

8. Principal Authorities' Consultation: Summary of Views and Responses

This section outlines key issues raised during the principal authorities' consultation in autumn 2005. These summaries have been prepared by the relevant principal authority.

8.1 Berkshire Unitary Authorities

Summary of consultation undertaken by the Berkshire unitary authorities

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing Distribution	There was a relatively even division of opinion between the options, with no clear favourite emerging. 26% wanted a continuation of current policies; 32% an increased focus on developing in built-up areas; 17% wanted an option which gave a better match between housing allocations and locally-identified needs; and 25% favoured none of these options	In the absence of a clear majority view, and given concerns among some of the urban authorities about their ability to maintain higher rates of urban development over the longer term, the Berkshire authorities opted for a distribution which broadly continued current rates of building in each authority. Wokingham have disassociated themselves from this distribution to the extent that, if a particular major (MoD) site within their area does not come forward for development, they would wish to see their housing allocation reduced
Infrastructure Requirements	There is broad consensus within Berkshire around the proposition that any future development should be accompanied by the timely and adequate provision of infrastructure	A detailed schedule of infrastructure needs for the sub-region was drawn up and submitted to the Assembly on 9 December. Further work is planned on this, to develop it into a full-scale implementation plan, during the run-up to the Examination in Public (EiP) into the South East Plan
Other Key Issues	A separate, structured sample telephone survey was undertaken to obtain the views of the Berkshire public on a range of development-related issues. Among its conclusions were: that there was far more support for housing which met locally-arising needs, rather than those of in-migrants; that resistance to development would be significantly reduced (but not removed entirely) by the timely and adequate provision of infrastructure; however, a majority of residents doubted that this would happen	A more detailed summary of these findings was relayed to the Regional Assembly, as part of the full report of consultation, and the results will be used in future evidence, as appropriate

8.2 Brighton and Hove

Summary of consultation by Brighton and Hove Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing Distribution	As a single authority, the distribution issue for Brighton & Hove was the acceptability of the proposed provision for the city. There was relatively little concern over the total amount of new housing to be provided	No change was made to the overall scale of provision for the city

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Affordable Housing	There was relatively little concern over the total amount of new housing, provided that it is geared to meeting existing local needs rather than attracting people to the city. Also, it was felt that the detailed layout of new housing should meet local needs for accessible and lifetime homes, for example	There is a growing level of unmet need in the city and it is vital, therefore, to deliver as many affordable units as possible. The draft South East Plan recognises that there needs to be a significant increase in affordable housing across the region. The approach in the Sussex Coast is set out in policy SCT8 and is based on providing realistic, but challenging, strategic parameters for affordable housing provision
Infrastructure Requirements	This was a key issue along with affordable housing. Concern was expressed that the city's infrastructure was already over capacity and it was seen as essential that infrastructure should be provided to support all new development	The City Council expects the adopted South East Plan to contain clear policies on the provision of infrastructure and for appropriate negotiations to take place at the regional level. The city council will continue to work with service providers to ensure infrastructure capacity is appropriately dealt with, such as through negotiated (s.106) agreements with developers. The council will continue to consult with infrastructure and service providers in the preparation of the local development framework and on individual projects
Economy and Employment	Not an issue. One comment at a public meeting as to why economic growth had to be sought	No response necessary
Other Key Issues	The city council has said that the housing figure can be met on brownfield land. There was general acceptance that it was likely that the proposed housing development could be met on brownfield sites over the next 10 to 15 years, but concern that greenfield sites would be needed after this time or that other supporting uses would need greenfield sites. Particular concern was expressed about the impact on the South Downs/ proposed National Park either directly from new development or from increased recreational use	An assessment of land supply suggests that the city will be able to accommodate the proposed housing figures on previously developed land over the next 10-15 years. Beyond this it is difficult to be certain regarding the availability of brownfield sites. It is important therefore, that regular and ongoing monitoring of residential development in the city will inform the review of targets in the South East Plan

8.3 Buckinghamshire County Council

Summary of consultation undertaken by Buckinghamshire County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing Distribution	Milton Keynes/Aylesbury Vale Sub-region This sub-region forms part of the wider Milton Keynes & South Midlands Growth Area, as originally identified in the Sustainable Communities Plan, and was the	The housing figure for Aylesbury Vale District was not amended following the consultation exercise, but the county council's advice to the Assembly sought the

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing Distribution - continued	subject of very recently adopted (March 2005) RSS Alterations which, inter alia, established firm levels of housing growth by district to 2021 with provisional planning assumptions for a further 10 years (to 2031). In the autumn 2005 housing consultation, the proposals for Aylesbury Vale District were directly based on the relevant housing provisions of the new RSS Alterations. Notwithstanding this, the majority (95%) of responding residents in Aylesbury Vale District ¹ (albeit only 55 in number overall) and some local environmental and amenity groups were opposed to the housing figure for the district, citing infrastructure deficiencies and lack of employment opportunities as particular reasons for their opposition. Amongst other respondents, the development and business community was broadly supportive, as was the district council (albeit expressing some concerns relating to affordable housing and infrastructure)	inclusion of new material (and a revised target) in the South East Plan regarding the need for supporting employment development at Aylesbury, together with the need for a careful approach to new employment generation in adjoining parts of the region. (See also Infrastructure section, below)
	Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley Sub-region A majority of responses from local residents in South Bucks District indicated support for the housing figures proposed by the county council, as did both South Bucks and Wycombe District Councils. Whilst the level of response from local residents in Wycombe District was very low (a total of 30), only a minority supported the proposed housing figure for that area, the others citing concerns about possible impacts on the Green Belt/AONB and infrastructure pressures. Amongst other respondents, no clear and consistent view was apparent, although most respondents from the development industry (who generally considered the figures too low) expressed concerns about the wider process and regional context	Housing figures not changed following consultation, but final advice to the Regional Assembly re-emphasised the need for continued protection of the Green Belt and AONB – upon which the county council's support for High Wycombe becoming a Regional Hub was absolutely conditional

FOOTNOTES

¹ It should be noted that the autumn 2005 housing consultation for the South East Plan did not include a figure for Milton Keynes. This was because of work, then at a very formative stage, on developing a new Long-Term Growth Plan for the City which will establish broad directions of future development and may involve expansion into Aylesbury Vale and/or Mid-Beds Districts. The outputs of that exercise are to feed into the South East Plan at a later stage of the process.

