
REGIONAL PLANNING GUIDANCE (RPG 14) FOR THE EAST OF ENGLAND - CONSULTATION ON OPTIONS

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report seeks Members' views on a document published by the East of England Local Government Conference or options for Regional Planning Guidance in the East of England.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 The creation of the East of England region means that the current planning guidance for East Anglia must be married to that portion of the South East planning guidance covering Essex, Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire to produce new planning guidance for the Eastern Region.
- 2.2 The process for the preparation of Regional Planning Guidance begins with the East of England Local Government Conference (LGC) and the publication of this options document.
- 2.3 The consultation period runs until the 16th December 2002. Thereafter, the LGC intends to prepare a draft of the guidance by mid-2003 for submission to the Deputy Prime Minister, followed by a second period of consultation.
- 2.4 A public examination of the guidance will then be held in 2004 by a Panel appointed by the Deputy Prime Minister, followed by publication of the final RPG 14.
- 2.5 A series of questions are included in the consultation document and these are attached in Appendix 1 to this report.

3 KEY ISSUES

- 3.1 The key issues for the region identified in the report are:-
- the implications arising from future population growth;
 - how to promote economic growth to fulfil the aspiration to reach 20th place in the ranking of EU regions by 2010;
 - how to develop transport infrastructure and tackle congestion generally;
 - how to deal with the proposals for a new lower Thames crossing;
 - the development of gateways - ports and airports in particular;

- the relationship to London and the need for a spatial match between the regional strategy and the Mayor's Plan for London;
- Green Belt - the need or not for wholesale review;
- climate change and water resources.

- 3.2 In considering these key issues, the LGC has proposed four spatial scenarios for the way in which growth could be located in the region.

1. Continuation of existing policy

This would mean focusing development on the main urban centres; regeneration of Thames Gateway; protecting and enhancing key areas of environmental importance; no major changes to Green Belts; continued support for the economic and social well-being of the rural areas and, emphasis on sustainable transport and incremental improvements to transport infrastructure.

2. Building on strengths of Regional Centres

This option would require significant development around major towns; economic and housing growth in Thames Gateway South Essex; focus on principal transport gateways; locally derived growth in market towns; and a lower Thames crossing and outer orbital link.

3. Building on Regional Strengths

The focus is on making provision to allow dynamic economies to reach their full potential; major investment in Thames Gateway; promoting biodiversity; maximising agricultural potential; improving tourism/recreation gateways; and improving inter-urban and intra-urban public transport networks.

4. A new settlement as a prime location for growth

- 3.3 The consultation document includes a table comparing each spatial scenario with proposed objectives and this is attached as Appendix 2 to this report.

Housing

- 3.4 At this early stage in the preparation of the new regional guidance, no detailed figures of future housing numbers are provided, although the key spatial principles for the location of development are outlined (with a focus on sustainability).
- 3.5 A series of housing sub-regions are proposed on the basis that a focus on District Council areas makes little sense in relation to overall planning needs. For South Essex a sub-region is proposed around Rochford, Southend, Castle Point, Basildon and Thurrock. This is, of course, the same grouping for Thames Gateway South Essex.

- 3.6 Key points to address in considering future housing development will be: use of previously developed land; housing density; and affordable housing provision.

Transport

- 3.7 Significant investment is required to develop a strategic transport network that reflects the needs of the region and integrates with the local network. This includes development of both road and rail infrastructure.
- 3.8 Notwithstanding a conclusion that major investment is required in transport infrastructure, it is suggested that policies will be required to encourage modal shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transport. Road charging is proposed as an option to significantly reduce traffic growth.

