

# Report

**Subject** : Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West – Draft Responses to Secretary of State Proposed Changes

**Report to** : Cabinet

**Date** : Wednesday 1 October 2008

**Author** : Senior Planning Officer, Forward Planning & Conservation

**Cabinet Member for Planning:** Councillor Paul Clegg

---

**1. Purpose of Report:**

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Secretary of State's proposed changes to the draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West (RSS), where felt key for Salisbury District and to seek members comments on the proposed changes.

**2. Background:**

- 2.1 The South West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) will be the statutory development plan that sits between national (planning policy statements and guidance notes) and local policy (Local Development Framework). Once adopted it will provide a broad development strategy for the region and its major settlements. It will also provide the strategic planning context for Local Development Frameworks.
- 2.2 In November 2004, Cabinet was informed about the emerging RSS process and was asked to comment upon three options which had been put forward by the South West Regional Assembly (SWRA) regarding the overall distribution of development across the region. The view relayed to the region by this council was that the overwhelming focus of development and resources on larger cities (e.g. Bristol, Plymouth, Swindon) did not adequately reflect the needs of local centres and rural areas.
- 2.3 In January 2006 a further report to Cabinet informed members of the emerging policies and proposals contained within a first draft of the RSS. The report gave a broad appraisal of the overall policy direction as well as some detailed analysis of the development strategy proposed. On the matter of proposed development levels for the RSS period (2006-2021), members were made aware that Salisbury District would be required to accommodate between 360 and 450 dwellings per year, or 7,200 to 9,000 over the period 2006-2026, with the implication that at least half of this supply would be located at Salisbury.
- 2.4 In September 2006 a further report was taken to Cabinet that sought member endorsement of formal comments on the Draft RSS. These comments included:
- Support for the overall development policies (Policies A-C) of the RSS in terms of development distribution on the basis of the role and function of settlements
  - A request that the text relating to Salisbury should reflect a more up to date position with regard to opportunities which the Salisbury Vision had the potential to deliver



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE

Awarded in:  
Housing Services  
Waste and Recycling Services



- That the position with regard to housing numbers remained unclear in light of emerging guidance in PPS3 regarding the treatment of windfall housing development
  - That the RSS did not provide sufficient guarantees regarding the delivery of funding for major infrastructure to catalyse development of key sites
  - Policy H2 provided too much of a 'one size fits all' approach which might be unrealistic for small developments in rural areas
  - Support for measures set out in respect of affordable housing requirements
  - That the RSS should support local landscape designations
  - Welcome the RSS position on renewable energy provision
  - Welcome for the sequential reuse of redundant employment sites
- 2.5 The Cabinet also authorised Forward Planning to take forward the representations through the Examination in Public (EIP) Process.
- 2.6 In June 2006, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) published new population figures for household formation. The key finding was that people were choosing to live in smaller households and hence whilst the population would grow steadily, the number of dwellings required would be proportionally greater. The Secretary of State indicated that these revised figures would need to be taken into account during the EIP of the draft RSS, as the revised population figures had not been incorporated into the draft RSS. The figures were analysed by the regional assembly secretariat in the following months prior to the holding of a stakeholder workshop in Poole during September 2006 when the implications were presented. The conclusions reached were that the draft RSS would be around 100,000 houses short and that build rates would need to increase by about 5,000 per year across the region. Three scenarios were presented which indicated ways in which this additional housing could be distributed:
- Pro-rata shares of the new development
  - Focusing additional growth purely at Strategically Significant City or Town (SSCT)
  - Focusing additional growth away from SSCTs
- 2.7 The regional assembly tasked section 4/4 authorities (counties and unitaries) to examine the options posed.
- 2.8 In November 2006 WCC held a workshop to present their findings. Discussion found that in Salisbury in realistic terms, the Salisbury Housing Market Area (HMA), which follows the boundary of Salisbury District, was seen to be an area more likely to illustrate the trends implied by the ONS household projections as a result of the growth in the elderly population. However, the bottom up analysis of supply made it clear that the scope for additional growth appeared to rely heavily of the release of new greenfield sites. On this basis the pro-rata distribution was supported.
- 2.9 In December 2006 a meeting with the then Leader and Portfolio holder was held at which supply analysis was presented. The conclusions of the discussion indicated that the members were comfortable with a compromised figure of 10,250 for the district, promoting 5,750 at Salisbury and around 4,500 for the rest of the district. These views were passed onto to WCC
- 2.10 At the EIP, held between April and July 2007, WCC and SDC provided joint statements to inform the Salisbury HMA session that provided a bottom up response to counter the population driven arguments, which would be made, by Government Office of the South West (GOSW) and the development industry in order to support a figure of between 10,000 and 10,500.
- 2.11 Following local elections, officers met with new portfolio holders to set out RSS issues with principal attention to household levels. The scenario agreed by the former administration (about 10,250 dwellings) was considered to be sound although members were advised that the EIP panel could increase the figure to around 12,000.
- 2.12 In December 2007 the South West EIP Panel report into the draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West was published. This recommended amongst other things that between 2006 and 2026 that the number of new dwellings built in Salisbury District should be 12,400 based on ONS population predictions.