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Infrastructure Requirements	Milton Keynes/Aylesbury Vale Sub-region A major issue for this national Growth Area and one cited by virtually every respondent in their comments (supportive or otherwise) is infrastructure. Transport and water resources/wastewater management were the primary areas of concern. Also, the issue of where the necessary funding was going to come from – a common view being that if growth in this sub-region was largely driven by the national need, funding should also originate at that level, not via increased council tax	The adopted RSS Alterations (March 2005) for the Milton Keynes & South Midlands area already identified several major infrastructure schemes and projects in this sub-region. In addition, a further tranche of work was subsequently carried out under the auspices of Aylesbury Vale Advantage (the new Local Delivery Vehicle) to refine and develop the initial list of requirements. The outcome of that exercise was submitted to the Assembly for inclusion within the initial draft of the South East Plan Implementation Plan. Further iterations of work will take place during 2006 with updated infrastructure requirements likely to be submitted to the EIP at the end of the year
	Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley Sub-region A broad consensus was apparent amongst residents, parish and district councils, environmental and amenity organisations and others regarding the need for growth to be made conditional upon adequate infrastructure provision. Over and above that, there was a particular concern amongst many local residents about the potential impacts (mainly traffic) on the south of the county and the Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Growth Areas just to the north	A schedule of key infrastructure requirements for the sub-region was drawn up in conjunction with the other Western Corridor & Blackwater Valley local authorities and submitted to the Assembly in December, with further iterations and refinements to be carried out during 2006 as a component of the South East Plan Implementation Plan. So far as the potential impacts of the Growth Area in north Bucks are concerned, the county and district councils continue to press for the carrying out of an integrated transport study to investigate issues and options in the corridor from Milton Keynes to the Thames Valley
Other Key Issues	Milton Keynes/Aylesbury Vale Sub-region Affordable housing was an issue raised by the district council. Whilst the 40% target was supported, the council had particular concerns about implementation mechanisms, definitions of need and affordability, the breakdown of different types and tenures of affordable housing within the 40% target and deliverability. So far as the latter was concerned, the district council queried the Assembly's apparent assumption that Aylesbury Vale could help to meet affordable housing needs arising outside the district when it could not even meet its own needs in full	In its advice to the Assembly, the county council relayed all of the matters raised by the district council on affordable housing and expressed a willingness to enter into further discussions. These are yet to take place, although it is recognised that some further work is taking place at the regional level on this subject. The matter of Aylesbury Vale's role (or otherwise) in meeting wider affordable housing needs and the mechanisms by which this might happen are still far from clear however
	Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley Sub-region Aside from the issues referred to above, concerns about the impact of re-development and intensification schemes on the existing character of towns and villages were a particular concern for many local residents	Not specifically dealt with in any changes to the proposed housing distribution, but it is noted that regional policies in the South East Plan seek to exercise a further degree of control over future intensification proposals

8.4 East Sussex County Council

Summary of consultation by East Sussex County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing Distribution	Opinions regarding housing provision in the East Sussex coastal towns were divided. Some favoured maximising the development potential of the coastal towns to aid economic regeneration and/or to reduce any need for greenfield development elsewhere. Others considered the towns to be already overcrowded with little capacity for further development. The majority of respondents to the stakeholder questionnaire felt that all district provisions were too high, but no real alternatives to the proposed housing distribution were raised by the consultation. 90% of the stakeholder questionnaire respondents agreed that we should maximise development on brownfield land. This was backed up by written comments stating that greenfield opportunities should not be utilised before brownfield options had been exhausted. Some felt that Hastings had an untapped resource of vacant housing which was not recognised by our proposals, while others felt that windfall estimates were optimistic. A considerable concern among written comments was the environmental impact of development at strategic locations	Only one district housing distribution was proposed and the housing figures were not changed following the consultation. The proposed housing distribution reflects the extensive environmental constraints that severely restrict the scope for physical development. The distribution is considered the most sustainable strategy because it will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optimise the use of the coastal towns' brownfield opportunities • Be delivered while respecting designated sites and landscapes • Will promote a better balance between people homes and jobs • Help reduce the need to travel • Spread the benefit of development across the sub-region including affordable housing
Affordable Housing	Two thirds of respondents to the stakeholder questionnaire believed it was important to provide more affordable housing and agreed that local councils should do everything they can to boost provision. Written comments on affordable housing centred on the desire for housing to meet local needs and provide for specific groups such as key workers and the elderly	The Sussex Coast approach (Policy SCT8) is based on providing realistic, but challenging, strategic parameters for affordable housing provision that give individual authorities the latitude to establish appropriate policies and local targets for the provision of affordable housing in their area. The guiding principle is to seek the maximum amount of affordable housing that developments can sustain, bearing in mind their need to contribute to necessary infrastructure provision
Infrastructure Requirements	The main concern respondents to the stakeholder questionnaire had was the impact more housing will have on infrastructure. There were concerns that it would increase traffic problems and put pressure on water supply, drainage and/or sewerage systems and on hospitals/ local health services. Written comments also expressed concern that key infrastructure in the past had not been delivered and respondents feared that this would continue. Most therefore stressed the importance of timing the delivery of the necessary infrastructure to support developments	A schedule of strategic infrastructure schemes so far identified, which is needed to deliver the sub-regional strategy, was submitted to the Assembly (Policy SCT9). This was informed by the public consultation and detailed discussions with key infrastructure providers. The Assembly has decided to incorporate these in an Investment Framework within the Implementation Plan. Further iterations and refinement of these will be carried out during 2006. Regional Policy CC5 in the South East Plan should ensure that development only proceeds when infrastructure is available or can be provided in time

