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Executive summary

1. This report looks at sub-regions and growth proposals in London and the area within 30km of its boundary. These areas are included in 3 regional plans, which have been produced by the regional planning bodies (RPBs) within the study area: the East of England Regional Assembly; the Mayor of London; and the South East England Regional Assembly. Each of their regional plans has now progressed beyond the Examination in Public stage. All 3 EiP Panel reports criticised the weakness of inter-regional dimensions in each plan.

2. The designated areas are of two kinds. First a set of areas which will experience significant growth and change: the Government’s 2 Growth Areas (Thames Gateway and London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough); 3 inter-regional “corridors”, proposed in the Further Alterations to the London Plan; and key urban growth points. Second, each regional plan includes other sub-regions for which particular policies are proposed to meet their distinctive characteristics.

3. The study looked at all these designated areas in terms of their distinctiveness, added value, ownership and effectiveness. It found that the inter-regional aspects of policy were weak, except for the Thames Gateway. The key urban growth areas do have a strong impetus, but the relationships between them are underdeveloped. The analysis suggested that there is little difference between the scale of housing and population growth planned in the designated areas and in the rest of the study area.

4. What emerged was a pattern of spreading growth across the study area. For example, there are 48 urban growth points (Hubs, Key Centres and Opportunity Areas), most of which are expected to have “medium” levels of growth (5-16,000 more housing over about 20 years). No less than 18 reviews of parts of the Metropolitan Green Belt are suggested. The London Arc and London Fringe, initially conceived as having a degree of constraint of development, will have rates of growth similar to the rest of the study area.

5. The study found that the implementation plans for all 3 regions were impressive, but lacking in substantial inter-regional dimensions. For example, issues of transport and water infrastructure clearly cross regional boundaries, but relatively little joint analysis has been done. The tendency to “spread” growth across the study area could increase unit costs of infrastructure and service provision; and incremental, dispersed development could make it difficult to capture the scale of resources needed to fund strategic infrastructure, including public transport schemes.

6. There are a number of ways in which the inter-regional aspects of planning in the study area could be strengthened, both in implementing current regional plans and in the formulation of the next round of “reviews” of plans.

Recommendations

- More joint evidence gathering and assessment should be undertaken, focused on key issues of connectivity, such as transport modelling, assessment of environmental criteria in the Green Belt and studies of water and drainage supply and of flood management. Work commissioned by one region should use a brief that could be adopted by the other two regions wherever possible.
• There should be more mutual and informal assessment of the 3 plans as they evolve between the 3 RPBs. Other key stakeholders, such as statutory undertakers should be engaged in these ongoing assessments. The Sustainability Appraisal process for each plan could facilitate this.

• There should be a “light touch” joint exercise to consider the options for the spatial development strategy across the study area. Continuation of the current spreading approach should be evaluated alongside options such as a more polycentric approach, more reliance on “co-ordination corridors”, more intensification in urban area and more emphasis upon a functional economic geography approach. This exercise should take account of the wider spatial context. This would emphatically not amount to a joint plan, but could offer a non-binding framework within which each RPB would determine its own spatial policy. This exercise could be extended beyond the study area to cover the Greater South East.

• There are some “co-ordination areas”, which cross regional boundaries, that have strong connections and which would benefit from light-touch joint analysis to ensure that the inter-action of development and transport is taken into account. There should be short studies for 4 such co-ordination areas: Upper Lea Valley to Harlow and Stansted; Brent Cross to Luton; the Western Wedge; Croydon-Gatwick. The Thames Gateway, however, needs to focus on delivery rather than on any further rounds of plan-making.

• The sub-regions could be a good basis for work on “implementation frameworks”: these should have a cross-boundary element and acknowledge the possibilities of overlapping sub-regional areas.

• More consideration should be given to strengthening the planned approach for groupings of small and medium sized towns, for example in the north of the study area.