- 2.13 The Secretary of State published her proposed changes to the draft RSS on 22nd July. A separate EIP into a Review of Additional Pitch Requirements for Gypsies and Travellers took place in March 2008, with a Panel Report published in May 2008.
- 2.14 A 12 week consultation period has been allowed on the Secretary of States (SoS) proposed changes closing on Friday 24<sup>th</sup> October 2008 during which time comments are invited on the proposed changes. The Proposed Changes to the draft RSS have been prepared taking account of the findings of the EiP Panel Report published in January 2008 and other material considerations such as national policy and revised national household projections. The Proposed Changes set of documents comprise
- Document 1 The main Proposed Changes report which reproduces the draft RSS with the proposed changes to it
  - Document 2 A tabulation of the Proposed Changes with an explanation of the SoS response to the EiP Panel Report and the reasons for the changes proposed
  - Document 3 The Sustainability Assessment of the Proposed Changes
  - Document 4 The Habitats Regulation Assessment
- 2.15 Copies of these EIP reports and all the documentation associated with the Proposed Changes are available on the Government Office website at [www.gosw.gov.uk/gosw/planninghome/691545/713860](http://www.gosw.gov.uk/gosw/planninghome/691545/713860). It is expected that the Secretary of State will publish the final Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) by the end of 2008.
- 2.15 The following report will now highlight key areas to Cabinet, however Members should be aware that other changes are also proposed and the full proposed changes report should be read to appreciate these. The areas covered in this report are:
- Housing and employment growth and the Salisbury Housing Market Area
  - The spatial strategy statement and policies for the scale and location of development
  - Sustainability policies
  - The spatial strategy and policies for the scale and location of development. Policies D to I of the submitted dRSS (draft Regional Spatial Strategy)
  - Regional approach to transport
  - Harnessing the benefits of population growth and managing the implications of population change (affordable housing)
  - Enhancing economic prosperity and quality of employment opportunity.

### **3.0 Housing and employment growth and the Salisbury Housing Market Area – Section 4 – of the proposed changes – Sub-regional policies and housing distribution**

#### **3.1 Salisbury Housing Market Area**

A single policy (Policy HMA11) has been introduced for the Salisbury HMA providing strategic policy, housing distribution, employment land and jobs figures for the sub-region. The HMA is contiguous with the boundary of Salisbury District. The policy includes key strategic provision for the Salisbury SSCT. The proposed wording of Policy HMA11 is as follows:

*In the Salisbury HMA provision will be made for:*

*Growth of about 13,900 jobs*

*Growth of at least 12,400 dwellings distributed between the local authorities as:*

<i>Salisbury</i>	<i>12,400</i>
------------------	---------------

*Provision will be made to deliver additional waste water treatment capacity in the HMA*

#### **Salisbury SSCT**

*Salisbury will enhance its role as an employment and service centre by providing for:*

- *Improvements to retail, cultural, educational and tourism facilities in the city centre*
- *Higher-skilled employment, particularly in the office sector*
- *A reduction in traffic in the city centre*
- *Improvements to the character and setting of the city*

*Provision for sustainable housing growth will comprise at least 6,000 new homes.*

*Planning for employment will provide for about 13,500 jobs in the Salisbury TTWA and the provision of about 37 ha of employment land.*