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Economy and Employment	80% of respondents to the stakeholder questionnaire agreed that the top priority in East Sussex must be to promote sustainable regeneration and growth, even if this means building slightly fewer homes compared to recent building rates. Written comments stressed the importance of providing additional employment opportunities and also the need for high quality employment provision and support for local businesses	The main objective of the Sussex Coast strategy is to achieve a sustainable economic renaissance (Policies SCT1-4). Therefore it emphasises the need for increasing employment provision as well as meeting housing requirements. The proposed housing distribution promotes a 'balanced dispersal'. This is considered the most sustainable strategy, partly because it will help promote business confidence and spread the benefit of development including employment provision across the whole sub-region
Other Key Issues	<p>A range of issues were raised which were outside the main scope of the consultation. Many were in respect of the overall housing provision for East Sussex; over two thirds of the respondents to the stakeholder questionnaire believed the provision for the East Sussex part of the Sussex Coast was too high. 60% believed that the proposed provision for the rest of East Sussex was too high. Written comments on the overall housing provision, by a small majority, considered it to be too high</p> <p>Written comments included support for Hastings being identified as a Regional Transport Hub. There were also comments surrounding the issue of part of Lewes District being in the Gatwick sub-region</p> <p>Issues of respecting environmental designations, resource management, flood risk management, sustainable building design, rural communities and the social impacts of development proposals were also raised by respondents</p>	<p>The overall level of housing and spilt between the sub-region and rest of county area should remain as agreed by the Assembly</p> <p>Our advice to the Assembly proposed the identification in the South East Plan of Hastings as a Regional Transport Hub. It emphasised the critical importance this would have to the future success of regeneration efforts in this sub-region and to the South East Plan's broader ambitions to promote an urban renaissance while reducing socio-economic disparities across the region</p> <p>The anomaly of part of Lewes being in the Gatwick sub-region is an issue the county council has taken up with the Regional Assembly, recommending the redrafting of the boundary to exclude Lewes District from the Gatwick sub-region</p> <p>Sussex Coast strategy does aim to respect environmental designations and issues and these are covered by regional policies in the South East Plan. However, it is considered that the economic problems are so great and the physical scope for resolving them so limited that, as an exception to general policy, Local Development Documents should be prepared to allow some development which infringes on environmental constraints but only where there is a clearly justifiable case and no more sustainable opportunities exist. Policy SCT4 has been amended to clarify this approach</p>