• The collaborative process should be phased in order to learn from progress and to make best use of limited resources and capacity. Sufficient resources will need to be made available to support the process; the RPBs, Government Offices and Regional Development Agencies should be supportive of collaborative projects. The proposed exercise on options for spatial development (recommendation 3) should be a priority. A joint analysis of transport infrastructure should be an early priority. The first “co-ordination area” to be looked at could usefully be the Brent Cross to Luton area.

7 The report acknowledges the factors that constrain inter-regional working, including the shortage of staff and other resources and the many demands for collaborative working. However, it argues that joint working would add value, make fuller use of the great expertise and fund of good practice within the 3 regions, attract more resources and reduce the threat of external intervention. The Inter Regional Forum has a key role to play in encouraging and supervising a more co-operative approach. Many of the suggestions for more joint work on the study area would apply equally to work on the Greater South East as a whole.

8 It is understandable that the first phases of plan making have been rather introverted. Each RPB is a relatively new institution charged with producing a new form of spatial strategy across complex regions with heavy growth impetus and strong environmental and other constraints. Having reached an advanced
stage in the first round of regional planning, the RPBs should now have more
time, experience, resources and inclination to work together in the
implementation phase and in the next round of plan making.
1 Introduction

1.1.1 This consultants’ report was prepared by Robin Thompson Associates and Urban Studio—the planning and urban design practice in the Tribal Group (formerly part of Llewelyn-Davies). It was commissioned in November 2007 by an inter-regional grouping led by the East of England Regional Assembly, and carried out over the three months to early March 2008.

1.1.2 The report looks at sub-regions and growth proposals in London and the area within 30 km of its boundary.

1.1.3 The first full round of regional planning across the Greater South East is now nearing completion. Each of the 3 regions within it have produced their Regional Spatial Strategies, which are complete or in their late stages; Plans for the East of England, London and the South East. The Inter-regional Forum, which co-ordinates the planning of the 3 regions, has commissioned this study of the various sub-regions and growth proposals in a study area, which comprises London and an area roughly 30 km beyond its boundary (Figure 1). This is the area in which there are generally the most significant inter-actions between the 3 regions. The Forum wishes to assess the effectiveness of sub-regions and other policy areas in the 3 plans and to draw lessons for the implementation processes and for the next round of regional plan making. It wants to consider the key pressures and opportunities, which the planning system has to deal with in the study area. There is a particular focus upon inter-regional collaboration. The study has been undertaken by working with a steering group of representatives of the 3 regions, studying the regional plans and related documents, interviewing key agencies and holding a workshop for stakeholders, drawn from a number of agencies across the study area.

Figure 1 Study Area
Chapter 2 below sets out the issues involved in managing growth across this area. Chapter 3 examines the main planned growth locations and sub-regions and how effective the proposals for them appear to be. Chapter 4 looks at how growth is to be delivered and at the constraints and opportunities facing the development process. Chapter 5 draws conclusions about the way in which future strategic planning in the area might proceed, and about how implementation might be made most effective, drawing on lessons from current regional planning.
2 Managing growth in the study area

2.1.1 The large majority of land in the study area is either built development, including London itself, or protected by the Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB). The area has a current population of 13.7 million, of whom 7.5 m live in London. It is part of the engine room of the UK economy with a total of 6.6m jobs in 2001. Under the 3 current regional plans, the population of the whole study area is planned to grow by 1.7 m by 2029, of which nearly 1m will be within London. In addition, there are planned to be 1.2m more jobs by 2016, of which about ¾ m will be in London. There are formidable problems in allocating and implementing these very high levels of growth in an area with severe constraints upon development.

2.1.2 Historically, there have frequently been tensions between London and its immediate hinterland, generally centred on differences about acceptable levels of growth and “overspill” from the capital. Although London intends to absorb very large amounts of growth over the next 20 years, there will continue to be a significant out-movement of people into the rest of the study area. Moreover, research suggests that London’s immediate hinterland is exhibiting more and more social and economic characteristics associated with the capital itself. According to some stakeholders, there remains a “fear” of something like colonisation by London.

