However, the needs of the whole community may be met through alternative sites.
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 general presumption against development in the Green Belt will help to protect and enhance the environment.



Plan Policy DAP1: Protecting the Green Belt													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧		✧		✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	◇		✧		✧	✧	Uncertain impact. People may travel further as they need to commute from beyond the Green Belt.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	The general presumption against development in the Green Belt will help to protect and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	This policy is unlikely to directly contribute to minimising the impacts of climate change. Although areas of green open space can help minimise the risk of flooding.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact. However, areas of open space can help to reduce the effects of local air pollution.
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	✓	✓	➔ ➔	✧	✓	✧	➔ ➔	➔ ➔	The aim of this policy is to minimise development on green belt land.

Plan Policy DAP1: Protecting the Green Belt													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✓	✓	✧	✧	✧	✧	→	→	Protecting the green belt from development may mean less land is available for housing development.
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	✓	✓	→	✧	✓	✧	✧	→	The open space provided by Green Belt may provide the opportunity for recreation.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP1: Protecting the Green Belt													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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.
Summary: The policy makes strong provision for maintaining the provision of greenbelt, seen as a key contribution towards maintaining defined urban boundaries and preventing urban sprawl. However, such a strong presumption against development does occasionally limit development, which could impact on the communities needs to be met (whether in housing or employment terms). Policy should perhaps make reference to how housing needs will be met through alternative sites or reference to other policies (RAP 2,4,5,6).													

Plan Policy DAP2: Protecting the Areas of Restraint													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	✓	⚡	⚡	⚡	This policy restricts certain forms of development within Areas of Restraint and this may be seen as restricting economic growth. However, in the long-term this may help to protect the vitality and economy of existing urban centres.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	✓	⚡	⚡	⚡	It is uncertain what effect this policy will have on rural communities.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	➡	⚡	✓	⚡	⚡	➡	By avoiding development in Areas of Restraint and focusing development in existing built up areas the vitality of existing towns may be improved.
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	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	⚡	Open spaces can provide opportunities for tourism. However, the significance of this is uncertain.
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	✓	✓	⬅	⚡	✓	⚡	⚡	⚡	Restricting development in the Areas of Restraint means that land for possible housing development may be limited. However, the needs of the whole community may be met through alternative sites.
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 general presumption against development in the Areas of restraint will help to protect and enhance the environment.

Plan Policy DAP2: Protecting the Areas of Restraint													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧		✧		✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	✧	➔	The general presumption against development in Areas of Restraint will help to protect and enhance the environment.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	This policy is unlikely to directly contribute to minimising the impacts of climate change. Although areas of open space can help minimise the risk of flooding.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay  Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored  Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11)  36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11)  90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998.  No trend available  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✓	✓	➔ ➔	✧	✓	✧	➔ ➔	➔ ➔	The aim of this policy is to minimise development in Areas of Restraint.

Plan Policy DAP2: Protecting the Areas of Restraint													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	⇄	No direct impact. However, protecting the Areas of Restraint from development may mean less land is available for housing development.
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	✓	✓	➔	⇄	✓	⇄	⇄	➔	The open space provided in the Areas of Restraint may provide the opportunity for recreation.

Plan Policy DAP2: Protecting the Areas of Restraint													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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? 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.
Summary: Similarly to policy DAP1, this policy contributes positively to the sustainability objectives relating to protecting open space, and particularly protecting the natural environment, landscapes and land quality. Again, the policy should perhaps make reference to how housing and other needs will be met through alternative sites or reference to other policies (RAP 2,4,5,6).													

Plan Policy DAP 4: Protecting Nature Conservation, Geology and Geomorphology													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	?	?	?	✧	✓	✧	?	?	This policy restricts certain forms of development within specified areas and this may be seen as restricting economic growth. However, in the long-term this may help to protect the vitality and economy of existing urban centres.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	?	?	?	✧	✓	✧	?	?	It is uncertain what effect this policy will have on rural communities.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✓	✧	➔	By focusing development in existing built up areas the vitality of existing towns may be improved.
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	✧	✧	?	✧	✧	✧	?	?	Open spaces can provide opportunities for tourism. However, the significance of this is uncertain.
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	✓	✓	←	✧	✓	✧	?	?	Restricting development on these sites may mean that land for possible housing development may be limited. However, the needs of the whole community may be met through alternative sites.
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 general presumption against development in these areas will help to protect and enhance the environment.



