

DRAFT SOUTH EAST PLAN  
TECHNICAL NOTE - ANNEX

**SPATIAL OPTIONS**

1. This annex should be read in conjunction with technical note 6 – spatial options (unchanged from January 2005)<sup>1</sup>. It updates the January 2005 note to assist understanding of the analysis that led from the spatial option contained in the consultation draft to the preferred spatial option in the March 2006 South East Plan.
2. The January 2005 technical note explains the process to generate the six options which were consulted on in the January 2005 consultation draft South East Plan. Following the publication of the consultation draft of the Plan in January 2005 two phases of work took place.

**Phase I: Analysis of Consultation Comments and Decisions by the Regional Assembly and Regional Planning Committee in June and July 2005**

3. The comments made during the January to March 2005 consultation were analysed. The pre-submission consultation statement (March 2006 version of the Plan) summarises the comments which were made and the Assembly's response. There was a strong division of opinion on the scale of growth, with approximately 45% supporting growth at 25,500 pa or less and 40% supporting growth at 32,000 pa or more, with many supporting a growth rate of 36,000 pa. The respondents who argued for reduced levels of growth were concerned that more housing would reduce quality of life and those who argued for higher levels of growth contended that they were essential to maintain the region's long term economic prosperity and competitiveness, without which the region's quality of life would be undermined. Taking into account household projections, economic growth forecasts, housing need and demand, the environmental, social and economic implications of development and the impact of development upon existing or planned infrastructure the Assembly concluded that an annual average growth level of 28,900pa would be appropriate.
4. In terms of distribution of growth, many respondents considered that the Plan should seek to address the economic disparity between the east and west of the region and supported the need for a focus on growth in the south and east of the region, in the Growth areas and in South Hampshire. There was a division of comments on the policy options. Respondents who supported the Sharper Focus option felt there was a need to promote a balance between regeneration areas and areas of economic opportunity. Respondents who supported the Continuation of Existing Policy option argued that a more even distribution of growth would allow the effect of polarisation and exclusion to be minimised and that Sharper Focus left rural areas with too little new development.

---

<sup>1</sup> Technical notes available at [http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan/plan/supporting\\_information.html#tech\\_notes](http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan/plan/supporting_information.html#tech_notes)

DRAFT SOUTH EAST PLAN  
TECHNICAL NOTE - ANNEX

5. There were also a limited number of comments on the hubs principles in the responses, with some querying the pattern of hubs identified and others whether they are all suitable for substantial development. In overall terms, however, the hubs approach was strongly supported. In light of the consultation responses and further analysis it was considered that all of the hubs approved in the Regional Transport Strategy remained justified and that four additional hubs<sup>2</sup> could play an important role as a focus for activity.
6. The Regional Assembly considered the overall spatial strategy and preferred level and distribution of growth in July 2005<sup>3</sup>. The overall level of growth of 28,900 pa and the phasing of the growth was agreed.
7. Regional Planning Committee (RPC) considered the response on the distribution of growth and proposal for four additional hubs at their meetings on 13<sup>th</sup> June<sup>4</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2005<sup>5</sup>. On the 13<sup>th</sup> June the Committee agreed that the strategy would have a strong urban focus concentrating on the hubs but did not clearly agree the distribution of growth with the County Councils stating that they wished to circulate their own proposals for distribution with both sub-regional and county numbers. The County Council distribution was received by Assembly officers on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2005 and was included in the RPC paper for agenda item 6a at the 23<sup>rd</sup> June meeting. The paper compares the County Council distribution with that proposed through the spatial options technical work.
8. The RPC agreed the County Council distribution for inclusion in the Plan, subject to further advice from the sub-regions to be submitted by 9<sup>th</sup> December. The Committee deferred the decision on the four additional hubs in light of the further sub-regional work to be received on 9<sup>th</sup> December. The Regional Assembly meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2005 endorsed RPC's decisions and additionally requested that Hastings be considered as a hub.