2.1.3 The inter-dependencies between London and the rest of the study area are profound and growing. Sir Peter Hall has described the Greater South East as one of the world’s “mega city regions”, in which the dominant city and its hinterland form part of a single interactive metropolitan system. The study area appears to be strongly mono-centric. About 25% of the population outside London commute into Central London. There is no town outside London with a population higher than 200,000 (larger centres, such as Milton Keynes and Southampton, are beyond the study area boundaries) and most have populations of below 100,000. Transport systems are generally strongly radial, especially public transport routes.

2.1.4 However, Hall has characterised the area as one of the most polycentric of all major metropolitan regions. This is because it has high levels of “functional” inter-linkages and networks driven by flows of information across the whole wider study area. For this reason he argues that planning needs to pay close attention to connectivities across all three regions: “Cross-border and transnational co-operation through linked policy networks will be essential to sustainable management of the Greater South East.” Professor Ian Gordon also argues that inter-regional collaboration is essential to the future success of the Greater South East. It is needed to avoid wasteful competition, which he believes is still evident at both regional and local levels. Gordon suggests that regional linkages are far more significant than local clusters, whose importance is exaggerated.

2.1.5 Notwithstanding its inter-dependencies, strategic planning for the study area is now divided between the 3 Regional Planning Bodies (RPBs): the East of England Regional

---

1 National Statistics Mid-Year Population Projections ibid.
2 Thompson in Dimitriou & Thompson “Strategic Planning for Regional Development in the UK” Routledge 2007
3 Volterra Consulting “Grouping wards in London, the South East and East of England” 2007
4 This view was strong expressed and endorsed at the workshop we held
5 Hall & Pain “The Polycentric Metropolis” Earthscan 2006
6 Hall & Pain ibid
7 Gordon I Paper to New Regionalism Conference London 2003
Assembly (EERA); the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA). Each of these is statutorily required to produce a Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). These are now at an advanced stage. Each has been through an Examination in Public (EiP) before an independent Panel. The Government published its “Proposed Changes” to the East of England Plan in October 2007. The Panel report on the Examination in Public (EiP) on the South East Plan was published in August 2007 and the Government response is awaited. The Mayor published his response to the Panel report on the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) in November 2007.

2.1.6 The Panel reports from all three EiPs supported the proposition that inter-regional linkages are of critical importance: “It is perfectly obvious that housing markets, employment locations and transport links pay no regard to boundaries.”\(^8\) The East of England Proposed Changes list some issues that had to be addressed across regional boundaries. These include:

- Differences in housing and jobs forecasts between London and areas beyond its boundary
- Increases in reverse commuting
- Problems of housing and employment balance
- Lack of clarity about the role of town centres
- Different car parking standards

2.1.7 Each of the 3 Panel reports criticised the lack of adequate inter-regional emphasis in each of the Plans. The London Panel was particularly dismissive of attempts to co-ordinate policy, especially for Growth Areas and corridors crossing the London boundary. It suggested that a more comprehensive overview of strategic planning across the 3 regions should be undertaken before the end of 2008.

\(^8\) London EiP Panel Report 3.5
3 Areas designated in regional plans

3.1.1 All three Plans have a great deal of common ground. Although often bitterly contested, the latest versions of each Plan are all characterised by the identification of substantial growth. All have policies that seek to manage this growth in order to achieve sustainable development, to address climate change and to improve accessibility, particularly by public transport. Many policies are the same or similar. This report particularly looks at the extent to which the Plans have compatible and deliverable strategies for the location and promotion of growth and at the inter-regional dimensions of planning growth. It concentrates upon the areas for which the Plans have specific particular policies to manage growth and which cross or abut regional boundaries.

3.1.2 We note the existence of a category of areas, which although they will experience substantial growth, are not explicitly designated as areas in which specific policies will be adopted. For example, many parts of Inner London will experience high levels of growth, but the London Plan does not include a specific “Inner London” area for which discrete policies will be adopted. Beyond the study area lie a ring of larger towns such as Southampton, Oxford, Milton Keynes, Cambridge, Ipswich and Colchester, for which substantial growth is planned and which will have a significant inter-action with parts of the study area. For example, the Milton Keynes/South Midlands Growth Area is adjacent to the edge of the study area. There are significant linkages between the study area and the regions beyond the Greater South East.