- 3.2 The reason for introducing a single policy for Salisbury HMA is for clarity and to be comprehensive. The policy sets out the key strategic development issues for the HMA focussing in particular on the employment and service centre role of Salisbury and the need to improve facilities in the city centre. The housing provision for the HMA is consistent with the Panel's recommendation. The employment growth and employment land figures are also consistent with the Panel's recommendations, with amendment to clarify that the figure of 37 ha of employment land applies to the Salisbury Travel to Work Area. This figure is approximately 7 hectares greater than that identified through the council's employment land review, however the RSS figures are based on amended economic assumptions. The inclusion of employment land figures in the RSS should be supported.
- 3.3 Gypsy & Traveller pitch provision at district level has now been included. The need to provide for gypsies and travellers is identified through policy GT1. For Salisbury District HMA, the requirement is for 18 residential pitches and 5 transit pitches to 2011 (this is detailed in table 4.3 (p133) of the proposed changes).
- 3.4 The council's own evidence base supports the level of new housing identified within the RSS proposed changes and suggests the need to:
- Address the acute shortfall in affordable homes
  - Use the market to provide more affordable homes
  - Plan for the population living longer and together in smaller numbers
  - Provide for a growing population
  - Retain an adequate workforce to secure long-term economic prosperity
  - Meet regeneration needs
  - Maintain viable local services and create sustainable communities
  - Using new development to solve local problems
  - Ensure there is enough housing to meet identified needs
  - Provide for gypsies and travellers.
- 3.5 **Recommendation** - The level of growth proposed for the Salisbury HMA should be accepted as reasonable. Any proposal for additional growth beyond this level should be included in subsequent review of the RSS.
- 4.0 **Section 3**, The Spatial Strategy Statement and policies for the scale and location of development
- 4.1 **Development Policies A, B and C**  
This section of the RSS sets out the Core Spatial Strategy and the spatial approach to development across the South West. These policies establish a hierarchy of settlements, that should be the focus of development over the plan period.
- 4.2 Development Policy A, establishes the principle of SSCTs and that these will be the primary focus of development in the region. The SoS has rejected the Panel proposals to introduce a 4 tier hierarchy into Policy A which that have differentiated between SSCTs. The modified Policy A presents the SSCTs as a single group of settlements of which Salisbury is one. This approach is considered to be clearer than the Panel recommendation and should be supported.
- 4.3 Development Policy B relates to development at Market and Coastal Towns and the SoS has rejected the Panel's recommendations for this policy. The Panel recommended that policy B should, in the first instance, invite LPAs to identify locations that could be suitable for locally significant development through 'analysis of roles and functions' of settlements. Following the identification of settlements, the Panel recommended that the policy should indicate the broad scale and type of development that would be acceptable. The SoS has rejected the Panel's suggested approach and removed the need for LPAs to make an assessment of a

settlement's functionality. The modified text is considered to be a backwards step and the approach should be challenged.

- 4.4 As with Development Policy B, the SoS has modified the Panel recommendation for Development Policy C (development at small towns and villages) by removing the need for LPAs to consider functionality of settlements. In their report the Panel recommended that "...Policy C should make clear that analysis of roles, functions and needs is, in a plan led system, to precede rather than follow housing allocations in LDFs" (para3.2). As with Policy B, the SoS modification to Policy C is considered to dilute the policy and the change should be challenged.
- 4.5 In the context of Salisbury District, the above policies relate specifically to the distribution of development across the settlements of the district. The principles set out in the Policies A, B and C have formed the basis for the production of the LDF Settlement Strategy (see Topic Paper 3). Policy A clearly relates to Salisbury as the SSCT, while the Council's own analysis identifies Amesbury as a settlement covered by Policy B. Policy C relates to those settlements identified in the settlement strategy as 'Local service centres'.
- 4.6 The Panel report suggested the insertion of a new policy (C2) which dealt with development in the countryside. This recommendation was rejected by the SoS as the matter is already clearly dealt with by national policy in the form of PPS 7. The SoS approach should be supported.
- 4.7 Recommendation - SoS recommendations relating to Policy A should be supported. The removal from Policy B & C of the reference to the need for authorities to assess role and function of settlements should be challenged. The rejection of policy C2 should be supported

#### 5.0 **Sustainability Policies:**

Section 1 – A sustainable future for the south west - Policies SD1 – 4, Section 3 – The Spatial Strategy and Policies for the Scale and Local of Development - Policy G and Section 7 – Enhancing Distinctive Environments and Cultural Life - Policy RE5 of submitted dRSS

#### 5.1 Strategic Comments on Proposed Changes

##### *SD1 - 4*

The regionally distinctive policies for sustainability have been 'watered down' substantially according to the Sustainability Appraisal of the Proposed Changes (see in particular paras 6.7, 7.4, 7.8 and 9.29 to 9.34) and a fundamental aspect of regional distinctiveness will be lost if these policies are revised as proposed.