8.5 Hampshire County Council

Summary of consultation undertaken by Hampshire County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing Distribution	<p>South Hampshire Sub-region</p> <p>Within the two consultation documents, respondents were asked to comment on a number of issues: development within existing urban areas, Strategic Development Areas and urban extensions. The general feeling from the consultation was that the figure for urban capacity for the sub-regions' towns and cities (38,000) is too high. In relation to the proposals for the two SDAs, there was general support from all sectors, including residents, for the Fareham Strategic Development Area. Likewise, the Hedge End Strategic Development Area drew more support than opposition from the consultation, although support from residents for both SDAs was greater from those living outside the sub-region. Opinions on the options for urban extensions were more divided. Whilst the majority supported the notion of urban extensions there was more of a split between the options with 37% of respondents siding with option A. Options B and C gained similar levels of support as each other with 23.1% and 25.8% respectively</p> <p>Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley Sub-region</p> <p>Responses to the county council's consultation booklet (Where Shall We Live) distributed to key stakeholders were evenly split between the three options. Options 2 (greatest concentration around Basingstoke) and 3 (more even distribution across the districts) received 34.8% and 34.7% respectively, with option 1 (centred around Basingstoke and Rushmoor) receiving 30.5%, with many respondents voicing their support for growth centred around Basingstoke to protect the SPA to the east of the sub-region. Responses to the consultation of residents (Hampshire Now), produced similar results with opinions relatively evenly split. Option 2 was the most favoured with 24%, with options 1 and 3 both receiving 20%</p>	<p>The preferred spatial option is to focus growth on the cities of Southampton and Portsmouth and the other main towns maintaining a high urban capacity figure. This has allowed a reduction in the number of dwellings on greenfield sites, especially the Hedge End SDA, a reduction to 6,000 dwellings, as opposed to the 9,000 originally consulted upon. The preferred option has also allowed each of the district authorities to secure their preferred levels of housing numbers to be built in urban extensions, which was usually the lowest figure, thus further reducing greenfield development. However, there will still need to be some development on greenfield land. In the first half of the plan period the focus will be on sites allocated in adopted and draft Local Plans, on brownfield sites within existing urban areas, plus urban extensions. In the second half of the plan period the focus will continue but with greenfield development being concentrated in 'Strategic Development Areas'. The urban extensions and Strategic Development Areas will be located close to and with good transport links to the two cities and other major employment centres. Their location will also help support improvements in public transport infrastructure and services across a wider area</p> <p>The consultation showed that there was no strong preference between the options for North Hampshire. However, the two councils, Basingstoke and Deane and Hart preferred the lowest of the range of figures for their areas whereas Rushmoor supported the highest range. Adoption of the district councils' preferences would produce a shortfall against the target set by the Regional Assembly for North Hampshire, so in order to meet the target, a hybrid preferred option was developed in consultation with the three districts. The combination is close to consultation option 3 but allocates slightly more housebuilding to Basingstoke and Deane and slightly less to Hart, in recognition that Basingstoke is a transport hub and has</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing Distribution - continued	<p>A number of respondents suggested that the levels of growth in the South East Plan in general were unjustified, in particular in north Hampshire, and proposed that growth should be directed elsewhere around the country</p> <p>Several respondents proposed particular sites around Basingstoke and suggestions for greater development along transport corridors were also voiced</p>	<p>proportionately higher commitments in the form of planning consents and allocations. The overall level of housing and split between the sub-region and rest of county area should remain as agreed by the Assembly</p>
Affordable Housing	<p>South Hampshire Sub-region</p> <p>Many of the responses to the consultation shared the sentiment that any plan needs to ensure that sufficient affordable housing is provided within the housing numbers and also generally to ensure that dwelling types are matched to housing needs within particular areas</p> <p>Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley Sub-region</p> <p>Residents of the sub-region are concerned with the state of the housing market and appreciate that high house prices currently exclude many young and old buyers. Consequently, many respondents feel that there is a serious need to provide a mix of types and tenure of housing, matching dwelling types to housing, particularly affordable/key worker, as well as three and four bedroom homes</p>	<p>It is a central priority for South Hampshire to ensure the affordable and key worker housing needs of the sub-region are met so as to support the economic development strategy and help deliver good quality public services. To address the current backlog of existing unmet need and to provide for newly arising needs, 30-40% of housing on new development sites should be affordable. The strategy approach will set out the range of affordable housing proportions that will be sought to meet the varying circumstances found throughout the sub-region</p> <p>The scale and distribution strategy proposed for the sub-region has been formulated to not place undue reliance upon any one local authority or any one type of housing (such as high-density flatted accommodation on brownfield land) that might make it vulnerable to changes in the market or to local circumstances</p>
Infrastructure Requirements	<p>South Hampshire Sub-region</p> <p>There was widespread concern over the state of current infrastructure and its ability to cope with any growth in housing or the economy. Many respondents repeated the statement that it is essential for infrastructure and services to be in place, prior to any new housing or employment development</p> <p>Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley Sub-region</p> <p>Respondents to both consultations stated that there should not be any growth in housing or the economy without substantial prior investment in infrastructure first. The sub-region currently suffers from severe congestion and many key services such as schools and hospitals are overstretched</p>	<p>The strategy for South Hampshire will be one based around 'conditional managed growth'. The pace of growth and development will be determined by, and conditional on, the rate of infrastructure investment</p> <p>A detailed schedule of infrastructure needs has been drawn up by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire for the sub-region and submitted to the Regional Assembly. This will also be the subject of continued refinement and further work</p> <p>Further development in the sub-region will be contingent upon securing all necessary supporting infrastructure. A detailed schedule of infrastructure needs for the sub-region was drawn up by the county council and submitted to the Assembly</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Economy and Employment	<p>South Hampshire Sub-region</p> <p>Another key issue to sustaining any planned growth in housing numbers is the need to precede such growth with economic development at the same pace. This was seen as a priority for many of the respondents to the consultation</p> <p>Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley Sub-region</p> <p>There was a consensus that to support the housing growth the economic focus should be on the existing 'sub-regional centres'. However, this is not to say that encouragement shouldn't be given to local employment opportunities as well</p>	<p>The strategy for South Hampshire is to improve its economic performance to at least match the regional average, with a target to achieve a Gross Value Added (GVA) of 3.5% per annum. This will involve an increase in jobs as well as productivity, requiring land for business development as well as housing</p> <p>The balance between jobs and labour supply differs between one part of the sub-region and another, with employment concentrated in some areas whilst others are more predominantly residential in character. Parts of the area already contain considerable amounts of land in employment use that will be ripe for redevelopment during the Plan period. The focus of the strategy will therefore be to give priority to the retention of, and making more efficient use of, existing employment land in employment use</p>
Other Key Issues	<p>South Hampshire Sub-region</p> <p>There were a number of other issues raised in the consultation, ranging from concerns that the consultation had taken place before the production of the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment and concerns that the housing numbers proportioned to the sub-region by the regional assembly are unjustified and the growth should be directed to other areas of the country. There were also calls for greater use to be made of existing/surplus public sector land, throughout the sub-region and the county as a whole, this could be a key contributor to achieving sustainable communities</p> <p>Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley Sub-region</p> <p>A general concern amongst all respondents was the need to protect the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA). There was a general concern with regards to protecting this area and consequently</p>	<p>The sustainability appraisal (SA) of the sub-regional strategy used an approach pioneered by the sub-regional group. This involved a two-stage process. The first stage involved the identification of the key sustainability issues at the sub-regional level. The second stage was consideration of the impact that different spatial options would have on those key sustainability issues. This work has been summarised in the pro-forma submitted alongside the sub-regional strategy. The work on the SA has been audited by the Regional Assembly's consultants, and the results included within the South East Plan's full SA Report</p> <p>The overall level of housing and the split between the sub-region and rest of the county area should remain as agreed by the Regional Assembly</p> <p>The Partnership for Urban South Hampshire believe that they are already attempting to make the best use of existing/surplus public sector land, and maintain that this will continue to be part of the long term strategy</p> <p>New residential development in the sub-region, which could potentially affect the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), will be facilitated by a policy in the Local Development Framework that refers to the need to avoid, or mitigate any</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Other Key Issues - continued	<p>directing development to the less constrained Basingstoke area. Several respondents highlighted that the need to provide large areas of mitigation land, to offset effects on the SPA, will severely restrict the ability to develop in the Hart and Rushmoor area</p> <p>There were a number of other issues raised in addition to those the consultation was focused on. Questions were posed regarding the build rates advocated in the strategy and that they are considerably higher than past rates and specifically past completion rates. Consequently there is some scepticism over the deliverability of such numbers</p>	<p>potential adverse affects on the SPA and may be supported, where appropriate, by SPD to assist implementation</p> <p>Local authorities will work with the Regional Assembly and English Nature, supported by central and regional Government and other relevant agencies and stakeholders to develop a practical solution for the management of development proposals that are likely to have an impact on the integrity of the SPA</p>