3.1.3 The planning areas in the 3 Plans covered by this report are shown indicatively on Map 2 and fall into 2 categories:

1. Areas for which substantial change in the form of growth and regeneration are to be encouraged and co-ordinated: these are Growth Areas; urban focal points; and “corridors” of development

2. Sub-regions, which have their own character and have dedicated policies to reflect the particular planning issues they have to address.
3.2 Growth Areas

3.2.1 The Government Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) seeks to facilitate sustainable growth in the Greater South East, and especially in the east and north of the Greater South East and four designated Growth Areas. Two of these are within the study area: the Thames Gateway and London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough corridor (LSCP). One abuts the study area to the north: Milton Keynes and South Midlands. The four areas are planned to absorb 200,000 new dwellings by 2016, and have been allocated dedicated funding, most of which is directed to the Thames Gateway.

3.2.2 Thames Gateway is now a long-standing policy area with clear boundaries. Strategic policy for the Thames Gateway was set out in RPG 9A. Subsequently, the three RPBs and Government collaborated to produce an Inter Regional Planning Statement in 2004. In October this year, Government published the Interim Plan for the Gateway with the intention of producing the final Plan following this year’s public spending review.

---

9 ODPM “Creating sustainable communities: making it happen : Thames Gateway and the Growth Areas” 2003
10 “Growth and Regeneration in the Thames Gateway” ODPM 2004
Interim Plan sets out a target of 160,000 new homes and 180,000 new jobs by 2016. Policy has consistently focused upon regeneration and sought to identify the main growth centres. The Interim Plan describes four “transformational locations” at Canary Wharf, Stratford/Lower Lea Valley, the Ebbsfleet cluster and the London ports cluster.

3.2.3 The whole concept of the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough corridor was heavily criticised by the East of England Panel and the Government’s latest Proposed Changes remove the Stansted/M11 sub-region, which provided the linkage within the study area, leaving ambiguity as to the relationship between the Government’s LSCP Growth Area and spatial strategy as set out in the East of England Plan.

3.3 Growth Centres – Hubs, Centres and Opportunity Areas

3.3.1 All 3 Plans identify urban growth centres, although they are given different names in each plan. The “Key Centres for Development and Change” in the East of England Plan are similar in purpose to the “Regional Hubs” (identified as centres of economic activity and transport services) in the South East Plan. They are larger urban areas with potential for growth and intensification. This is comparable in many ways with the “Opportunity Areas” in London, which are locations in which relatively large amounts of housing and/or employment growth are planned. There are also “New Growth Points” designated by Government for modest financial support, but their relationship to regional policy is less clear and their impact on the study area is modest. The Government intends additionally to identify a number of “eco-towns”. The London Plan defines 11 Metropolitan town centres, where housing and employment as well as retail growth is encouraged.

3.4 Corridors

3.4.1 There is less clarity about the inter-regional “corridors” in the study area. These do not have the formal national status of the Growth Areas, but are mechanisms through which planning along major transport routes can be co-ordinated to achieve, for example, best use of infrastructure investment and optimal distribution of housing and employment. There has been some dispute, not least between the RPBs, about the intent of these corridors. Are they “development or growth corridors” in which growth should be maximised to take advantage of strong communications systems? Or are they “co-ordination corridors”, in which growth is focused upon hubs, like beads on a string, rather than at all points? The latter was the formulation favoured by the FALP EiP Panel.

3.4.2 There are 3 co-ordination corridors shown in the Further Alterations to the London Plan:

1. London-Luton. The Mayor has accepted the Panel recommendation that “the regional and local authorities will jointly examine timescales and mechanisms for the strategic co-ordination” of London – Luton and possibly extending to Bedford. This would potentially be a “co-ordination corridor”, but is not in the East of England Plan.