4 DISCUSSION

- 4.1 This is an options consultation paper and, inevitably, it is heavy on suggestion and light on concrete proposals, particularly with regard to key areas such as housing, economic development and transport.
- 4.2 The commentary in this section of the report is based on the consultation questions listed in Appendix 1. Note that several of the questions have not been considered.
1. As a general view of the future of the region, a vision to develop a prosperous, outward looking and more sustainable region seems reasonable.
 2. The strategic aims are listed in Appendix 2 to this report: these seem reasonable.
 3. The objectives are listed in Appendix 3 to this report: again, these seem reasonable.
 4. The key principles from existing Regional Planning Guidance have been closely scrutinised through a Public Inquiry and, given that they focus on economic development, transport improvements, protection of natural resources, etc., provide a reasonable starting point for the new guidance.

5. In as much as the proposed spatial principles propose focusing major generators of travel demand in urban areas, ensuring that new development offers wide travel choice, locating development in rural areas at service centre focal points, etc., the general spatial principles can be supported.
7. The new RPG must give full support to the Thames Gateway and, in particular, reflect the demand for significant improvements to transport infrastructure. The gateway in South Essex should be highlighted as a key area for economic regeneration.
8. Yes, significant investment in transport infrastructure is required. These should include examining options for developing existing strategic road and rail transport links.
9. These are key issues for the RPG and the response to them will result in implications for future housing provision in districts. The difficulty at the moment is that the 2001 Census has only just become available and realistically future requirements should use this as the base for projections. Two areas are likely to influence future dwelling provision: first, the level of in-migration and, second, household formation rates.

The level of in-migration has increased significantly in the late 1990's, over the rate experienced through the 1980's, from about 18,500 per year to about 32,000 per year. A key element of this seems to be an increase in population movement from London. Migration will be influenced by Government policy designed to stimulate growth in less prosperous regions. The rate of household formation in the region has been lower than expected: it is not clear if this is a long-term trend or not.

Given the significant levels of uncertainty, it is considered that extreme caution should be exercised in reaching conclusions about future dwelling provision at this early stage.

10. The challenge is to develop a regional economic strategy that ensures areas with strong growth are supported but, at the same time, develops those areas, including the Thames Gateway, where regeneration is crucial. It would be all too easy to focus on achieving this aspiration by supporting areas of already strong growth at the expense of regeneration.

12. It is far from clear that road user charging will successfully reduce the number of private vehicles on the roads and thus assist improvements to public transport. The introduction of road charging in London will, in due course, provide evidence of car drivers' willingness to abandon their vehicles in favour of public transport.
13. The provision of a Lower Thames Crossing is a national rather than a regional issue, but there is no doubt that consideration of a new lower crossing must be fully considered. Whilst it is likely that the final decision on this will rest with the Government, there is no doubt that a new crossing has the potential to open-up the Eastern Region and to trigger very substantial economic benefits. On this basis, a new lower Thames Crossing, with both rail and road links should be supported through the RPG.
14. Gateways (Airports, Shellhaven, Felixstowe, etc.) will play a key role in spatial strategy, particularly from the perspective of economic growth.
15. High level of support for the regeneration of the Thames Gateway, development of better road and rail links and acceptance that London should be handling its own waste.

Inevitably, there is a very close economic relationship between the southern part of the region and London. There is no escaping from this situation and it is unlikely that it will change in the future, given the strength of London as a world City. Many people in the South of the region will continue to commute to London for work, but the regeneration of the Thames Gateway, M11 corridor, etc., should provide some re-balancing in the relationship.

16. It is agreed that there is no requirement for any wholesale review of Green Belts. The Essex Structure Plan requires a detailed survey of inner Green Belt boundaries to be carried out and no doubt this will apply in other Counties also. The results from such studies may result in minor changes to inner boundaries, but no more than that. Against this positive scenario though must be weighed the regeneration proposals, transport infrastructure developments and of course, housing. It is difficult to see that the Green Belt will escape unscathed from development intrusions over the next twenty years.
17. Climate change is a very important issue and there is no doubt that the RPG will need to consider strategic policies dealing with flood risk, managed retreat, etc., and the full implications of social and economic blight.