Plan Policy DAP 4: Protecting Nature Conservation, Geology and Geomorphology													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy supports the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of landscape by protecting specified sites.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity  Per capita consumption of gas  Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	This policy is unlikely to directly contribute to minimising the impacts of climate change.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	One of the aims of this policy is to protect nature conservation sites from development.

Plan Policy DAP 4: Protecting Nature Conservation, Geology and Geomorphology													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➡	↔	✓	↔	↔	➡	The open space provided by these sites may provide the opportunity for recreation.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP 4: Protecting Nature Conservation, Geology and Geomorphology													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
Summary: Similarly to policy DAP1 and 2, this policy contributes positively to the sustainability objectives relating to protecting open space, and particularly protecting the natural environment, landscapes and land quality. Again, the policy should perhaps make reference to how housing and other needs will be met through alternative sites or reference to other policies (RAP 2,4,5,6).													

Plan Policy DAP6: Protection of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	?	?	?	✧	✓	✧	?	?	The impact of this policy on economic growth is uncertain.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	?	?	?	✧	✓	✧	?	?	It is uncertain what effect this policy will have on rural communities.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	?	?	?	✧	✓	✧	?	?	It is uncertain what effect this policy will have on town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✓	✓	→	✧	✓	✧	→	→	The wealth of listed buildings in the District is an important tourist asset. The long term protection of these buildings will encourage sustainable tourism.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP6: Protection of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔➔	✧	✓	✧	➔➔	➔➔	This policy supports the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of townscapes by protecting Listed Buildings.
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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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	✓	✓	➔➔	✧	✓	✧	➔➔	➔➔	This policy will help to protect the historic environment.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP6: Protection of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✓	✓	➡	✧	✓	✧	➡	➡	This policy will significantly contribute to the enhancement 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 impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP6: Protection of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy contributes significantly to the sustainability objectives relating to enhancing the built environment, the historic environment, the landscapes and townscapes, also indirectly contributing to more sustainable tourism. Links to specific development policies guiding the design and construction of extensions to property should be made.													

Plan Policy DAP7: Changes of use of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	The long term protection of these buildings should enhance the vitality of town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	The wealth of listed buildings in the District is an important tourist asset. The long term protection of these buildings will encourage sustainable tourism.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.



Plan Policy DAP7: Changes of use of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	✧	➔	This policy supports the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of townscapes by protecting the use of Listed Buildings.
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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy aims to protect the historic environment.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP7: Changes of use of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy will contribute to the enhancement of the built environment by restricting change of use of Listed Buildings.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP7: Changes of use of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy contributes significantly to the sustainability objectives relating to enhancing the built environment, the historic environment and the landscapes and townscapes. Links to specific development policies guiding the design and construction of the property should be made for any alterations proposed.													

Plan Policy DAP8: Upper Floors within Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy helps to protect space for housing.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP8: Upper Floors within Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Uncertain impact. This would depend on whether the Listed Buildings were located near to existing public transport services or not.
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Uncertain impact. This would depend on whether the Listed Buildings were located near to existing public transport services or not.
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 policy supports the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of townscapes by restricting the use of Listed Buildings.
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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8)  Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8)  Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified  Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy aims to protect the historic environment.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)  PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP8: Upper Floors within Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy will contribute to the enhancement of the built environment by restricting the use of Listed Buildings.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP8: Upper Floors within Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy contributes favourably to the sustainability objectives relating to protection of the historic environment, enhancement of the built environment. It may also have indirect benefits on economic growth, employment opportunities and housing provision, depending on the use of protected space.													

Plan Policy DAP9: Restoration of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	The restoration of Listed Buildings may help to sustain tourism.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.