8.6 Kent County Council

Summary of consultation by Kent County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE																								
Introduction	<p>All Kent Sub-regions Similar comments were made in response to the Assembly's January-April 2005 consultation, and to the principal authorities' consultation on sub-regions in September-October</p> <p>Although the dwelling totals for sub-regions were decided in July 2005, the matter remained a major concern in the autumn consultation</p> <p>The main response to the autumn consultation was from 265 questionnaires, and 228 letters containing 932 comments</p> <p>Of the comments in letters :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> nearly 40% were not specific to a sub-region: <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Kent and South East</td> <td>353</td> <td>38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kent Gateway</td> <td>191</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East Kent & Ashford</td> <td>225</td> <td>24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rest of Kent</td> <td>161</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> </table> nearly 40% were about infrastructure, and transport was the most common concern <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Housing</td> <td>280</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Employment</td> <td>214</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Infrastructure</td> <td>362</td> <td>39%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>76</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> </table> 	Kent and South East	353	38%	Kent Gateway	191	21%	East Kent & Ashford	225	24%	Rest of Kent	161	17%	Housing	280	30%	Employment	214	23%	Infrastructure	362	39%	Other	76	8%	<p>The steering groups submitted their response to key points from the Assembly's spring consultation in June</p> <p>Some of the points raised by the autumn consultation were dealt with in the June submission and by the Assembly's decisions on housing numbers in July</p> <p>The steering groups considered draft advice to the Assembly and an interim report on the autumn consultation in late October</p> <p>The report to Kent County Council (KCC) Cabinet of 5th December on the advice to be submitted to the Assembly included key points from the consultation. The advice was a Cabinet Member decision in Medway Council</p> <p>The Statement of Consultation submitted to the Assembly included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analysis of 265 Questionnaires analysis of 932 comments in letters a summary of frequent comments not confined to a sub region, and a response to them a summary of the main comments on each sub region, and a response
Kent and South East	353	38%																								
Kent Gateway	191	21%																								
East Kent & Ashford	225	24%																								
Rest of Kent	161	17%																								
Housing	280	30%																								
Employment	214	23%																								
Infrastructure	362	39%																								
Other	76	8%																								

