

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

Minutes of the Meeting on 23 June 2005

Present:

Members

Cllr Keith Mitchell
(Chairman)
Cllr Mary Ballin
Kevin Baylis
Cllr Ian Beardsmore
Cllr Gill Ferguson
Cllr Christine Field
Cllr Moira Gibson
Cllr Jonathan Glen
Cllr Brian Gurden
Sharon Hedges
Ian Hepburn
Cllr Alex Hollingsworth
Cllr Alan Hopkins
Cllr Keith House
Richard King
Jeremy Leggett
Tim Lockwood
Cllr Dr Royce Longton
Cllr Alan Lovell
Cllr Tony Reid
Cllr Rodney Royston

Eileen Armstrong, SEEDA

Officers

Mike Gwilliam (Director of Planning & Transport)
Ray Bowers (Head of Spatial Planning)
Martin Tugwell (Head of Regional Transport
Planning)
Heather Bolton (Head of Communications)
Alison Bailey
Andy Barton
Nikki Nicholson
David Payne
Nick Woolfenden
Catherine Rose
Sarah Coleby

In Attendance

Sue Archer, APSU
Paul Geehan, SE District Councils
Cllr Jill Davison, Sevenoaks DC
Cllr Matthew Balfour, Tonbridge & Malling BC
Alistair Robson, East Sussex CC
Tim Greenwood, Terence O'Rourke
Chris Kenneford, Buckinghamshire CC
Antony Payne, Hampshire CC
Natalie Levett, Barton Willmore
Tim Watton, Cherwell DC
Frankie Upton, Oxfordshire CC
L Martin, CHP Action
Edward Dawson, SEFS
Chris Lawrence-Pietroni, SECCE
Steve Williams, English Heritage
Cllr Don Phillips, Chiltern DC

1. Apologies and Substitutions

Apologies were received from: Paul Clokie, Alex Hollingsworth, Douglas Horner, Graham Mabbutt, Douglas Murdoch. The following substitutions were declared: Richard King for Paul Clokie, Gill Ferguson for Graham Mabbutt.

2. Schedule of Changes from 13 June 2005

- 2.1 The Chairman confirmed that Minutes of the meeting on 13 June would be brought to the Committee on 27 July for approval. For expediency, a schedule of changes agreed on 13 June, together with an annex showing the detail, were discussed. Ian Hepburn asked for the schedule to be amended for slide 17 (the slide was correct). The

Chairman asked for amendments to slides 1 and 2. With these amendments, the schedule was noted and approved. (Revised slides appear at 1 and 2 in the attached annex).

3. Infrastructure Proposals

- 3.1 Since the Committee had deferred consideration of this report on 13 June, the Executive Committee had discussed it on 17 June generally positively and agreeing that the proposed Concordat would be useful if short and focused.
- 3.2 The Director of Planning and Transport explained that the package of measures proposed including the Concordat would provide the basis for debate with Government. Members complimented officers on the report, and debated amendments put forward.
- 3.3 J Glen amendment – carried (Annex 1 – slide 3)
- 3.4 J Glen amendment - withdrawn (Annex 1 – slide 4)
- 3.5 J Glen amendment – carried (Annex 1 - slide 5)
- 3.6 With these amendments, **the Committee AGREED to endorse the proposed programme of action set out in 'Infrastructure – A Way Forward' and to incorporate the proposals in the South East Plan.**

4. Outstanding Matters from Meeting on 13 June 2005

- 4.1 Four issues, left unresolved by the Committee on 13 June, were further debated.
- 4.2 Cross-Cutting Policy CC4 – **The amended Policy CC4 was AGREED**, with the addition of the amendment shown at slide 6 in the Annex to these Minutes.
- 4.3 Transport Policies – **The combination of Transport Policies T1 and T2 and deletion of Policy T9 were AGREED** with amendment shown at slides 7-9 in the Annex.
- 4.4 Cross-Cutting Policy CC2 – **The amended Policy CC2 was AGREED** (see attached Annex 2), and reference to an action plan and monitoring would be included in the supporting text.
- 4.5 At the request of members, further clarification of the analysis of responses to the Consultative Draft South East Plan had been undertaken by Ubiquis, and a report was tabled. **The Committee noted the contents of the report.**

5. Responses and Issues on Sub-Regions and Sustainability Appraisal

- 5.1 Sub-regional Proposals - The Head of Spatial Planning reported that all sub-regional groups had met the 6 June deadline for submitting further advice on affordable housing, employment and sub-regional policies. A submission was however still awaited from the

Isle of Wight. He emphasised the need for targets on affordable housing for each sub-region in order to monitor performance against Policy H4 at regional level.