18. Future development in the region will be dependent on water supply and, in strategic terms, it will be essential to relate provision and enhancement of supply closely with areas where new development is eventually planned.

Efficient measures, sustainable drainage systems, etc., must become the norm for all new developments, although it may be such changes will be driven nationally by Government.

19. All the spatial scenarios see the largest percentage of new housing provision in Essex. However, the local implications of this are far from clear at this stage, particularly given the levels of development likely to be associated with Stansted and the M11 corridor. The DPM's proposals on housing have yet to be announced.

It is considered that a strategy based on scenario 1 (continuing with existing policy) is unlikely to be acceptable to the Government.

More likely, is the adoption of either scenario 2 or 3. If scenario 4 was proposed, there is no doubt that it would have to take into account significant elements of scenarios 2 or 3 or else there would be a dearth of resources directed towards regeneration in, for example, Thames Gateway, which is already a priority.

In both scenarios 2 and 3, notwithstanding comments made above about the Green Belt, there is no doubt that there would be an impact in South Essex as a result of investment in the Thames Gateway and the resultant economic and housing growth.

21. The RPG will have to identify the M11 Stansted corridor as an area for major investment and growth: new transport infrastructure is essential. Significant levels of new housing likely to be required in association with the development of Stansted.
30. The issues raised in the consultation document are supported: major investment in new transport infrastructure, including a lower Thames Crossing, development in the Thames Gateway and other key areas for regeneration, promotion of the gateways (Shellhaven, Haven Ports, etc.), encouragement for small and medium businesses, focusing on rural areas, etc., will all contribute towards the economic success of the region.

31. Business clusters are defined as groups of Companies focusing on particular skills, technologies and so on. These may not be geographically orientated and, in reality, planning policy can probably do little more than assist existing clusters to grow and develop, perhaps by ensuring that transport housing and other infrastructure, especially the availability of broadband, is in place.
32. Priority Areas for Regeneration (or PARs) and Priority Areas for Economic Regeneration (PAERs) are a part of existing RPG. Whilst economic investment may be the key driver to improvements in such areas (Tendring Coast for example), there is no doubt that economic considerations alone are not enough. A broader focus on social environmental and economic issues is really much more appropriate although, of course, a judgement will be required in respect of the balance to be struck between each theme.
33. It would be disappointing if RPG did not consider rural areas, given the extensive areas of countryside in the region.
34. In some respects, the suggestion that RPG define sub-regions for housing, reflects the emerging guidance from Government on Local Development Frameworks, the proposed replacement for Local Plans.

The advice on LDF's is that they do not need to follow current administrative boundaries, but rather should include policies that are designed to reflect the requirements of wider areas. For the RPG, the consultation paper proposes a housing sub-region based on Thurrock, Basildon, Castle Point, Southend and Rochford, which is conveniently the same grouping for Thames Gateway South Essex.

Inevitably, leaving aside the local issues likely to be identified through LDF's, the identification of sub-regions to guide housing development through RPG does make more sense than basing conclusions on County boundaries as has been the case up to now. There will be an opportunity to better focus housing supply on the characteristics and needs of the sub-regions which should create a more responsive planning framework.

35. The proportion of new housing development on previously developed land is a key part of the Government's housing strategy. However, there is no doubt that even across the whole of South Essex, previously developed land that can be used for housing is not in abundance.

Notwithstanding the fact that the proportion of housing on such land has in Essex been slightly exceeding the Government's target of 60%, it is not considered appropriate then to raise the stakes for the period of RPG to 2021 to 70% for Essex. Even with increases in density of development, it is considered that 70% would be very difficult to achieve.

36. The Government is taking steps to adopt powers to prevent housing on larger sites from achieving minimum density targets. Really, the RGP should, as is indicated in the consultation document, focus on strategic issues and avoid interfering with matters that should be subject to local level policy making.