2. The Western Wedge is included in the London Plan as a co-ordination corridor in which the regional and economic development bodies will promote co-ordinated forms of sustainable development (Policy 1.3). However, there is no specific boundary in the Plan and that contained in the 2002 Arup Report has no statutory status. The Wedge is not included in the South East Plan as a concept or area, although an interregional corridor is identified running through the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley sub-region and Western Wedge into central London, as well as a number of regional spokes (identified as management and investment priorities).

3. The London-Gatwick corridor was included in the 2004 London Plan and remains in the Further Alterations as identified on the Key Diagram. A proposal to extend the corridor to Brighton was withdrawn by the Mayor in response to representations by SEERA. The Mayor accepted the Panel’s suggestion that London-Gatwick should be
known as a “co-ordination corridor”. The corridor does not appear in the South East Plan.

3.4.3 PPS 11 supports the designation of sub-regions where appropriate. It suggests that there are two principles involved in the assessment of potential sub-regions: the existence of functional relationships between settlements and the existence of “a clearly recognisable strategic policy deficit, which cannot be addressed by general RSS policies or by LDDs on their own.” (para 1.13). The settlement character of the study area makes the definition of sub-regions more problematic than in most parts of the UK, where city regions generally predominate. The lack of dominant cities outside London means that there are fewer distinctive sub-regional centres and many focal points, such as airports, that can pull development in different directions. The East and South East Plans include sub-regions, partly because they are both large and complex regions with markedly different geographical areas and a variety of socio-economic characteristics. These are:

- The London Arc  East of England
- The Western Corridor South East
- Gatwick  South East
- The London Fringe  South East

3.4.4 Both Plans identify discrete sub-regional policies for each sub-region. The East of England EiP Panel questioned the need for sub-regions unless they had demonstrably distinctive policies in line with PPS 11. Indeed the current “Proposed Changes” reduce the number of sub-regions and the length of treatment given to them (though the sub-regions in the East part of the study area survived, albeit “on balance” in at least one case). The Panel Report for the South East Plan supported all the proposed sub-regions, though with varying degrees of enthusiasm.

3.4.5 The sub-regions in the London Plan have a rather different character. In the first place, they are comprehensive: no part of London is not defined in a “sub-region”. Secondly, to some degree, they provide an intermediate level of co-ordination between the top and lower tiers (Mayor and the boroughs). And thirdly, the Sub-Regional Development Frameworks are geared to the implementation of policy in the London Plan rather than to policy initiation. The FALP commits the Mayor to produce a new generation of sub-regional documents using new boundaries identified in the Further Alterations. The sub-regions are:

- North
- North East
- South East
- South West
- West
3.5 Assessing the effectiveness of sub-regions and designated growth locations

3.5.1 We wanted to assess the current effectiveness of these various areas. To do so we have looked at the EiP comments on them; used some simple criteria which we then apply to each; considered their contribution to achieving growth targets; and assessed their contribution towards balanced growth.

EiP Panel Reports

3.5.2 All these areas were considered in some depth at EiPs, although it could be argued that the 2 Growth Areas were Government-initiated “givens”. In many of them, some stakeholders argued that they were unnecessary or needed change to their policies or boundaries. The Panels acknowledged deficiencies in several cases, but all the areas discussed above have survived the process so far. Whatever the problems identified by Panels and by this report, the areas shown on Figure 2 have been tested statutorily and accepted. Other areas might be proposed, but these would doubtless carry their own deficiencies. There is a strong case for retaining them for the present, if only to provide a degree of stability.

Judging effectiveness of the designated areas

3.5.3 We identified a number of criteria which could be used to assess the effectiveness of these various areas and sub-regions.

Status

- Is the area recognised in one or more of the RSS “Plans” or elsewhere (e.g. the SCP)?
- Do key development and service agencies recognise the area?
- Is there agreement between all the RPBs that the area exists?
- Are there clear boundaries for the area?

Policy

- Is there a clear policy for the area and is this accepted by all key agencies?
- Is the policy underpinned by a strong evidence base?

Added value

- Does the policy for the area add anything to national or regional policy?