- 5.2 After considerable debate, **the Committee NOTED the advice received from the principal authorities leading sub-regional work and AGREED:**
- i) **That the Principal Authorities, working with their districts, be asked to prepare advice on the appropriate targets for affordable housing in each sub-region for 9 December. The advice should take into account the regional target in policy H4 of the Plan. It should also be based on a consistent, up-to-date and long-term bottom-up assessment of housing need and demand. In the rest of the region (outside the sub-regions) LDDs will contain policies to deliver a substantial increase in the amount of affordable housing consistent with Plan policy H4.**
 - ii) **To request all sub-regional groups, as part of the ongoing work for 9 December to:**
 - **provide further advice on the broad scale and nature of employment change;**
 - **review critically their proposed sub-regional policies with the Assembly officers, to ensure appropriateness in the light of Government guidance and regional policies.**

5.3 Sustainability Appraisal – The Head of Regional Transport Planning reported on the application of the process at sub-regional level. **The Committee NOTED the contents of the report.**

6. Sub-regional Proposals

6.1 Sub-regional Strategies (Agenda Item 6c) - The Director asked the Committee to consider the four common requirements and the 9 individual sub-regional strategy statements. Tim Lockwood declared an interest when the Gatwick Area sub-region was discussed. The following amendments were made:

Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale	Strategy agreed with no amendments
Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley	See slide 10 for agreed amendment
Central Oxfordshire	Strategy agreed with no amendments
London Fringe	Strategy agreed with no amendments
South Hampshire	See slide 11 for agreed amendment
Sussex Coast	Delete 'in the eastern part, closely linked to a parallel programme for East Kent.'
Gatwick area	Add reference to the need to limit development at Gatwick to current planning

Post Meeting Note:	agreements. Following additional outcome added to statement 'Expansion of Gatwick airport will only be supported to agreed levels appropriate for a single runway.'
East Kent and Ashford	Delete 'There must also be close working with adjoining areas of East Sussex which have similar needs. The intention would be to create a positive new image for the two areas, which might be termed the 'Ozone'.
Kent Thames Gateway	Delete 'relationship to' and replace with 'impact on' the adjoining Zone of Influence
Isle of Wight	... Strategy agreed with no amendments

6.2 With these amendments, **the Committee AGREED the Statements of Strategy for the sub-regions for inclusion in the first stage submission of the Plan.**

6.3 Proposed revised sub-regional distribution (Agenda Item 6b) – The Director stressed that the preferred strategy needed to be clarified as much as possible. Further clarification was also needed on the issue of phasing of housing. The report included a suggested distribution by sub-region (SO3). The County Councils had subsequently submitted a revised table of distribution; the most significant variations were in Kent Thames Gateway and Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley. He emphasised the need to adopt a credible level of housing in the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley, given the considerable existing economic and housing pressures in the sub-region. He drew the Committee's attention to limited amendments to the SO3 proposal in the light of the County table.

6.4 The Chairman proposed the following resolution:

6.5 The Regional Planning Committee commends the sub-regional steering groups and believes that they have made a significant contribution to injecting a much needed 'bottom up' element into the development of the South East Plan. The Committee notes that considerable consensus has been achieved and extremely useful policy development has taken place.

The Committee notes that the South East Plan must ultimately include District/Borough/Unitary housing numbers which should reflect work carried out at the sub-regional level. The Committee considers that the continued use of sub-regions as the primary unit for making housing allocations, as distinct from the location for specific policies, causes unnecessary complexity.

The Committee wishes to ensure that District/Borough/Unitary authorities have maximum scope to exercise meaningful local choices within their LDFs. The Committee considers that, in many cases, the combination of sub-regional and 'rest of District/Borough/Unitary' allocations could be extremely prescriptive leaving individual authorities with very little scope for local discretion within their LDFs. The Committee therefore resolves that the South East Plan should include a regional housing allocation, a housing allocation for each County area (which reflects the

work carried out at the sub-regional level) and an indicative allocation for each sub-region. For the avoidance of doubt the Committee resolves that each of these allocations should be included as policy within the South East Plan.