The consultation paper suggests that a density target of 35-40 dwellings per hectare should be adopted, but the question to be asked is why this target when the Government appears to accept a minimum of 30 per hectare?

37. Given the movement of population across district boundaries in South Essex to place of work, there is little doubt that the need for affordable housing may justifiably be considered beyond district boundaries, perhaps in relation to the suggested sub-regional housing areas.

However, whatever policy advice is eventually provided by RPG, it is only at the local level that provision can be achieved. At this stage and, pending announcements from Government, decisions about advice in RPG should be put on hold.

One area though where the RPG might assist is in promoting the case for increased subsidy to affordable housing supply, given that at the moment, the planning system is used as the key mechanism to achieve provision: increased subsidy should help RSL's achieve more direct provision rather than relying solely on private housebuilders.

38. The two options are either major strategic investment or an emphasis on reducing traffic growth.

Whilst, in principle, an argument supporting measures to reduce traffic growth can be made, there is no doubt that the region is suffering significantly from lack of infrastructure and this, in turn, impacts on economic success.

Really, for the region to achieve the target of getting into the top 20 of regions in Europe, the emphasis must be on investment. Certainly, in South Essex, there are transport infrastructure problems to overcome but, more broadly, as stated above, the provision of a new lower Thames crossing, together with other major road and rail connections would be the catalyst to developing and sustaining economic prosperity in the region.

41. Yes, there is no doubt that improved interchanges are essential.
42. The decision by the SRA to reduce the number of rail franchises is to be welcomed and this decision may very well have more impact than any advice through the RPG.
43. Parking Standards are not a matter for RPG.
46. The strategy could take a view on this, although it is not clear how this would influence improvements where problems are identified.
47. It is not clear why this would be helpful.
48. A rail link under the Thames has already been discussed. Other improvements in South Essex to link the C2C to the Great Eastern Freight line (Benfleet to Wickford?) plus better connections from the Great Eastern northwards would be beneficial - to avoid travelling all the way to Shenfield.

Freight movement in the Thames Gateway is the subject of a recent Consultants' report commissioned by EEDA and the results of the study should be taken into account. Freight movement is a key driver towards economic prosperity.
49. A difficult question, but inevitably a balance must be struck between the economic needs of the region and environmental impacts. This is particularly so in the case of Airport development.
50. Targets are proposed in respect of modal split, freight on rail, rural buses and car traffic in urban areas. Whilst these may be aspirations, it is difficult to see how easy it will be to use the RPG as the key tool to achieve these.
51. It is agreed that the current approach to discourage development in areas at flood risk should be continued.

52. Whilst the RPG might provide aspirations for reductions in energy, usage, etc., it may be that it can only ever be of limited impact in achieving a real step change. Certainly, renewable sources of energy generation should be promoted, off-shore wind generation in particular, but other tools (Government policy, Building Regulations, etc.) are more likely to influence energy efficiency in the built environment.
53. The preparation of management strategies for the coastal/estuarine areas can really only be tackled at the local level. However, the RPG can set the scene by providing a framework for management that is fairly prescriptive and takes account of the challenges of climate change, rises in sea level and the wider implications of managed retreat.
54. A detailed and extensive framework of controls already exists to protect the built and archaeological heritage. Whilst RPG can promote high standards of design, consideration of setting, etc., these are really issues that are best dealt with at local level against the backdrop of national protective guidance and designations.
55. Protection of valuable landscape, woodlands, land and soils, air and water quality and the promotion of biodiversity, are all matters to be promoted through the RPG although, as above, the guidance should avoid getting into too much detail which should be dealt with locally.
56. Cultural issues, tourism, etc. are all fundamental elements of the planning policy framework and the RPG must consider options for development, particularly given the number of people employed in such industries. Cultural facilities are required to support new housing development and this is one aspect that often lags well behind in provision. It is also the case that whilst tourism can be very important in urban areas, it also very often underpins the economy in rural areas and can contribute positively to assisting social exclusion. Overall then culture should be given some weight in the RPG.
57. The detailed provision of cultural facilities is something best left to analysis of need at the local level and for provision then as required through Local Plans/LDFs.