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
	<p>Many comments on housing and employment were not confined to the matters in the consultation document. The main comments from letters and supporting results from the questionnaire and panel are as follows:</p>	
Housing	<p>The public and environment groups felt proposed housing numbers are too high in general (73% of the Panel) or in particular areas, because of pressure on green land, the environment or local services</p> <p>The development industry and others call for higher dwelling quantities in the South East and each Kent sub region to meet projected demand, opportunity and government policy</p> <p>There is some support for more affordable housing</p> <p>The public and environment groups feel that green land should not be taken for development – or brown land should be used first</p> <p>High density development is sometimes seen as leading to the loss of urban quality and character</p> <p>The development industry calls for less reliance on brown land and more release of green field sites</p>	<p>Steering groups and KCC Cabinet supported the lower dwelling options for Kent Thames Gateway and East Kent & Ashford, as decided by the Assembly</p> <p>Steering groups and KCC Cabinet supported 35% affordable housing in sub-regions and 30% in rest of Kent as a realistic target, to be varied with local circumstances</p> <p>The advice submitted assumes use of the potential brown land supply and suitable densities before triggering the need for new green housing land, with one exception</p>
Employment	<p>New jobs should balance or precede new housing - 70% support in the questionnaire survey and 85% of the panel</p> <p>High quality development for technology and knowledge employment is supported by 70% in the questionnaire survey and 73% of the panel</p>	<p>The advice proposes a readily available supply of employment land and identifies new locations for business and other employment uses, and proposes new locations for technology and knowledge employment</p>
Infrastructure	<p>The public and environment groups feel that infrastructure should be provided alongside or in advance of development - 90% of the questionnaire survey and 94% of the panel</p> <p>They feel there is insufficient water to supply new housing and development should not take place on land liable to flood</p> <p>Measures are needed to deal with traffic congestion – with support expressed for both roads and public transport</p>	<p>The Investment Framework submitted includes necessary infrastructure</p> <p>Specifically the Investment Framework includes major investment in water supply, flood defence measures, and transport. It proposes further study of water supply</p> <p>The advice proposed includes an additional policy for flood risk in Kent Thames Gateway</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing Distribution	<p>East Kent and Ashford Sub-region Option 1 distributes new dwellings evenly among coastal districts, options 2 and 3 concentrate progressively at Dover, with 9,900 dwellings in option 3, needing new green land release for about 5,100</p> <p>In the questionnaire survey 55% favoured option 1, and 16% option 3. Comments from letters were evenly for option 1 and 3, but the Whitfield Action Group (Dover) submitted a survey of 271 residents opposed to green land release at Whitfield</p> <p>All district councils preferred option 1 for the main urban areas, except Dover who noted that option 3 is closer to the LDF mid and high options</p> <p>Swale preferred the lower option of 700 dwellings for Faversham</p> <p>All options include the greatest concentration of dwellings at the Ashford Growth Point. This is generally supported but there is concern whether major new infrastructure and employment will be provided to achieve and balance the dwelling target</p>	<p>The steering group and KCC Cabinet favoured option 1, increased by 200 to 6,100 dwellings for Dover District to compensate for the lower option in Faversham. At Dover an additional 2,000 dwellings are to be tested in the LDF to demonstrate if they can be accommodated satisfactorily. This would increase the total for the sub-region above that decided by the Assembly</p> <p>The sub-regional strategy states that delay to infrastructure and employment may reduce dwelling numbers, particularly at Ashford (Policy EKA1)</p>
	<p>Kent Thames Gateway Sub-region A single distribution was offered for consultation that matched the availability of previously developed land. This avoided the need for new green land release</p> <p>In the questionnaire survey 72% favoured this approach, and 24% objected. Opinion in the 72 comments in letters was evenly divided. 26 comments supported the approach, sought fewer houses, or sought use of brown land only protect to the Green Belt or other green land. 32 comments, mainly from developers, sought a higher total for the sub-region and/or release of green land</p> <p>The district councils supported the approach in option 1, but Dartford District regarded the quantity of 15,700 dwellings for their borough as a maximum. Gravesham requested that the quantity for the borough be reduced to that which can be realistically developed on the small number of complex sites</p>	<p>The steering group favoured option 1 but referred the quantities for Gravesham and Swale to the principal authorities for resolution</p> <p>The sub-regional strategy as submitted to the Assembly states that the dwelling quantity for Dartford is a maximum. KCC decided that provision for Gravesham should be reduced by 600 dwellings, balanced by an increase of 600 in Sittingbourne-Sheppey. This increase will require a small release of green land</p> <p>The sub-regional strategy states that delay to infrastructure and employment may reduce dwelling numbers, particularly at Dartford (Policy KTG1)</p> <p>Major new development locations on green land are not required to meet the Assembly's targets, and the dwelling distributions were not changed in response to these proposals</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing Distribution - continued	<p>There is concern whether major new infrastructure and employment will be provided to achieve and balance the dwelling target</p> <p>Land interests proposed major mixed use development on green land south of Medway and Sittingbourne</p> <p>Concern was frequently expressed with quantities for Medway because of the perceived need for green land release on the Hoo peninsula north of Medway urban area</p>	<p>Medway quantities require the release of MoD land at Chattenden and the development of allocated employment sites, but otherwise no green land release for housing is implied. The dwelling distributions were not changed in response to these comments</p>
	<p>Affordable Housing Kent Thames Gateway Sub-region Districts expressed slightly differing views on the proportion of new housing that should be affordable</p>	<p>The KCC Cabinet decided that 30% affordable housing as in East Kent would be appropriate</p>
Economy and Employment	<p>East Kent and Ashford Sub-region In the questionnaire survey 50% supported new employment locations at Dover if new housing were concentrated there, and 51% at Ashford.</p> <p>Land interests favour large scale employment provision at Faversham</p>	<p>The sub-regional strategy endorses identified locations in Dover and Ashford districts for new employment, and proposes that new locations be provided to balance housing if required</p> <p>This has been rejected at Inquiry and in the Local Plan. The sub-regional strategy proposes provision in keeping with the scale and character of the town</p>
	<p>Kent Thames Gateway Sub-region In the questionnaire survey 55% supported new employment locations at Sittingbourne-Sheppey and 51% at Medway. Developer interests favoured much higher provision in Medway</p> <p>There was support for the recognition of Kent Science Park at Sittingbourne as a location for technology and knowledge sectors</p>	<p>The sub-regional strategy endorses identified locations in Medway and Sittingbourne-Sheppey for new employment (KTG6). KCC Cabinet endorsed "a range of readily available sites will be provided" (Policy KTG5)</p> <p>The sub-regional strategy endorses this view (KTG6)</p>
Infrastructure Requirements	<p>East Kent and Ashford Sub-region The letter response included 92 comments on infrastructure, of which 52 were about transport</p> <p>There is concern that East Kent is inaccessible, and local rail services will be replaced by fast London services via the Channel Tunnel Rail Link in 2009</p> <p>There is wide concern for water supply to support growth. Canterbury City question the practicality of the proposed strategic reservoir at Broad Oak near Canterbury</p>	<p>The sub-regional strategy and Investment Framework support Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL) services and maintaining local services, giving added capacity and service to support growth</p> <p>The advice accepts the need for major investments in water supply to enable growth but seeks further study of the options and early decisions to ensure timely additional capacity to support growth levels</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Infrastructure Requirements - continued	Dover Council and Dover Harbour Board support improvement of A2 north of Dover, and management of international freight traffic	The Investment Framework supports these objectives, subject to further study of solutions to international freight traffic
	Kent Thames Gateway Sub-region The letter response included 58 comments on infrastructure, of which 29 were about transport	The sub-regional strategy and Investment Framework support CTRL services and maintaining local services, giving added capacity and service to support growth
	There is concern that local rail services will be replaced by fast London services via the Channel Tunnel Rail Link in 2009	The advice accepts the need for major investments in water supply to enable growth but seeks further study of the options and early decisions to ensure timely additional capacity to support growth levels
	There is wide concern for water supply to support growth	KCC Cabinet sought an urgent study of the options and evaluation on a wide range of criteria. (Policy KTG 12)
	Mixed views were expressed about a Lower Thames Crossing, with concern for the environmental impact but also recognition of the possible relief to transport and air pollution in Thameside	KCC Cabinet sought an urgent study of the options to relieve Junction 5 on M2 within the Investment Framework
	Mixed views were expressed for the concept of a new access to Sittingbourne from M2	
Other Key Issues	East Kent and Ashford Sub-region There are concerns with the environmental impact of a proposed extension of the runway at Lydd airport, and with growth of air traffic at Kent International Airport (KIA Manston)	Amendments are proposed to EKA4 to delete reference to air traffic volumes at Lydd and to include environmental criteria for assessment of proposals at KIA. The Assembly has since proposed deletion of reference to Lydd airport in the policy
	Kent Thames Gateway Sub-region There was objection from property interests to the roles for Bluewater and Ebbsfleet defined in Policy KTG8, as being contrary to Policy TC2, but also support for this approach	KTG8 reflects the view of the steering group and was endorsed by KCC Cabinet and Medway
	Concern was expressed with development on sites with flood risk	The advice includes a policy for flood risk (KTG9) and the Investment Framework includes investments in flood defence. Further evaluation of the implications of flood risk will be needed