Plan Policy DAP9: Restoration of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	✓	➔	This policy supports the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of townscapes by ensuring that restoration of Listed Buildings is appropriate.
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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy aims to protect the historic environment.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP9: Restoration of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy will contribute to the enhancement of the built environment by restricting inappropriate alterations to Listed Buildings.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP9: Restoration of Listed Buildings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy contributes favourably to the sustainability objectives relating to protection of the historic environment and enhancement of the built environment. It could be linked more strongly to development policies relating to sustainable construction (DP1, DP12)													

Plan Policy DAP10: Protection of Conservation Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Placing restrictions on development in certain areas may be regarded as limiting economic growth. However, in the long-term this is likely to enhance the vitality of these areas.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✧	✧	➡	✧	✧	✧	➡	➡	Conservation Areas can encourage tourists to visit the area for the historic character.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP10: Protection of Conservation Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy supports the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of townscapes by ensuring the protection of Conservation Areas.
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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy aims to protect the historic environment.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP10: Protection of Conservation Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy will contribute to the enhancement of the built environment by restricting inappropriate development in Conservation Areas.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP10: Protection of Conservation Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> The policy contributes favourably to sustainability objectives relating to protection of the environment and enhancing the quality of landscape													

Plan Policy DAP11: Unlisted Buildings in Conservation Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Placing restrictions on development in certain areas may be regarded as limiting economic growth. However, in the long-term this is likely to enhance the vitality of these areas.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✧	✧	➔	✧	✧	✧	➔	➔	Conservation Areas can encourage tourists to visit the area for the historic character.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.



Plan Policy DAP11: Unlisted Buildings in Conservation Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	✧	➔	This policy supports the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of townscapes by ensuring the protection of Conservation Areas.
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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	✧	➔	This policy aims to protect the historic environment.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP11: Unlisted Buildings in Conservation Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy will contribute to the enhancement of the built environment by restricting inappropriate development in Conservation Areas.
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.
<b>Summary:</b> <b>This policy contributes positively to the sustainability objectives relating to enhancing the vibrancy of rural communities and protecting the environment and character of the area. The policy needs to be linked to RAP 8, 9 and 10.</b>													

Plan Policy DAP12: Control of Advertising Hoardings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP12: Control of Advertising Hoardings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	✧	➔	This policy supports the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of townscapes by ensuring that advertisement hoardings are not permitted within Conservation Areas.
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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), 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	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy aims to protect the historic environment.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP12: Control of Advertising Hoardings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧		✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP12: Control of Advertising Hoardings													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> <b>This policy contributes positively to the sustainability objectives relating to enhancing the built environment, the historic environment, the landscapes and townscapes.</b>													

Plan Policy DAP13: Protecting Historic Parks and Gardens													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➔	✧	✧	✧	➔	➔	Historic parks and gardens can be an important feature in rural communities.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	➔	✧	✧	✧	➔	➔	Historic parks and gardens can be an important feature in town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✓	✓	➔	✧	✧	✧	➔	➔	Historic parks and gardens can help to promote tourism.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP13: Protecting Historic Parks and Gardens													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	✧	➔	Historic parks and gardens improve the landscape and character of the locality.
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 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✧	✧	⬢	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Parks and gardens can help reduce the risk of flooding (in certain areas).
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	✓	✓	➔	✧	✓	✧	➔	➔	This policy aims to protect features of historic and cultural value.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✓	✓	➔	✧	✧	✧	✓	✓	The protection of historic parks and gardens can contribute to the protection of good quality land.



Plan Policy DAP13: Protecting Historic Parks and Gardens													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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 330 kg 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	✓	✓	➔	✧	✧	✧	➔	➔	Parks and gardens can provide the opportunity for leisure and recreation activities, which can contribute to improving people's health and well being.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP13: Protecting Historic Parks and Gardens													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy contributes significantly to the sustainability objectives relating to enhancing the environment, the historic environment, the landscapes and townscapes, also indirectly contributing to more sustainable tourism and promotion of health.													