60. The way forward on waste management has really been set by the draft Regional Waste Management Strategy which reflects government targets on waste recovery. The options paper suggests that while recycling, waste minimisation, etc. are crucial elements of the waste management strategy, in the longer term other recovery options are likely to be required. Difficult decisions will definitely need to be taken on waste management facilities in the future, though the assessment of appropriate locations for development, beyond broad brush guidance in the RPG, is a matter for waste Local Plans. However, these will need to conform to a clear regional framework that sits within the government's longer-term ambitions for waste.

5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The new Regional Planning Guidance will undoubtedly have wide ranging and significant environmental implications for the region.

6 RECOMMENDATION

It is proposed that the Committee **RESOLVES**
That, subject to comments from Members, this report forms the basis of the Council's response to the option consultation paper on Regional Planning Guidance for the East of England. (HPS)

Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning Services

Background Papers:

None.

For further information please contact Shaun Scrutton on:-

Tel:- 01702 318100
E-Mail:- shaun.scrutton@rochford.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1

**EAST OF ENGLAND - YOUR REGION ? YOUR CHOICE ?
YOUR FUTURE**

**CONSULTATION ON OPTIONS LEADING TO CONSULTATION
QUESTIONS**

- Q.1 Do you agree with RPG 14's vision?
If not, what changes would you make and why?
- Q.2 Do you agree with RPG 14's strategic aims?
If not, what changes would you make and why?
- Q.3 Do you agree with RPG 14's objectives?
If not, what changes would you make and why?
- Q.4 Do you agree that the key principles from existing Regional Planning
Guidance should be continued in RPG 14?
If not, what changes would you make and why?
- Q.5 Do you agree with the spatial principles suggested for RPG14?
If not, what changes would you make and why?
- Q.6 Do you agree that existing RPG policy for the Cambridge Sub-region
should be continued without major change?
- Q.7 Do you agree that RPG14 should continue existing Thames Gateway
policies?
If not, how should RPG 24 address the Thames Gateway's needs, and
why?
- Q.8 Do you agree that the Thames Gateway, especially South Essex,
needs significant investment in transport infrastructure?
What do you think should be the priorities for future investment?
- Q.9 How should RPG 14 respond to:
- The overall likely long-term increase in regional population?
 - The apparent increase in the rate of population movement into the
East of England from London?
 - The apparent change in the rate of household formation?
- Q.10 How should RPG 14 respond to the RES aspiration that the region
should reach 20th place in the ranking of EU regions by 2020?

- Q.11 How should RPG 14 respond to economic growth pressures in Hertfordshire and south-west Essex?
- Q.12 Do you agree that road-user charging is, in the end, inevitable? If not, how should RPG 14 respond to traffic growth, congestion and environmental problems on the strategic and local road networks?
- Q.13 How should RPG24 address the Lower Thames Crossing issue? What balance should be struck between regional and national issues?
- Q.14 What role should gateways have in spatial strategy, in relation to, for example:-
- economic growth;
 - sustainable transport;
 - other centres of economic activity, i.e. major cities and towns?
- Q.15 How should RPG 14 respond to the spatial, economic and other relationships between the East of England and Greater London?
- Q.16 What approach should RPG 14 adopt on Green Belts in relation to other issues discussed in the spatial strategy?
- Q.17 How should RPG 14 address possible long-term climate changes?
- Q.18 How should RPG 14 address water resource issues in the region?
- Q.19 Which spatial scenario offers the best basis for RPG 14's spatial strategy? Which elements of the scenario, if any, would you leave out and which elements of other scenarios, if any, would you add to it?
- Q.20 How should RPG 14 address the issues emerging from the Milton Keynes and South Midlands study?
- Q.21 How should RPG 14 address the issues emerging from the London-Stansted-Cambridge study?
- Q.22 How should RPG 14 address development pressures, regeneration needs, transport and other infrastructure constraints, and development constraints, in the Arc around London?
- Q.23 Do you agree that Peterborough-Huntingdon and the Fens could be recognised as a sub-regional focus in RPG 14? What advantages or disadvantages would you see in such designation?