**Phase 2: Sub-Regional Work submitted to the Assembly in December 2005 and Decisions by the Assembly in March 2006**

9. The principal authorities were commissioned to provide advice to the Assembly on the distribution of housing by District for each sub-regional strategy area and rest of County area. The sub-regions allocated the level of housing growth for their area according to the spatial strategy that has been developed at the sub-regional level and the County Council distribution. Following the development of the options the principal authorities carried out a consultation on them in Autumn 2005.
10. The sub-regional work was submitted to the Assembly in December 2005 and was considered by RPC on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2006 and the full Assembly on 1<sup>st</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Canterbury, Tonbridge/Royal Tunbridge Wells, High Wycombe and Aldershot/Farnborough/Camberley

<sup>3</sup> See <http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/meetings/plenaries/2005/130705.html> - agenda item 5

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/meetings/planning/2005/130605/agenda\\_item\\_7b-spatial\\_strategy.pdf](http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/meetings/planning/2005/130605/agenda_item_7b-spatial_strategy.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/meetings/planning/2005/230605/agenda\\_item\\_6b-distribution.pdf](http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/meetings/planning/2005/230605/agenda_item_6b-distribution.pdf)

**DRAFT SOUTH EAST PLAN  
TECHNICAL NOTE - ANNEX**

March 2006. The Assembly agreed a proposed distribution for each of the sub-regions and County areas. The County area figures were unchanged from those agreed on 23<sup>rd</sup> June and there were minor amendments to the Gatwick Area, London Fringe and Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley sub-regional strategies and the Rest of County areas. The revised table is shown below and included in the draft South East Plan<sup>6</sup>. The draft Plan also includes district housing figures<sup>7</sup>. The Assembly agreed that Canterbury, Tonbridge/Tunbridge Wells, High Wycombe and Hastings be considered as hubs<sup>8</sup> and the 21 hubs identified in the draft Plan are listed in box CCI on page 48.

**Sub-regional and County Housing Figures (Annual average rates of provision 2006-2026)**

	<b>Berks</b>	<b>Bucks</b>	<b>E Sussex</b>	<b>Hants</b>	<b>IoW</b>	<b>Kent</b>	<b>Oxon</b>	<b>Surrey</b>	<b>W Sussex</b>	<b>Total</b>
Kent Thames Gateway	-	-	-	-	-	2,400	-	-	-	2,400
Milton Keynes & Aylesbury Vale	-	3,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,500
East Kent and Ashford	-	-	-	-	-	2,400	-	-	-	2,400
Central Oxfordshire	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,700	-	-	1,700
Gatwick Area	-	-	-	-	--	-	-	150	1,500	1,650
London Fringe	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	1,768	-	1,868
South Hampshire	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	4,000
Sussex Coast	-	-	1,600	-	-	-	-	-	1,100	2,700
Western Corridor & Blackwater Valley	2,574	390	-	1,300	-	-	-	212	-	4,476
Isle of Wight	-	-	-	-	520	-	-	-	-	520
"Rest of County" areas	50	150	300	800	-	1,200	660	230	300	3,690
<b>County Total</b>	<b>2,624</b>	<b>4,040</b>	<b>1,900</b>	<b>6,100</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>6,100</b>	<b>2,360</b>	<b>2,360</b>	<b>2,900</b>	<b>28,904</b>

<sup>6</sup> Draft South East Plan, March 2006, Table C3

<sup>7</sup> Draft South East Plan, March 2006, Policy HI

<sup>8</sup> See [http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/meetings/planning/2006/010206/agenda\\_item\\_4a-spatial\\_emphasis-revised\\_policies.pdf](http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/meetings/planning/2006/010206/agenda_item_4a-spatial_emphasis-revised_policies.pdf). It was decided that Aldershot-Farnborough-Camberley should not be designated a hub at this time due to current uncertainties in the area relating to the impact of environmental constraints on the strategic transport and planning framework