Plan Policy DAP14: Protecting Safeguarded Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term		Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary		
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact. Although may be felt to be restricting other economic activity
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP14: Protecting Safeguarded Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981 kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428 kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717 kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163 kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP14: Protecting Safeguarded Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	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 330 kg 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	✓	✓	➔	➔	➔	➔	➔	➔	Development which may inhibit the safe operation of an aerodrome or a technical site is restricted.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy DAP14: Protecting Safeguarded Areas													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy relates directly to the safe operation of existing aerodrome/technical sites. It does not directly have negative impacts on the other objectives.													

Plan Policy SSP1 : Employment Allocations													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	➡ ➡	➡	✓	✧	➡	➡ ➡	Provision of PDL within urban fringe comprising of a mix of sites for all B class classifications; however, there is an oversupply of land (4ha) which is argued will be adequate.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact. The sites are largely constrained to urban areas.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	➡ ➡	➡	✓	✧	➡	➡ ➡	Development sites are within / adjacent to existing town centres to ensure the maintenance of viability of town centres
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact. However, if land which is suitable for housing is designated as employment land this may reduce the amount of available housing.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	←	✧	✧		✧	✧	Will not contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment, for example Site F is proposed on a part of a greenfield site. However, the focus of the development is on previously developed land which will help to minimise adverse effects.

Plan Policy SSP1 : Employment Allocations													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	➔	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	A number of the sites are within the town centre or near existing transport infrastructure, this will help to promote public transport and walking.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓	➔ ➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔ ➔	Land identified for development is within the urban confines and for the TTW requirements is likely to minimise the additional demand for travel; however, there will still be a net increase in travel and hence it will it scores both positively and negatively.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	➔ ➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔ ➔	Involves re-use of under-used and previously developed sites.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity  Per capita consumption of gas  Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981kWh/ person in 2003 (8)  Domestic consumption of 20,428kWh in 2003 (8)  Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717kWh), but no trend identified  Higher than regional average (20,163kWh), but no trend identified  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay  Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored  Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11)  36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11)  90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998.  No trend available  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Uncertain impact.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)  PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Uncertain impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	✧	➔ ➔	Potential for the policy to have a significant positive impact on this objective with regard to use of previously used land/under used land. Additional potential to use this policy



Plan Policy SSP1 : Employment Allocations													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									to improve/remediate existing contaminated sites
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Not explicit within the policy
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Potential to influence here but not directly applicable to the policy.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	As above.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected.

Plan Policy SSP1 : Employment Allocations													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected.
<b>Summary:</b> The production of Supplementary Planning Guidance for those sites without guidance would assist in identifying further planning restraints and opportunities and is strongly encouraged.													

Plan Policy SSP2 : Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Does not make a direct contribution.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Marginal positive, due to some of the sites focused on development of rural business (Stoneleigh Park)
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Marginally positive as most of the land is PDL

Plan Policy SSP2 : Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	↔	✧	✓	✧	↔	✧	Potential for additional trip generation will be significant due to location of the sites (in rural locations only accessible by road vehicle)
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓	↔	✧	✓	✧	↔	✧	As above
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	✧	Implied as redevelopment will need to be 'appropriate'- not clear though.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Unclear- may increase road traffic and adverse effects associated with fuel consumption.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	✧	Marginal positive.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	↔	✧	✓	✧	↔	✧	Could lead to increased road traffic, hence adverse implications for local air quality.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✓	✓	↔	✧	✓	✧	→	✧	Will lead to development on greenfield sites, although could enhance rather than disturb. (Positive and negative impacts).

Plan Policy SSP2 : Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✓	✓	←	✧	✓	✧	←	✧	Marginal negative due to the increase of waste arisings; however, that existing waste infrastructure has sufficient capacity to address additional demand
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Uncertain how local communities can and will benefit.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact- focus is on employment land.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	May improve employment opportunities- impact unclear.

Plan Policy SSP2 : Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> May wish to consider ways in which the net loss of green belt (and open space) could be minimised, possibly through the creation/allocation of additional green belt and open space.													