- Q.24 Do you agree that Norwich could be recognised as a sub-regional focus in RPG 14? What advantages or disadvantages would you see in such designation?
- Q.25 Do you agree that Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft could be recognised as a sub-regional focus in RPG 14? What advantages or disadvantages would you see in such designation?
- Q.26 Should RPG 14 support development of Great Yarmouth 'Eastport'?
- Q.27 Would there be advantages in proposing any joint policies for Norwich and Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft sub-regions?
- Q.28 Do you agree that the Haven Gateway could be identified as a sub-regional focus in RPG 14? What advantages or disadvantages would you see in such designation?
- Q.29 Should any further sub-regions be included in RPG 14, either in place of or in addition to those identified above? Do the 'economic arcs' merit inclusion in RPG 14?
- Q.30 Are there any specific policies or issues concerning the economy you consider must be included or discussed in RPG 14?
- Q.31 How could support for business clusters be best achieved by RPG? Please explain your views.
- Q.32 Should Priority Areas for Regeneration be defined by reference to all factors (i.e., social, environmental, etc.) or only economic ones?
- Q.33 How should RPG 14 address economic development needs in rural areas, villages or smaller market towns?
- Q.34 Do you agree that defining sub-regions could assist RPG 14 in:
guiding housing developments to the correct broad locations;
enabling housing supply to be monitored and managed in line with changing conditions?
If not, what alternative approach would you recommend, any why?
- Q.35 Do you agree with the suggestions for increasing the proportion of development coming forward on previously developed land? If not, what targets do you suggest and how could they be achieved?
- Q.36 What should RPG do to foster the achievement of higher targets, for example on design, density and re-use of land/buildings (bearing in mind that RPG must focus on strategic issues, and not try to dictate detailed, local implementation)?

- Q.37 What targets should RPG 14 set for affordable housing provision? Would the definition of sub-areas assist provision? If so, what sub-areas should be used, and what should the targets be?
- Q.38 Do you think the emphasis should be more on Transport Option A or Option B? Do you consider this relevant in all parts of the region? And for all the spatial options?
- Q.39 Do you agree with these transport objectives?
- Q.40 Do you consider that the road and rail networks adequately identify links of national and regional significance? If not, what changes would you wish to see - and why? What parts of the network require significant investment to enable them to fulfil their role in the hierarchy?
- Q.41 Should key regional transport nodes (e.g. Bedford, Cambridge, Luton, Stansted, Stevenage, Thames Gateway and Watford) be the focus for improved network and interchange possibilities?
- Q.42 What type of management should take place on the strategic rail and road networks? Where should this be concentrated?
- Q.43 Should RPG 14 set maximum levels of parking provision for non-residential developments lower than those set out in PPG 13 where there is (or could be) good public transport accessibility levels (e.g. in town centres)? If so, do you think 70% of the maximum level would be appropriate?
- Q.44 Under what circumstances could workplace parking charges and/or congestion charging be introduced in the region's main urban areas?
- Q.45 Are there any areas where there is a particular need for improvement in the provision of strategic rail and/or bus/coach services?
- Q.46 Should the RTS identify where local public transport investment should be targeted? If so, how should it be targeted? To achieve maximum model shift? To guarantee a minimum service provision where commercial services are not viable?
- Q.47 Do you consider that the identification of public transport nodes as locations for regional or sub-regional development is a helpful approach?
- Q.48 What rail and road freight improvements do you consider are required? Where should strategic freight interchange be encouraged?