#### 5.2 **Policy G and RE5**

In preparing the draft RSS, the Regional Planning Board (RPB) responded to requests from stakeholders and authorities for an aspirational regional target for sustainable construction. Policy G introduced the Code for Sustainable Homes standards ahead of the national timetable, and provided a consistent framework for local decision-making. If adopted, they would make a significant contribution to delivering real reductions in the region's carbon dioxide emissions. This policy would have also benefited private developers in the region who would otherwise be faced with a variety of local standards, an inevitable consequence of the changes to Policy G and RE5 proposed by the SoS. The Panel in their deliberations were broadly content with the RPB proposals and supported the notion of setting a regional standard. The SoS in her proposed changes has replaced policy G and rather than providing strict standards as suggested within the Panel report has suggested a more dilute policy:

##### **Development Policy G**

*Local Planning Authorities should promote best practice in sustainable construction and help to achieve the national timetable for reducing carbon emissions for residential and non-residential buildings. This will include:*

- *consideration of how all aspects of development form can contribute to securing high standards of energy and water efficiency*
- *the use of sustainable drainage systems to minimise flood risk, manage surface water and encourage natural drainage and ground water recharge where appropriate*
- *designing for flexible use and adaptation to reflect changing lifestyles and needs and the principle of 'whole life costing'.*

*There will be situations where it could be appropriate for local planning authorities to anticipate higher levels of building sustainability in advance of those set out nationally, for identified development area or site-specific opportunities. When proposing any local requirements for sustainable buildings, local planning authorities must be able to demonstrate clearly the local circumstances that warrant and allow this and set them out in Development Plan Documents.*

- 5.3 The rationale for the changes may well relate to issues of housing affordability and current market conditions may well have influenced the Secretary of State's decision making about Policy G in particular. The changes proposed for the SW RSS mirror changes made in other regions. The implications of Policy G standards on delivery and affordability were considered at the EIP
- 5.4 The amendments suggested for Policy RE5 mean that the potential for reduced energy use and increased renewable energy capacity in new development (before national legislation is brought in) have been substantially reduced. Instead of setting a target for both domestic and non-domestic developments meeting a reduction in energy use equivalent to 20% of regulated carbon dioxide levels through the incorporation of on-site renewable energy, the amended RSS would only ask for a reduction of 10% of *both* regulated and unregulated energy using renewable or 'low carbon' technology, and this target would only be for residential development.
- 5.5 One of the most important justifications for the proposal for setting these challenging targets in the RSS relates to the need for large scale developments, especially new urban extensions, to be developed to the highest standards in order to ensure long term sustainability benefits (including the social benefits of lower running costs) are locked into such developments from the start. Awaiting national policy for sustainable construction and renewable energy use for both residential and non-domestic development, (both of which are still to be legislated for), could lead to a number of major developments starting or being committed to at much lower standards, despite the urgent need for reduced carbon emissions and with the prospect of having to retro fit improvements later.
- 5.6 Recommendation- It is suggested that an objection should be raised to the proposed changes to Policies SD1 to 4 and Policies G and RE5 for the reasons set out above.
- 6.0 **Section 3** – The spatial strategy and policies for the scale and location of Development.  
Policies D, E, F, H and I of submitted dRSS  
Development Policy D – Infrastructure  
Development Policy E – High Quality Design  
Development Policy F – Planning and delivery of major development  
Development Policy H – Re-using land  
Development Policy I – Release and Disposal of land
- 6.1 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Proposed Changes comments that 'The SSA of the draft RSS noted that Policies E to H were generally excellent for sustainability' (para 9.27). Policies D to J were intended to set out a clear framework of policy dealing with the development process, to be applied across the region, with the intention of driving up the quality and coordination of development. The Panel did not comment on Policies E (Design) and F (Master Planning). The Panel recommended deletion of Policy I (Release and Disposal of Land) and this has carried through into the Proposed Changes and supported Policy H (Re-Using Land) with the 50% requirement of all new housing development in the South West to be on previously developed land (including the conversion of existing buildings).
- 6.2 **Policy D and Infrastructure**  
Regarding delivery of development, in preparing the draft RSS, the Regional Planning Body (RPB) was clear that significant effort and resource would be required to ensure that the major development proposed would be supported by adequate social and transport infrastructure. The Foreword to the draft RSS states quite clearly that