Inter-regional

- Does policy and implementation in the area take account of inter-regional dimensions?

Ownership

- Are there bodies or mechanisms that drive forward policy–making and implementation in the area?
Resources

- Are there direct resources allocated to the area?
- Are other forms of investment aligned to the area?
- Are other sectoral investment plans (e.g. for housing or transport) aligned to the area?

Effectiveness?

- Is the designation of these areas effective in terms of advancing regional policy and supporting implementation? Since many of these areas are relatively new, it is often difficult to assess how effective they have been, but we can ask whether there are clear criteria against which success can be measured and clear monitoring systems that would allow that assessment to take place.

3.5.4 Appendix A looks at each of the areas against these criteria, taking each main geographical segment of the study area. In summary, this analysis suggests that there is a disturbing lack of clarity and cross-regional agreement about some of these designated areas. Apart from the Thames Gateway, none of the inter-regional corridors are explicitly supported by both of the RPBs in which they are located and none has clear boundaries or definitive status. None has a dedicated mechanism to drive implementation forward. The LSCP Growth Area has some funding, but now occupies a very wide area, for which there is no coherent overall policy and no mechanism for supporting implementation.

3.5.5 There is little reference to adjoining areas in other regions or sub-regions in any of the sub-regional policy, whether inside or outside London. The London sub-regions have active sub-regional partnerships, which have needed some alignment to new sub-regional boundaries. Elsewhere, there is some co-ordination within the sub-regions, but with relatively limited powers or funding. The Western Corridor, for example, has 15 constituent local authorities, making co-ordination a difficult task.

3.5.6 The various Hubs and Key Centres are dispersed across the study area with limited differentiation or prioritisation of their role. These key urban growth points can generally be identified with local authorities, which will provide leadership and co-ordinate funding. They are generally not related to each other across (or within) regional boundaries. Town centres on either side of the MGB are not planned with any co-ordination.

3.5.7 Many of the area designations are relatively new, having emerged from the regional plan-making processes. It would, in some cases, be premature to expect that partnerships were strongly formed or that investment strategies were well advanced. The pressures on overstretched resources can make collaboration very difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, the detailed analysis in Appendix A suggests that there are some serious weaknesses that need to be addressed through the delivery and review processes.
Contribution to achieving growth targets

3.5.8 An accurate assessment of the contribution of these areas to growth is compromised by some inconsistencies: for example, the Plans have different end dates and several boundaries, which in many cases do not correspond exactly to Local Authority boundaries, have had to be assumed. However, some general conclusions are legitimate. Figures 3-6 all show that there is relatively little difference in the rates of growth of housing, jobs or population between the Growth Areas, corridors and sub-regions outside London on the one hand, and the rest of the Study Area on the other. For a full explanation of all calculations in the tables, please see Appendix D.

Figure 3 Housing projections in project study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Dwellings: 2001</th>
<th>Proposed to mid 2020s</th>
<th>Mid 2020s</th>
<th>Percentage change 2001 to mid 2020s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THAMES GATEWAY TOTAL</td>
<td>1,133,020</td>
<td>291,850</td>
<td>1,424,870</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON LUTON BEDFORD TOTAL</td>
<td>525,248</td>
<td>102,900</td>
<td>628,148</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCP TOTAL</td>
<td>821,967</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>969,967</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN CORRIDOR TOTAL</td>
<td>457,368</td>
<td>93,080</td>
<td>550,448</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATWICK DIAMOND TOTAL</td>
<td>95,378</td>
<td>24,060</td>
<td>119,438</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON ARC TOTAL</td>
<td>374,940</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>430,940</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON FRINGE TOTAL</td>
<td>441,482</td>
<td>56,020</td>
<td>497,502</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON-GATWICK TOTAL</td>
<td>514,111</td>
<td>63,690</td>
<td>577,801</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN WEDGE (London) TOTAL</td>
<td>466,045</td>
<td>46,650</td>
<td>512,695</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub regional designations total</td>
<td>4,378,331</td>
<td>882,250</td>
<td>5,260,581</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA TOTAL</td>
<td>5,592,308</td>
<td>995,550</td>
<td>6,587,858</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA OUTSIDE DESIGNATED AREAS TOTAL</td>
<td>1,213,977</td>
<td>197,280</td>
<td>1,411,257</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA OUTSIDE DESIGNATED AREAS TOTAL excluding Inner London</td>
<td>802,011</td>
<td>96,180</td>
<td>898,191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: National Statistics Census Data 2001, Inspector's Panel (EiP) reports for SE Plan and East of England Plan and London Plan Further Alterations. NB: Study area outside designated areas defined as on page 13. NB2: 'Mid 2020s' given as end-point as plans differ in end point from 2021 to 2027.