- Q.49 How far should environmental, safety, social inclusion and quality of life impacts of strategic transport policy proposals determine whether and how proposals are implemented?
- Q.50 Do you consider that the proposed targets adequately reflect the transport objectives?
- Q.51 How should RPG 14 set guidance for Flood Risk Assessment at a strategic level?
- Q.52 How should regional policy encourage greater energy efficiency? How best should regional policy encourage the achievement of renewable energy generation targets? Should RPG 14 set county-level targets for renewable energy, or should they be set on some other basis (e.g. regional, sub-regional)? Should RPG 14 include policies for non-renewable energy generating capacity and energy distribution networks? If so, what approach should be taken?
- Q.53 What are the most important coastal management issues to be resolved and what are the key elements of a vision for the future planning of the Region's coast to be incorporated in RPG?
- Q.54 All elements of the built and archaeological heritage are important, but which are particularly significant to the region and how can RPG ensure that they are conserved and enhanced?
- Q.55 Do you agree with the policy approaches suggested above for the management of land, air and water quality? If not, what policies should be pursued? Are there other issues that RPG should address?
- Q.56 What weight should RPG 14 give to culture as a component of regional planning policies?
- Q.57 How should RPG 14 address existing deficiencies in cultural provision, and the need to ensure proper co-ordination of community and cultural provision in association with new development?
- Q.58 Should RPG 14 make any specific strategic proposals? If so, which proposals justify inclusion in the RPG, and why?
- Q.59 Is the present approach to re-use and recycling of recycled aggregates sufficient? Could further measures be taken to increase the supply from this source, particularly in the context of measures to increase the re-use of previously used land?

- Q.60 How should RPG 14 incorporate the principles of the Regional Waste Management Strategy (RWMS)? How can we ensure that new facilities can be developed in the right locations without adverse impact on new or existing development, and without inhibiting the region's ability to ensure proper, sustainable treatment of waste? Are there any conflicts with other aspects of regional strategy? If so, how can they be resolved?

APPENDIX 2

STRATEGIC AIMS

- i to conserve and enhance the rich cultural and environmental diversity of the region;
- ii to promote social progress and improvement in the quality of life of those living in, working in or visiting the region;
- iii to enable the region's potential for economic growth to be achieved in the interests of all groups of people and all parts of the region;
- iv to protect and enhance the quality of the region's natural and built environment, including the diversity of its wildlife and landscape character; and
- v to manage resources innovatively and in accordance with sustainable development principles, in order to minimise the region's global environmental impact.

APPENDIX 3

OBJECTIVES

- i promote prosperity and employment growth, where appropriate, to meet identified employment needs;
- ii promote social inclusion and access to employment and services among disadvantaged groups;
- iii promote and enhance cultural and environmental diversity while addressing the distinctive needs of constituent parts of the region;
- iv promote regeneration and renewal in disadvantaged areas;
- v deliver more integrated patterns of land use, activity and development, including employment and housing;
- vi promote the vitality and viability of town centres;
- vii promote the re-use of previously developed land in meeting future development needs;
- viii meet identified housing needs, and in particular provide sufficient affordable housing;
- ix promote the protection and enhancement of the built and natural environment, including consideration of flood risk, and encourage good quality design for all new developments whether or not related to heritage buildings or landscapes;
- x minimise the demand for use of resources, in particular water, minerals, aggregates and other natural resources whether finite or renewable, by encouraging efficient use, re-use, or use of recycled alternatives, and endeavouring to meet needs with minimum impact;
- xi minimise the environmental impact of travel, by reducing the need to travel, encouraging the use of more environmentally friendly modes of transport, and widening choice of modes;
- xii ensure that infrastructure programmes, whether for transport, utilities or social infrastructure, will meet current deficiencies and development requirements; and that the responsible agencies commit the resources needed to implement these programmes.