6.6 Keith House and other members expressed concern about this approach, fearing that it might undo the constructive relationships and positive attitudes achieved (particularly in South Hampshire), while others stated that greater concern about the sub-regions overall made the resolution necessary. **The Committee AGREED the resolution but with deletion of the reference to 'indicative' allocations in the final paragraph.**

6.7 Members debated a resolution from Sharon Hedges to vary the phasing suggested in para 2.2 to:

2006-2016 32,000 homes per annum

2017-2026 25,750 homes per annum

This amendment was not carried. **The Committee AGREED to delete paragraph 2.2 but also agreed that further information on the trajectory issue would be submitted to the Assembly meeting on 13 July.**

6.8 Members debated the level of economic growth assumed in the Plan. The Director emphasised that in his view it was essential that the Plan included a clear statement on the issue. Members agreed that it was necessary to have a reference to economic growth in the Plan, particularly to reinforce the view of the South East as a driver and because it was interlinked with the need for infrastructure provision. A resolution to delete paragraph 2.3 of the report was withdrawn, and **the Committee AGREED to adopt a level of 3% GVA for the first 10 years of the Plan period, but to express uncertainty about the likely level thereafter.** The Chairman indicated that he would wish to see a form of words along these lines put forward to the Assembly meeting.

6.9 Members discussed a resolution to delete paragraphs 2.1, 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 and replace with:

The overall spatial strategy for the South East Plan is/will be provided in the following ways:

- i) The spatial elements of the Core Strategy agreed by the RPC on 13 June (i.e. "Within the region, a particular emphasis will be placed a strong urban focus balanced with sustainability across the whole region and measures to reduce present economic and social disparities between east and west of the region including the successful regeneration of the Thames Gateway, coastal towns and cities in East Kent and East Sussex and the Isle of Wight").
- ii) The sub-regional strategies.
- iii) The ongoing work on sub-regional policies to be completed by 9 December 2005.
- iv) The further advice to be received on the proposed Policy Designations and additional hubs also by 9 December 2005.

The Committee noted the resolution but AGREED that further advice on a Regional Spatial Strategy Statement, acknowledging an urban emphasis but also the need to address needs across the whole region including the rural areas, should be prepared and submitted to the Assembly on 13 July.

- 6.10 The Chairman proposed the distribution in Table 2 and stressed that the figures had been submitted on the clear understanding that, if accepted by the Committee, they would be fully consulted upon. **The Committee AGREED Table 2.**
- 6.11 Possible Adjustments to Sub-Regional Boundaries (Agenda Item 6a) – The Head of Spatial Planning explained the proposal to change the southern boundary of Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley. This was agreed in principle, although some further refinement in the Dummer area would be necessary.
- 6.12 **The Committee AGREED that:**
- i) **the boundary of the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley sub-region be adjusted in the area to the south and south east of Basingstoke to the line shown on map 2;**
 - ii) **no further changes be made to the boundaries of the sub-regions as agreed by the Assembly on 24 July 2004 in response to comments received on the draft South East Plan;**
 - iii) **discussions continue with local authorities in the sub-regions to investigate minor changes to the sub-regional boundaries so that they are coterminous with ward boundaries.**

7. Any Other Business

- 7.1 Members debated a resolution to remove Farnham from the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley sub-region. Cllr Ferguson told members that Farnham had transport links with the Blackwater Valley, but all its other links (eg economic, primary health care trusts) lay with places outside the sub-region. The Head of Spatial Planning pointed out the strength of the journey-to-work links to the Blackwater Valley and recommended that the boundary remain unchanged. Moreover the Surrey Structure Plan EIP Panel, while recognising the unique character of Farnham concluded that Farnham was part of the Blackwater Valley. **The Committee AGREED to remove Farnham from the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley sub-region.**
- 7.2 On the last occasion on which Cllr Mitchell would chair the Committee before nominations were received at the Assembly Annual Meeting, Cllrs Reid and Longton complimented him on the way he had managed a complex process and the Committee endorsed this view.

The meeting closed at 5.35 pm

Slide 1- KRM amendment re deferred to 9 Dec

Slide 2 – KRM amendment re green belt

Slide 3 –J Glen amdt re charging

Slide 4 – J Glen amdt re concordat

Slide 5 – J Glen amdt re

Slide 6 – CC4

Slide 7-9 – T1/T2 and T9

Slide 10 – W Corridor & B Valley strategy

Slide 11 - S Hampshire strategy

**Cross-Cutting Policy CC2
Climate Change**

Revised wording agreed: Regional Planning Committee 23 June 2005

Specific measures will be undertaken and targets achieved to support these objectives include:

- 1. Regional and local authorities, agencies and others shall include policies and proposals in their development plans, local transport plans, strategies and investment programmes to help reduce the Region's ~~greenhouse gas~~ carbon dioxide emissions by at least 20% below 1990 levels by 2010 and by at least 25% below 1990 levels by 2015. A target for 2026 will be developed and incorporated at the first review of the Plan (and no later than 2011).**