*'Key to achieving this are sufficient resources to make sure important infrastructure is put in place before, or at the same time as, development occurs. Only in this way can we prevent infrastructure 'deficits' arising in future, and ensure poor living and working environments do not arise as a result of this strategy. The Assembly remains gravely concerned that the*

*resources required to deliver the very substantial investments in social, health, educational and transport infrastructure will not take place to facilitate the high levels of development envisaged in the strategy.'*

- 6.3 These views, expressed in 2006, relate to a proposed level of housing development 29% lower than the Proposed Changes envisage. The RPB recognised in the submission Implementation Plan that the identification of infrastructure needs in the draft RSS and Implementation Plan was “work in progress” and that further work will be needed to better understand the requirements to service the growth proposed. The lack of specific detail on schemes at this stage in the RSS should not hamper the preparation of LDDs by local authorities, providing that significant rapid progress can be made in identifying the precise infrastructure requirements to service the substantial additional development of housing and employment land proposed by the Secretary of State. The move to defining ‘outcomes’ for transport and other infrastructure in the Proposed Changes is supported but this too puts a premium on updating the Implementation plan.
- 6.4 Policy D in the draft RSS articulated a key concern that infrastructure should be provided in step with development. The Panel found ‘no significant shortcomings’ with Policy D (Infrastructure) and recommended no change (paragraph 3.43 of the Panel report). Whilst the policy has been retained by the Proposed Changes, the policy as proposed has lost its clear emphasis on the measures required to help ensure that infrastructure is delivered. Policy D is essential in helping to ensure that places are planned holistically and on a functional basis. Therefore, it is recommended that the Secretary of State be advised that elements of the draft RSS Policy D be re-incorporated to strengthen it in terms of the importance of cross-boundary working and an integrated approach to the planning and delivery of service infrastructure.
- 6.5 Recommendation - Regarding policies D to I of the dRSS the changes proposed should be supported, but with concern expressed about the re-wording of Policy D
- 7.0 **Section 5 – Regional Approach to Transport**
- 7.1 The changes which have been made to the transport section particularly the focus on transport corridors and the reinstatement of proposals for a “step change” in demand management linked to improved public transport in urban areas are welcome. The overall approach and objectives identified in the draft RSS have been retained including the objective of reducing the rate of growth in traffic. The main concern relates to the extent to which the Proposed Changes fail to address the functionality of routes, particularly where the routes have an inter regional function.
- 7.2 Policy RTS1 identifies the following corridors relevant to Salisbury district:
- Exeter to London via Salisbury and Basingstoke strategic corridor
  - A36 trunk route - Bristol/Bath to the South Coast strategic corridor
- 7.5 The RTS Key Diagram (Picture 5.1 Transport Map) and new policy RTS1 does not reflect the regional corridor between the Bristol/Bath area and SE Dorset.
- 7.6 The Regional Freight Map, incorporated into the draft RSS, has been deleted with a focus on the Primary Route Network being the main routes signposted for freight. While this reflects the national position it ignores the evidence base compiled for the RSS based on routes that are more fit for purpose for HGVs.
- 7.7 The Proposed Changes define transport ‘outcomes’ for each sub-region and all reference to ‘schemes’ has been deleted. This approach is supported and is in line with the RPB’s position at the EiP. It is inappropriate to include schemes in the RSS unless they are committed through the formal appraisal and scheme option development process. Inclusion of schemes that are ‘not committed’ would risk the Plan quickly becoming out of date. However this information will need to be set out in the Implementation Plan. The question for each of the sub-regions is: “do the Proposed Changes define the right outcomes and is the Key Diagram appropriate in articulating the outcomes diagrammatically. There are no transport outcomes for the Salisbury HMA.