Plan Policy SSP3: Stoneleigh Park													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	✧	Makes reference to activities to promote agriculture- should have some positive economic impact on this sector.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	✧	Marginal positive, due to some of the sites focused on development of rural business
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	✧	Marginally positive as most of the land is PDL

Plan Policy SSP3: Stoneleigh Park													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	↔	☒	✓	☒	↔	☒	Potential for additional trip generation will be significant due to location of the site (rural locations only accessible by road vehicle)
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓	↔	☒	✓	☒	↔	☒	As above
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	→	☒	Implied as redevelopment will need to be 'appropriate' (cross reference with SSP1)
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✓	✓	←	☒	✓	☒	←	☒	No direct impact although may increase road traffic and adverse effects associated with fuel consumption.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	✓	☒	→	☒	Marginal positive.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	←	☒	✓	☒	←	☒	Could lead to increased road traffic, hence adverse implications for local air quality.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	☒	→	☒	Will lead to development on some greenfield sites, although potential to enhance sites (Positive and negative impacts).



Plan Policy SSP3: Stoneleigh Park													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✓	✓	←	→	✓	✧	→	✧	Marginal negative due to the increase of waste arisings; however, that existing waste infrastructure has sufficient capacity to address additional demand
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	✓	✧	Focuses on the well-being of the countryside and its inhabitants.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	✓	✧	Focus on certain activities e.g. equestrian could promote healthy lifestyles to a certain extent.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	✓	✧	May improve employment opportunities in agriculture.

Plan Policy SSP3: Stoneleigh Park													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> <b>May wish to consider cross references to the Development Policies in Chapter 4.</b>													

Plan Policy SSP4: Safeguarding Land for Kenilworth Railway Station													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Implications are that it will contribute positively in some respects- will provide public transport and could therefore improve mobility (to town centres and to employment).
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 immediate direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	⬢?	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected only perhaps that this may improve mobility and access into town centres which could result in increased visitors.
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	✧	✧	⬢?	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	As above- could result in better access to a particular area by a sustainable transport mode
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	⬢?	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	⬢?	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Uncertain what the impact will be.

Plan Policy SSP4: Safeguarding Land for Kenilworth Railway Station													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	This is likely to have a significant impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Again, as above- extent of impact is unclear.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Location is on PDL
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Creation of a more sustainable transport option- could contribute to lowering ghg emissions.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✧	✧	⬢	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Any increase in public transport use should have positive implications for air quality in that it should contribute to a reduction in car and possibly lorry 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	✧	✧	⬢	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Development on PDL. Any further development on the land must be complementary.

Plan Policy SSP4: Safeguarding Land for Kenilworth Railway Station													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	↻	↻	↻	↻	↻	↻	↻	↻	Any development will have waste implications although it is not clear what the direct impact on this objective will be through implementing this policy- needs to give some attention to ensuring any development is resource efficient and minimises wastes.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	↻	↻	↻	↻	↻	↻	↻	↻	Potential to have a positive influence on design and particularly to be sustainable in design although these considerations have not been made explicit within this policy and it would have to be implemented with other policies such as D12.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✓	✓	➡	➡	✓	✧	➡	➡	As above and also supporting better transport choices should in turn, reduce reliance upon car travel (although not directly through this policy) and hence reduce natural resource consumption (fuel use).
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➡	➡	✓	✧	➡	➡	Should maximise access to community facilities and services.
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	✧	✧	↻	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	Could improve access to key services and facilities.

Plan Policy SSP4: Safeguarding Land for Kenilworth Railway Station													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 positively address some access issues
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.
Summary: This policy aims to safeguard land for development.													

Plan Policy SSP5: Safeguarding Land for Warwick and Leamington Spa Park and Ride													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
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 improve access to urban centres.
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 immediate direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	Again, should improve access to urban centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	Could improve access to tourist facilities through provision of more sustainable transport choice.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Uncertain what the impact will be.