8.7 Oxfordshire County Council

Summary of consultation undertaken by Oxfordshire County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Spatial Strategy and Housing Distribution	Central Oxfordshire Sub-region The largest proportion of respondents to the county council's consultation booklet (39%) preferred option 1 (focus on Bicester and Didcot). 27% preferred option 2 (focus on south of county). A third of respondents proposed alternative distribution, the most popular being in and around Oxford City. Consultation organised by other groups indicated a strong preference (88%) for further development in and around Oxford City	The housing distribution in Policy CO2 takes account of existing planned commitments and urban potential, distributing the remaining housing (requiring greenfield land) primarily to Cherwell District (with a focus on Bicester), Vale of White Horse District (focus at Didcot, Wantage and Grove) and South Oxfordshire District (focus at Didcot). This reflects the preferred spatial strategy of the county council, including locations for new employment development, that emerged from the previous consultation on the South East Plan (option A) and does not involve encroachment of Green Belt land. Policy CO2 provides for continued housing development within Oxford City
	A third group of respondents came in the form of written letters and emails. See below	
Housing Distribution	Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley Sub-region Request for the six parishes that fall within the WCBV area to be removed and placed within the rest of South Oxfordshire area	Housing proposed in this area was minimal and therefore covered as part of the overall consultation for Oxfordshire. Six parishes affected written to directly on this matter Request to the Assembly to amend the boundary of the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley sub-region to exclude the small part of South Oxfordshire from that sub-region. This was agreed by the Assembly on 1 March 2006
Infrastructure Requirements	Central Oxfordshire Sub-region There was a general consensus on the need for improved infrastructure to meet historic and current as well as future needs, with public transport and roads, schools and healthcare facilities emerging as the top priorities	A detailed draft Infrastructure and Investment Programme was prepared and submitted to the Assembly. It will be incorporated into the Implementation Plan for the South East Plan. It includes specific schemes and was informed by the public consultation and detailed discussions with key infrastructure providers
Other Key Issues	Central Oxfordshire Sub-region A range of issues were raised in addition to those on which the consultation process focused. In many cases there were a divergent range of opinions expressed, including: Need for more/less housing than in the South East Plan; need to protect /allow for some review of the Green Belt; development of mixed communities and matching housing with employment growth; phasing of infrastructure (transport, utilities - including need for further investigative work) with development; need for further growth/need to restrict growth in Oxford; Bicester and Didcot may become dormitories; alternative options to those above include spreading development across the county to include smaller towns and villages	The county council balanced the various views in arriving at its preferred strategy. Bicester and Didcot are identified as the main locations for much of the additional housing and employment growth reflecting their potential. Policy CO5 (Economy) has been amended to provide added emphasis on regional and local priorities, provision of a range of accommodation, and skills development, and linkages within knowledge-based economy

8.8 Surrey County Council

Summary of consultation carried out by Surrey County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing Distribution	<p>In terms of responses to the proposed housing allocations, 59% of the replies were in favour of the preferred option to accommodate development within existing urban areas and protect the Green Belt. 9% favoured alternative 1 to distribute a proportion (10% of the requirement) as urban extensions across all towns and 11% favoured alternative 2 to distribute the 10% across the three regional hubs. The remaining 21% did not support any of these, considering that the allocations proposed were too high</p> <p>Many developers considered the housing proposed for the region was too low and consequently both the county and district numbers were inadequate. The more specific concerns were an over-reliance on urban sites, the need to review Green Belt boundaries, the urban focus being unlikely to deliver local needs or infrastructure requirements, and concern that the strategy would not be robust if higher allocations were required</p>	<p>The recommended housing distribution reflects the general support for the preferred option which makes the best use of existing commitments and potential within urban areas. Green Belt policy is a constraint against the expansion of existing urban areas across the sub-region. The outcome of the estimates of urban housing potential do not justify alternative strategies based on release of Green Belt land</p>
Affordable Housing	<p>There was wide recognition that this was a particular problem across Surrey which needed to be addressed as a priority in implementing the housing requirement. Economic partners pointed to the need for adequate provision to underpin the local economy. This point was shared by a number of other respondents, alongside the need to address the issue from a social and community development viewpoint</p> <p>Comments on the delivery of affordable housing included concern that the large number of small sites, allied to the use of thresholds, reduced development contributions to the solution of this problem. New arrangements, including the requirement for all development to contribute towards provision were suggested. A point made by a number of developers was that the potential land supply was likely to constrain the housing mix that they could offer</p>	<p>Achieving a higher proportion of affordable housing as part of the implementation of proposals for the sub-region is a critical issue. The sub-regional strategy should ensure that future development makes the fullest possible contribution to these needs. One way of tackling this is for all development to be required to make a contribution, either by on-site provision or commuted payments rather than having thresholds applied. This reflects the preponderance of small sites in the housing supply chain</p> <p>Opportunities to achieve contributions from commercial development will also need to be considered</p>
Infrastructure Requirements	<p>Residents and amenity groups emphasised that pressures on infrastructure and services were already severe. Their support for the scale of development proposed was conditional on the need to address current perceived deficiencies in infrastructure and</p>	<p>The strategy should include specific mechanisms to address the pressures arising from cumulative small-scale development and to ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure and services. Key investments have been identified which</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Infrastructure Requirements	<p>services before further development, timely delivery of new facilities and services, and the need to phase development where appropriate</p> <p>Other issues raised covered the need to address the cumulative impact of small scale developments, the need to apply a tariff-based approach to secure funding, and the need to take account of the pressures arising outside Surrey in adjoining sub-regions and across the regional boundary in London. Developers and landowners were concerned that over-reliance on previously developed land within urban areas would make it more difficult to deliver infrastructure and service improvements</p>	<p>need to be in place by 2011 and subsequently to ensure that movement problems within the sub-region(s) and rest of county are addressed</p> <p>Phasing of large sites needs to be introduced to ensure that development remains close to the annual rate suggested by the Assembly given that infrastructure and service providers will use these to inform their investment decisions</p> <p>The imposition of a tariff on all development proposals will go some way towards ensuring that funds are available to tackle cumulative impact issues. Specific measures to implement such a tariff would need to be explored, including ways of financing immediate requirements against future funding streams</p>
Other Key Issues	<p>Ranking of the sustainable development objectives revealed that the top four objectives (ranked as either first or second preferences) were respectively :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserving the countryside and historic sites • Conserving the character of settlements • Reducing road congestion by improving public transport • Making it easier to get suitable housing at an affordable cost <p>English Nature objected to the housing allocations on the basis that no account had been taken of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. A 'shadow appropriate assessment' should be undertaken to determine whether or not there would be impacts on the designated areas</p> <p>There were divergent views on regional hubs. Some developers considered that insufficient attention had been given to their role in the future strategy. Some residents supported the concept in principle, but others opposed the switch from a transport hub to a concept of regional hubs with a greater emphasis on planned growth. The need to define the role of hubs was raised, given on the one hand the close proximity of Guildford and Woking and on the other the need to consider the relationship between Redhill and other hubs, notably Crawley to the south and Croydon in Greater London to the north</p> <p>The proposal for an additional regional hub in the Blackwater Valley was not supported</p>	<p>The responses to the objectives indicate that many people share the concern that further development in an already densely developed area is likely to erode the quality of life. An urban focus for development requires that the consequences, in terms of impact on character and identity and pressure on infrastructure and services, be addressed</p> <p>Mitigating potential impacts on the Special Protection Area need to be addressed by specific policy advice within the strategy</p> <p>The future role of regional hubs within the sub-region requires consideration. The opportunities for extensions to the towns are limited by the Metropolitan Green Belt, the Surrey Hills AONB, other important landscape constraints and river corridors</p> <p>The strategy for the Western Corridor/ Blackwater Valley should not include a proposed regional hub in the Blackwater Valley</p>