- 7.8 Recommendation - The Proposed Changes to the Transport Section of the dRSS and the move to an outcomes focus are supported. In addition, the routes for freight set out in the Regional Freight Map should be reinstated rather than the Primary Route Network and corridors should be amended to reflect north/south connections.
- 8.0 Section 6- Harnessing the Benefits of Population Growth and Managing the Implications of Population Change  
Policy H1
- 8.1 The Proposed Changes have deleted text in policy H1 (Affordable Housing) that enabled local authorities to specify affordable housing 'rates up to 60% or higher in areas of greatest need'. As the draft RSS (submitted April 2006) predates the publication of Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing (published November 2006) it is acknowledged that national policy has superseded Policy H1 and enables Local Authorities to specify their own affordable housing targets based on an assessment of need and economic viability (PPS3: Housing Para 27-30). It is suggested therefore that this change to RSS Policy should not be challenged. Consultants are currently preparing an Economic Viability Study for Salisbury District to inform the affordable housing targets to be included in the emerging Core Strategy.
- 88.2 The affordable housing target has been increased from 7,500 dwellings per annum (dpa) to 10,000 dpa across the south west. High affordable housing need in the region is well documented and the increase in the affordable housing target is an appropriate response although actual delivery is well below this level. Housing Corporation target level for affordable housing is 6,200 dpa which raises concerns about delivery at the higher level. It should be borne in mind that further evidence, commissioned by the South West Housing Corporation and published after the South West EIP, does raise concern about the economic viability of even the draft RSS 30% target in some local authority areas. However, as referred to above, the affordable housing target for the Salisbury HMA will be based on the latest evidence as set out in the emerging Economic Viability Study.
- 8.3 **Recommendation - There are no significant concerns about the Proposed Changes to Policy H1.**
- 9.0 **Section 8 – Enhancing Economic Prosperity and Quality of Employment Opportunity.**
- 9.1 The changes to section 8 of the draft RSS have been made largely in line with the Panel Report. The new spatial economy policy (ES1) is a welcome addition. Policy ES2 'Providing for Employment Land and Premises' could be strengthened by referring to the need for joint working / collaboration across Local Authority boundaries.
- 9.2 The changes to the town centres policy largely reflects discussions and suggestions made during the EiP, which were supported. The requirement, as part of policy TO2 'Other Centres', for Local Authorities and partners to collaborate across administrative boundaries is welcomed, a requirement, which, for consistency should be a key part of any policy where planning and delivery on a functional basis is essential.
- 9.3 Further work on overall strategy for town centres including planning for growth in retail, cultural and other facilities (which may be required by revised PPS6) will need to be undertaken as part of the partial review of the RSS proposed by the Secretary of State.
- 9.4 The changes to the Tourism section have taken on the majority of revised wording suggested by the RPB at the EiP and the Casino policy has been deleted given the change in circumstances, meaning that the policy is no longer needed.
- 9.5 **There are no significant concerns about the Proposed Changes to Section 8**



## 10.0 Recommendations:

10.1 It is recommended that:

- a) The level of growth proposed for the Salisbury HMA should be accepted as a reasonable proposal for regional housing provision. Any additional proposed growth beyond this level should be included in any partial review activity which may take place subsequently.
- b) SoS recommendations relating to Policy A should be supported. The removal from Policy B & C of the reference to the need for authorities to assess the role and function of settlements should be challenged. The rejection of policy C2 should be supported
- c) An objection should be raised to the proposed changes to Policies SD1 to 4 and Policies G and RE5 for the reasons set out in section 6 of this report.
- d) The changes proposed to policies D, E, F, H and I should be largely supported with concern expressed about the re-wording of Policy D
- e) The Proposed Changes to the Transport Section of the dRSS and the move to an outcomes focus are supported. In addition, the routes for freight set out in the Regional Freight Map should be reinstated rather than the Primary Route Network and corridors should amended to reflect north/south connections
- f) There are no significant concerns about the Proposed Changes to Policy H1
- g) No significant concerns should be expressed about the Proposed Changes to Section 8
- h) Members highlight any other relevant issues they would like fed back in respect to the consultation on the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy Proposed Changes
- i) The Forward Planning team be authorised to respond to the consultation on the draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West Proposed Changes based on these recommendations with any amendments agreed by the Cabinet

### Background Papers:

- The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West 2006 – 2026 -
- South West EIP Panel Report for the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West – December 2007
- The Draft Revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West Incorporating the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes – July 2008
- The South West Regional Spatial Strategy: Schedule of the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes and Reasons – July 2008-09-19
- South West Regional Spatial Strategy Proposed Changes Sustainability Appraisal Final Report and Non- Technical Summary – July 2008
- South West Regional Spatial Strategy Proposed Changes Habitats Regulations Assessment Final Report and Non –Technical Summary – July 2008

### Implications:

**Legal** : In the report.

**Financial** : There are no financial implications in respect of this report

**Personnel (POD)** : None

**Environmental** : These considerations are at the heart of the development of a set of new planning policies

**Human Rights** : None at this stage

**Council's Core Values** : Excellent Service; Fairness and Equality; open, learning Council and a willing partner; communicating with the public; supporting the disadvantaged.

**Consultation Undertaken:** This is the third round of public consultation on the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy

**Parish Affected** : All