

**SOUTH EAST ENGLAND REGIONAL ASSEMBLY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Date: 8 December 2004

Subject: **Sub-Regional Options – Schedule of Changes**

Report of: Head of Spatial Planning

Recommendation:

That the Committee approves the changes to section E of the consultation draft South East Plan.

I. Background

- I.1 On 29 November the Regional Assembly agreed to amend the options for housing growth to be included in the consultation draft of the South East Plan. As a result of these changes, the regional spatial options have been amended as set out in Agenda Item 6a. Suggested amendments to Section E of the Plan resulting from these revised options are set out in Annex A.

Ray Bowers
Head of Spatial Planning
2 December 2004

Contact: Ray Bowers, Head of Spatial Planning
T: 01483 555231 E: raybowers@southeast-ra.gov.uk

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Suggested Changes to Section E – Sub-regional Policy Framework

All changes relate to the version of the consultation draft Plan considered by the Plenary meeting on 29 November 2004.

1. South Hampshire

Policy SH11 (page 226)

Add to the last sentence:

‘but the Regional Assembly would welcome comments on the spatial principles referred to in section 2.’

2. Sussex Coast

No further changes

3. East Kent and Ashford

Policy EKA2 (page 243)

Add the following paragraphs to Policy EKA2:

In the meantime, the Sub Regional Strategy Members Group preferred overall level of housing provision is for some 56,000 additional homes between 2001 and 2026 (45,400 dwellings 2006 to 2026 - Option 1 as discussed in Section 2 of this strategy). New dwellings would be concentrated in the Ashford Growth Area together with other significant developments in Shepway and Canterbury or at Dover and Thanet.

The Regional Assembly is also seeking views on Option 2 which would require provision of up to 59,900 dwellings 2001 to 2026 (71,900 dwellings 2006 to 2026).

Commentary (page 249)

Retain paragraph 6.1 and the first sentence of 6.2.

Reword the remainder of paragraph 6.2 as follows:

Option 1 is broadly consistent with the regional spatial options described in section C of this draft Plan. However, it is considered that views should also be sought on a higher level of development (up to the level tested by the Sub

Regional Strategy Group as Option 2) to positively support economic growth and regeneration in the sub-region.

4. Kent Thames Gateway

Commentary (page 265)

Delete paragraph 5.2 and replace with:

‘Views are now sought on all three options tested by the Sub Regional Strategy Group. Options 1 and 2 would require provision for 2900 and 3190 dwellings per annum respectively. They are broadly consistent with the regional spatial options described in section C of this draft Plan which include the pace of growth in the Thames Gateway proposed in the Inter-regional Planning Statement.

5. London Fringe

Policy LFI (page 271)

Delete the last paragraph and replace with:

‘In addition, the Regional Assembly is seeking views on whether in the event of greenfield land releases being required they should take the form of extensions to the main settlements within the sub-region or be focussed primarily on the three Regional Hubs – Guildford, Redhill/Reigate and Woking.’

Commentary (page 272)

Replace paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 with the following:

‘The region is an economically buoyant area reflecting its position close to London and the international airports of Heathrow and Gatwick. However, most of the sub-region outside urban areas is within the Metropolitan Green Belt for which the Assembly considers there is no case for a strategic review within the South East Plan (see Policy CC9 on page 61). However, there may be a case for local small scale reviews which can be pursued in detail through the Local Development Framework process.

Option 1 identified by the sub-regional strategy steering group reflects closely the levels of housing growth implied by the regional spatial options considered in Section C of the Plan. Some release of greenfield land may be required if the development potential of urban areas proves to be less than currently envisaged. Views are therefore sought on whether this land, if required, should be released around the main settlements within the sub-region or focussed primarily on the three Regional Hubs.

Further work is required on the issues referred to in existing paragraph 3.8, in particular the impact of Heathrow and its planned expansion with the building of a fifth terminal.

6. Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley

Policy WCBV 1 (page 277)

Reword third paragraph to read as follows:

‘The Regional Assembly is also seeking views on a higher level of housing development of RPG9 +20% (111,500 dwellings 206 to 2026) as tested by the Sub-Regional Strategy Steering Group.’