3.5.9 The "rest of the study area" is those areas of London, South East England and the East of England that lie within the study area but outside the named growth designations, consisting therefore of local authorities such as Maidstone or Tunbridge Wells, as well as
most of Inner London. The only area designated for growth that has growth significantly above the study area average in regional plans is the Thames Gateway, where official government designation at national level has resulted in higher than average housing and employment growth and the relatively small Gatwick diamond sub-region. The parts of London outside the Growth Areas and corridors are allocated slightly less housing and employment, but their population is projected to rise faster than the study area as a whole.

**Figure 4 Employment projections in project study area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Workplace jobs 2001</th>
<th>New jobs proposed to 2020s</th>
<th>Workplace jobs mid 2020s</th>
<th>Percentage change 2001 to mid 2020s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THAMES GATEWAY TOTAL</td>
<td>1,017,060</td>
<td>309,299</td>
<td>1,326,359</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCP TOTAL</td>
<td>718,617</td>
<td>191,502</td>
<td>910,119</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON ARC TOTAL</td>
<td>424,016</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>499,016</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON LUTON BEDFORD TOTAL</td>
<td>713,400</td>
<td>125,667</td>
<td>839,067</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN WEDGE (LONDON) TOTAL</td>
<td>649,205</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>759,205</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON FRINGE TOTAL</td>
<td>503,908</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>543,408</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON-GATWICK TOTAL</td>
<td>511,268</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>561,268</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN CORRIDOR TOTAL</td>
<td>732,294</td>
<td>70,583</td>
<td>802,877</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATWICK DIAMOND TOTAL</td>
<td>210,157</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>225,157</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA TOTAL</td>
<td>6,559,412</td>
<td>1,196,402</td>
<td>7,755,814</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA OUTSIDE DESIGNATED AREAS TOTAL</td>
<td>1,761,525</td>
<td>272,493</td>
<td>2,034,018</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA OUTSIDE DESIGNATED AREAS TOTAL excluding Inner London</td>
<td>742,045</td>
<td>92,893</td>
<td>834,938</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: National Statistics Census 2001 data, Inspector's Panel (EiP) reports for SE Plan and East of England Plan and London Plan Further Alterations. Latter will be updated to reflect Government’s latest Changes. NB: ‘Mid 2020s’ given as end-point as plans differ in end point from 2021 to 2027. NB2: New jobs proposed for study area parts of the SE sub regions only approximate, as EiP Report does not break down jobs total by individual local authority.
3.5.10 All 3 Plans aspire to maximise the self-sufficiency and sustainability of their regions by matching housing and job growth as closely as possible. There are obvious limits to the capacity to achieve “matching” of jobs and resident workers in local or sub-regional areas. Nevertheless, functional economic geography should be a significant influence upon spatial planning. For example, labour imbalances in the west of the Study Area will generate commuting pressures across, and from outside, the Study Area.