Plan Policy SSP5: Safeguarding Land for Warwick and Leamington Spa Park and Ride													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➔ ➔	➔ ➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	This is likely to have a significant positive impact.  Should limit congestion within urban centres.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Again, as above- extent of impact is unclear.
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Location is on PDL
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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Creation of a more sustainable transport option- could contribute to lowering ghg emissions.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay  Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored  Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11)  36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11)  90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998.  No trend available  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high  Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2)  PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse  Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Any increase in public transport use should have positive implications for air quality in that it should contribute to a reduction in 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	✓	✓	➔	➔	✓	✧	➔	➔	Development on PDL. Any further development on the land must be complementary and not prejudice the scheme.



Plan Policy SSP5: Safeguarding Land for Warwick and Leamington Spa Park and Ride													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Any development will have waste implications although it is not clear what the direct impact on this objective will be through implementing this policy- needs to give some attention to ensuring any development is resource efficient and minimises wastes.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Potential to have a positive influence on design and particularly to be sustainable in design although these considerations have not been made explicit within this policy and it would have to be implemented with other policies such as D12.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✓	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	As above and also. supporting better transport choices should in turn, reduce reliance upon car travel (although not directly through this policy) and hence reduce natural resource consumption (fuel use).
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	Should enhance access to community facilities and services.
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	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	Could improve access to key services and facilities.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→	→	✓	✧	→	→	Could positively address some access issues

Plan Policy SSP5: Safeguarding Land for Warwick and Leamington Spa Park and Ride													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		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.
Summary: This policy aims to safeguard land for development.													

Plan Policy SSP6: Safeguarding Land for the Barford Bypass													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	←	→	✓	✧	→	→	Bypassing traffic may reduce trade for local retailers.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✓	✓	← ←	→	✓	✧	→	→	A range of adverse environmental impacts associated with construction, development and use of bypass.

Plan Policy SSP6: Safeguarding Land for the Barford Bypass													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	✧	→	→	Negative impact upon this objective- promotes road transport and car travel.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	✧	→	→	Promotes car use.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	✧	→	→	Negative impact- no positive benefits on landscape character and ecology.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✓	✓	↔	→	✓	✧	→	→	Encourages road transport use and adverse impacts associated with fuel consumption.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✓	✓	→ ↔ ←	→	✓	✧	→	→	Could enhance character of Barford through limiting congestion although could also increase pollution (noise, visual, particulates).
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	←	→	✓	✧	→	→	Will encourage more road traffic in locality which will have negative implications for air quality.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Uncertain impact.

Plan Policy SSP6: Safeguarding Land for the Barford Bypass													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Any development will have waste implications although it is not clear what the direct impact on this objective will be through implementing this policy- needs to give some attention to ensuring any development is resource efficient and minimises wastes.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Potential to have a positive influence on design and particularly to be sustainable in design although these considerations have not been made explicit within this policy and it would have to be implemented with other policies such as D12.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✓	✓	↶ ↷	→	✓	✧	→	→	Consumption of natural resources during construction phase.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact expected
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Uncertain
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✓	✓	↶ ↷	→	✓	✧	→	→	Will increase road traffic- adverse health implications associated with poorer air quality.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact

Plan Policy SSP6: Safeguarding Land for the Barford Bypass													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy aims to safeguard land for development.													

Plan Policy SSP7: Coventry Airport													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	→ →	✧	✓	✧	→	→	This policy supports appropriate development within Coventry Airport, which is a major employer and an important asset to the local and regional economy.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✓	✓	◇?	✧	✧	✧	◇?	◇?	Uncertain impact. However, local tourism may be boosted from incoming visitors to the area by air travel.
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.									No direct impact- indirect impacts associated with road and air movements

Plan Policy SSP7: Coventry Airport													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	➔	➔	✧	✧	➔	➔	The Policy does attempt to address the issue of promoting public transport for passengers using the airport.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✓	✓			✧	✧			This policy does not help reduce the need to travel.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact, although development will not detract from this.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✓	✓	↔	✧	✧	✧	↔	↔	Increased air travel will increase the amount of greenhouse gases.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact, although development will not detract from this.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✓	✓	↔	✧	✧	✧	↔	↔	Increased air and road travel will increase the amount of greenhouse gases.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.