8.9 West Sussex County Council

Summary of consultation undertaken by West Sussex County Council

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Housing Distribution	<p>The largest proportion of respondents to the county council's consultation questionnaire (almost 60%) supported scenario A – that is a focus on Gatwick Area. Only 10% of the responses expressed a preference for scenario B. Of the letters and reports received, including those from prospective developers, many supported Scenario A. Almost 20% of the responses indicated support for another scenario (such as a new settlement), and about 11% did not specify a response</p> <p>Almost 70% of respondents agreed with accommodating as much housing as possible in urban areas; c. 15% disagreed; the remainder expressed no preference or did not specify a response</p> <p>Over 70% agreed with the indication of growth for Crawley, whereas about 13% disagreed</p> <p>Just over 50% of responses supported continued small scale gradual growth of towns and villages to meet local needs. Only about 26% disagreed with this type of development</p>	<p>Scenario A was presented to the Assembly as the preferred view on 9th December 2005</p> <p>Scenario A has a strong Crawley urban focus, with the majority of any further development in other main towns and transport corridors, with some small scale gradual growth of some other settlements to meet local needs and support the rural economy</p> <p>Development on the coast is limited because of land constraints and the need for priority to be given to economic regeneration (SCT3 and SCT4)</p>
Affordable Housing	<p>Affordable housing was identified as a priority by 30% of respondents</p>	<p>Policy GAT 2 sets an aspirational target of 40% affordable housing, and requires local authorities to determine relevant thresholds, type of provision, and percentage of provision by type and site, as justified by housing needs studies. It also states that the 40% affordable housing target is subject to additional government funding, in recognition of the fact that the planning system alone is unable to effect this change</p> <p>Policy GAT 4 also states that within the level of housing provided for in the sub-region, priority should be given to the provision of affordable housing including housing for key workers</p> <p>Policy SCT8 does not set a single target, but suggests at least 40% of new housing development should be affordable. It asks for the maximum that the viability of particular developments can support, and sets a site size threshold of 15 units or more, unless a lower threshold can be justified locally</p>

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE																		
Affordable Housing - continued		<p>The type, size and nature of affordable housing should be determined locally to recognise the needs of different sections of the community</p>																		
Infrastructure Requirements	<p>The following infrastructure and services were identified as priorities:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>issue</th> <th>% of respondents</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>transport</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>water supply and sewerage</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>health care</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>affordable homes</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>education facilities</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>flood and sea defences</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>community facilities</td> <td>19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>waste and recycling facilities</td> <td>14%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	issue	% of respondents	transport	64%	water supply and sewerage	60%	health care	50%	affordable homes	30%	education facilities	20%	flood and sea defences	20%	community facilities	19%	waste and recycling facilities	14%	<p>The views submitted to the Assembly on the Gatwick Area sub-region clearly state that new homes and employment must not be created without the certainty that the infrastructure and services needed to support them, and to meet existing deficits, will be provided (Policy GAT 1). Policy GAT 4 also sets out the infrastructure that will be required to support the development that is planned, and to support the strategy expressed in GAT 1. It includes consideration of all the issues raised as priorities by the consultation respondents</p> <p>For the Sussex Coast sub-region, Policy SCT 1 requires pro-active pursuit and promotion of sustainable economic growth and regeneration that will help deliver major improvements to the strategic transport infrastructure and services. Policy SCT 2 calls for increased priority to be given to investment decisions and other direct support including delivering improvements to east-west transport links by road and rail, and maintaining and/or improving key north-south communication links. Policy SCT 9 also sets out the infrastructure that will be required to support the development that is planned</p>
issue	% of respondents																			
transport	64%																			
water supply and sewerage	60%																			
health care	50%																			
affordable homes	30%																			
education facilities	20%																			
flood and sea defences	20%																			
community facilities	19%																			
waste and recycling facilities	14%																			
Economy and Employment	<p>Scenario A favoured less development in the coastal sub-region which would enable the prioritisation of land for employment needs. Both scenarios A and B adopted a smart growth approach for Crawley. As discussed above, most respondents favoured scenario A and, by extension, the economic principles behind it</p>	<p>Scenario A was presented to the Assembly as the preferred view on 9 December 2005. Policy GAT 3 in the county council's submission states that high value-added economic growth, and development which seeks to maximise the value added by the sub-region's economy, that can be accommodated without adding to the pressure for housing or labour in the sub-region will be encouraged, as will development that contributes to the improvement in the skills and flexibility of the local workforce</p> <p>Scenario A is consistent with the Sussex Coast sub-regional strategy giving priority to economic regeneration (SCT2) and employment priority in land allocations (SCT4)</p>																		

TOPIC	KEY ISSUES	KEY CHANGES/RESPONSE
Other Key Issues	<p>Concern about overall housing numbers required in West Sussex by the draft South East Plan, particularly the potential impact on the county's character, environment, and potential loss of the countryside</p> <p>A range of environmental issues, especially protection of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Sussex Downs AONB and the proposed South Downs National Park</p>	<p>Policy GAT 5 of the preferred view submitted to the Assembly on 9 December 2005 addresses environment and character, including the importance of retaining and enhancing the existing settlement pattern (including preventing coalescence), strategic gaps, High Weald and Sussex Downs AONBs, and Low Weald countryside</p>