Commentary (page 282)

Paragraph 5.1

Rewrite as follows

In addition to the options for the level of housing growth identified by the Sub-Regional Strategy Steering Group (RPG9 and RPG9+10%) it is considered that comments should also be sought as part of the consultation on a higher level of housing development of 20% above RPG9 (level B in paragraph 2.1). This would provide a range of levels of housing growth which reflect the regional spatial options discussed in section C.

7. Central Oxfordshire

Policy CO2 (page 287)

Reword the last but one sentence to read:

‘The Regional Assembly is also seeking views on higher levels of development up to RPG9 + 25%, a level of growth tested by the Sub Regional Strategy Steering Group.’

Commentary (page 290)

Reword the first sentences of paragraph 5.1 to read:

‘It is considered that as part of the consultation views should be sought on the County Council preferred level of housing provision, together with higher levels of up to RPG9+25%.’

8. Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale

Commentary (page 297)

Replace paragraphs 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 with the following:

- 6.1 The brief issued to the sub-regional Steering Group was to recommend options for levels of growth over the period 2016 – 2026 (i.e. the 10 year period beyond the draft MKSM SRS). However the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the MKSM SRS set out proposed levels of development to 2021.
- 6.2 The sub-regional Steering Group have recommended options for the period 2026. The Assembly therefore invites comments on the options covering the full period to 2026.
- 6.3 The Secretary of State's proposed changes now provide a clear steer on the scale of growth in the sub-region, and clearly reject the Panel's recommendation to reduce the level of growth at Aylesbury after 2016.

Add new paragraphs 6.4 – 6.7 as follows:

- 6.4 In accordance with the brief issued to the sub regional Steering Group, those options tested which fall below the levels of growth set out in the Proposed Changes are not considered appropriate. The Assembly does not therefore request comments on Option Higher Growth 'B' for Milton Keynes and Option 'A' for Aylesbury.
- 6.5 The Assembly invites comments on the 'Base Growth' and 'Higher Growth A' Options for Milton Keynes, and on Options B and C for Aylesbury. The 'Base Growth' option for Milton Keynes and Option B for Aylesbury are both consistent with those regional Spatial Options that incorporate the Governments proposals for the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Growth Area. The 'Higher Growth' A option for Milton Keynes and Option C for Aylesbury advocate levels of growth which exceed those in any of the regional spatial options.
- 6.6 A key requirement is the timely provision of supporting infrastructure. Many of these needs have already been identified, but reassurance about effective delivery remains an unresolved issue.
- 6.7 Although the Strategy does not include any specific policies providing criteria on the location of sub-regionally significant development, this guidance is implicit within the overall focus of development at the urban areas of Milton Keynes and Aylesbury which is clearly established in the MKSM Sub-Regional Strategy. The strategy does not propose any specific policies in relation to affordable housing, and further work will be required on this issue.

9. Gatwick Area

Paragraph 2.7 (page 303)

Delete first sentence and replace with:

“2.7 The Steering Group considered that further development would be required to meet housing needs and to enable the economy to grow and adapt, but that it was not possible to precisely quantify the amount of development needed. They have suggested that a range of development of up to a continuation of RPG9 levels in the period beyond 2016 could be considered.”

Policy GAT1 (page 304/305)

Retain first paragraph
Reword the remainder as follows:

In the meantime The Steering Group’s preferred overall level of housing provision is 30,000 dwellings between 2006 and 2026 (Option 1) which represents provision in existing Plans to 2016 and continuation of up to the RPG9 rate of development after 2016.

The Regional Assembly is also seeking views on higher levels of housing provision up to 34,500 dwellings from 2006 and 2026.

Commentary (page 308)
Reword paragraphs 6.1 and 6.2 as follows:

Growth Options

The sub-regional economy requires diversification from Gatwick Airport as the key economic driver, in order to maximise the value added by the sub-region’s economy. To support future economic diversification and to build on the potential related to the growth of the Airport, views are sought not only on the continuation of RPG9 levels of development but also on higher growth levels of up to the RPG9 +15%, this would provide a range of levels of growth which reflect the regional spatial options in section C.

Spatial Distribution

Further studies are required as a priority to enable the spatial distribution to 2016 to be developed, and to quantify overall development levels for the post-2016 period in time to inform the draft Plan to be submitted to the Secretary of State.

10. Isle of Wight

No further changes.