Plan Policy SSP7: Coventry Airport													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact although there may be job creation opportunities and also improved accessibility to travel opportunities for those in most need i.e. good public transport links

Plan Policy SSP7: Coventry Airport													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									and cheap flights
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy and the supporting text could be made more clear and transparent. For example, there may be uncertainty as to what is meant by “unacceptable harm to the environment and local residents”.													

Plan Policy SSP8 : Hatton Country World													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To maintain high levels of economic growth	Will it meet the employment needs of the local community? Will it help diversify the economy? Will it enhance the vitality of urban centres? Will it support small businesses?	Number of VAT registered businesses  Number of business start-ups net of closures  Loss of employment uses within designated town centre employment areas	4,965 in 2002 (2)  11% new VAT registrations as a % of existing VAT registered businesses (2002) (2)  No applications permitted for the loss of employment space in 2004 (15)	Increasing from 4,925 in 2001 and 4,855 in 2000  Favourable situation with numbers increasing after a decline in 2000  Favourable situation, but no trend identified	✓	✓	←	✧	✧	✧	←	←	New retail development will not be permitted under this policy. This is likely to have a negative impact on economic growth in the area.
To promote and enhance vibrant rural communities	Will it assist with the diversification of the rural economy? Will it retain / enhance village services?	Number of planning permission granted for rural diversification proposals  Number of service closures in rural areas	8 in 2004 (15)  District level data not available	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend	✓	✓	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	It is uncertain how restricting further retail development will affect the rural communities.
To enhance the vitality of town centres	Will it improve the economic viability of town centres? Will it maintain a balanced mix of development?	Number of applications refused for change of use from A1 within primary and secondary shop frontages	One application refused change from A1 to A3 (2003/4) (15)	No trend available	✓	✓	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	It is uncertain how restricting further retail development will affect the vitality of town centres.
To promote sustainable tourism	Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Number of tourists	1.4 million people from the UK visited Warwickshire in 2003 (no data at district level or for international visitors) (17)	Number of UK tourists has fluctuated between 1.2 and 1.6 million since 2000	✓	✓	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	The Council will not support proposals which would lead to an increase in visitor numbers. However, it may be that
To meet the housing needs of the whole community	Will it reduce homelessness? Will it increase the level of affordability of housing for all social groups?	Homeless households in need of temporary accommodation  Percentage of population living in affordable housing	46 in 2004 (13)  10.6% renting from LA, 3.6% renting from housing association or other RSL (3)	Numbers increasing from 2 in 2000/1, 31 in 2001/2 and 28 in 2002/3.  No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the natural environment, including habitats, species, landscapes and inland waters	Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality of the countryside? Will it protect and enhance species, habitats and sites at risk? Will it protect and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it minimise adverse effects on ground and surface water quality?	Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value  Condition of protected species  Percentage of rivers of good or fair quality	Data unavailable  Data unavailable  74% graded good for chemical quality, 39% for biological quality in 2002 (2)	Unable to identify trend  Unable to identify trend  Chemical quality is improving and better than regional and national averages. Biological quality is below average.	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy SSP8 : Hatton Country World													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
To promote the use of sustainable transport options (i.e. cycling, walking, public transport)	Will it encourage the use of public transport, walking or cycling? Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Local bus services- journeys per passenger kilometre	District level data unavailable	Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the movement of goods and people by private car / lorry? Will it minimise the need to travel?	Percentage of journeys to school by car Percentage of journeys to work by car	40% in 2003 (9) 62.8% in 2003 (3)	Slight reduction from 42% in 2002 No trend available	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will it reduce the amount of derelict and underused land? Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside? Will it provide a sense of identity and local distinctiveness?	Condition of landscape character areas	No data available	Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To limit, and reduce the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? Will it minimise the risk of flooding? Will it minimise the need for energy? Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Per capita consumption of electricity Per capita consumption of gas Land at risk of flooding	Domestic consumption of 4981kWh/ person in 2003 (8) Domestic consumption of 20,428kWh in 2003 (8) Data unavailable	Higher than regional average (4717kWh), but no trend identified Higher than regional average (20,163kWh), but no trend identified No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value? Will it protect and enhance the character and settings of towns and villages? Will it improve access to buildings and landscapes of historical/ cultural value?	Percentage of listed buildings and archaeological sites at risk of decay Number of buildings of cultural or historic interest restored Percentage of residents that are satisfied with their neighbourhood	5% (January 2005) (11) 36% of listed buildings restored out of total stock since 1994 (11) 90.3% in December 2004 (12)	This has reduced from 10% in 1998. No trend available No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve air quality	Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM <sub>10</sub> , ozone, etc.	44 days (measured in Leamington Spa for 2002 and 2003) (2) PM <sub>10</sub> - none, ozone- 144 days moderate in 2004 (10)	Higher than national average and getting worse Favourable situation getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect and improve land quality	Will it minimise development on greenfield land? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Percentage of development on greenfield sites	76% employment land on greenfield sites (2002/3)- no information available on housing sites (7)	Unfavourable situation for employment land, although no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy SSP8 : Hatton Country World													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
	Will it retain the best quality agricultural land?	Percentage and type of agricultural land affected by development	No information available at district level	No trends identified									
To reduce the generation and disposal of waste	Will it reduce the amount of waste generated? Will it encourage recycling? Will it promote the re use of resources? Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy (avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and residual disposal in the least environmentally detrimental manner)?	Amount of waste produced per capita  Percentage of waste recycled and composted per capita	362kg (household waste collected) in 2003/4 (2)  23.4% (2003/4) (2)	Increasing, from 344kg in 2002/3 and 330kg in 2001/2  Increased from 11.1% in 2002/3 and 10.3% in 2001/2	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To promote sustainable design and enhance the built environment	Will it promote design that enhances townscapes, streetscapes and/or landscapes? Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Number of homes built to ecohome or other efficiency standard	No data available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To ensure the prudent use of natural resources	Will it minimise the use of water? Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Use of water per capita	District level not available	No trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To make housing available and affordable to everyone	Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Percentage of homes unfit for use	1.59% in 2004 (13)	Improved from 1.86% in 2001	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	Will it maintain and enhance existing community facilities? Will it put unacceptable pressure on existing services and community facilities? Will it improve access to local services and facilities?	Percentage of district-owned public buildings with access and facilities for people with disabilities  Percentage of population within 10 minute walk of bus stop	77.3% (14)  Data unavailable	Figure in top quartile of local authorities- no trend available  Unable to identify trend	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To improve health and well being	Will it promote healthy lifestyles? Will it provide and improve access to health and social care services? Will it reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community? Will it provide and/or enhance the provision of open space?	Length of new cycleways created  Percentage of population with a limiting long term illness  Percentage of population within 200m of parks and open spaces	Data not available at district level  15.4% (3)  Data not available	Unable to identify trend  Lower than county and national averages, but unable to identify trends  Unable to identify situation	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
To reduce poverty and social exclusion	Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most effected?	Percentage of adult population who have never worked or are long term unemployed	1.2% have never worked, and 0.7% are long term unemployed (3)	Slightly lower than county averages, but no trend identified	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.

Plan Policy SSP8 : Hatton Country World													
	Questions	Indicators	Baseline Information	Targets and trends	Timescale		Impact	Scale			Rural	Urban	Commentary
Sustainable Development Objectives					Short term	Long term	Severity	Cumulative	Local	Trans-boundary			
		Number of companies implementing flexible working schemes	Data not available	Unable to determine trends									
To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour	Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? Will it reduce noise levels?	Number of crimes reported per 1000 population  Percentage of those very or fairly worried of being a victim of crime	41.2 2004/5 to date (4)  Having home broken in to- 54%, having car stolen- 46%, being attacked by strangers- 44% (5)	Lower than county average (43). No trend available  Better than county average and getting better	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	✧	No direct impact.
<b>Summary</b> The policy would be strengthened if it were to include all development types, and not just 'retail development'. The policy makes appropriate cross references in the supporting text to other policies including DAP1, DAP3 and RAP10.													