3.5.11 The study area has of course a structural imbalance, because of the dominance of central London as an employment, retail, cultural and government centre. The FALP further strengthens the role of central London, arguing that this is essential to London’s continued economic success as a global city. 44% of new jobs in London are projected to be in the finance and business sector, many of them in central London. Cambridge Econometrics found that there was a greater propensity to commute longer distances amongst workers

### Figure 5 Population projections in project study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LONDON LUTON BEDFORD TOTAL</td>
<td>1,280,200</td>
<td>1,318,000</td>
<td>1,430,900</td>
<td>1,506,100</td>
<td>225,900</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN WEDGE (LONDON) TOTAL</td>
<td>1,105,100</td>
<td>1,135,700</td>
<td>1,214,900</td>
<td>1,270,400</td>
<td>165,300</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON ARC TOTAL</td>
<td>906,100</td>
<td>922,700</td>
<td>980,900</td>
<td>1,027,300</td>
<td>121,200</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON FRINGE TOTAL</td>
<td>1,062,000</td>
<td>1,081,200</td>
<td>1,141,000</td>
<td>1,190,800</td>
<td>128,800</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAMES GATEWAY TOTAL</td>
<td>2,744,500</td>
<td>2,786,700</td>
<td>2,949,100</td>
<td>3,076,200</td>
<td>331,700</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON-GATWICK TOTAL</td>
<td>1,209,800</td>
<td>1,228,200</td>
<td>1,297,300</td>
<td>1,349,300</td>
<td>139,500</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCP TOTAL</td>
<td>2,003,000</td>
<td>2,029,100</td>
<td>2,138,200</td>
<td>2,228,900</td>
<td>225,900</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATWICK DIAMOND TOTAL</td>
<td>387,700</td>
<td>391,300</td>
<td>405,500</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>32,300</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN CORRIDOR TOTAL</td>
<td>1,394,900</td>
<td>1,407,700</td>
<td>1,446,000</td>
<td>1,481,500</td>
<td>86,600</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA TOTAL</td>
<td>13,472,600</td>
<td>13,730,700</td>
<td>14,572,900</td>
<td>15,207,000</td>
<td>1,734,400</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA OUTSIDE DESIGNATED AREAS TOTAL</td>
<td>2,757,100</td>
<td>2,826,600</td>
<td>3,033,300</td>
<td>3,178,800</td>
<td>421,700</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA OUTSIDE DESIGNATED AREAS TOTAL excluding Inner London</td>
<td>1,827,100</td>
<td>1,856,600</td>
<td>1,961,900</td>
<td>2,048,600</td>
<td>221,500</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Statistics, Population Projections. All figures are estimates.

### Achieving balanced growth

3.5.10 All 3 Plans aspire to maximise the self-sufficiency and sustainability of their regions by matching housing and job growth as closely as possible. There are obvious limits to the capacity to achieve “matching” of jobs and resident workers in local or sub-regional areas. Nevertheless, functional economic geography should be a significant influence upon spatial planning. For example, labour imbalances in the west of the Study Area will generate commuting pressures across, and from outside, the Study Area.

3.5.11 The study area has of course a structural imbalance, because of the dominance of central London as an employment, retail, cultural and government centre. The FALP further strengthens the role of central London, arguing that this is essential to London’s continued economic success as a global city. 44% of new jobs in London are projected to be in the finance and business sector, many of them in central London. Cambridge Econometrics found that there was a greater propensity to commute longer distances amongst workers
in these higher order employment sectors. Indeed, under all 5 of its future scenarios for the Greater South East, their report anticipated increased commuting into central London.\(^{11}\)

3.5.12 However in many town centres, especially in outer south and east London, the FALP anticipates limited job growth as industry continues to decline and many local service functions become uncompetitive. In several cases, this weak economic position in Outer London contrasts with economic strength in towns on the immediate other side of the MGB. Figure 6 suggests that the Plans actually accentuate imbalances in some of the designated areas (assuming that the “ideal” job to dwelling ratio is roughly 1). The Plans do not appear to make any significant corrective changes to imbalances in the places where there are current labour supply shortages and high levels of in-commuting. There is no reason to suppose that economic growth pressures will decline in these areas, which are central to national economic success.

**Figure 6 Ratios of jobs to dwellings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of jobs per dwelling, 2001</th>
<th>Number of jobs per dwelling, mid 2020s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THAMES GATEWAY</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON LUTON BEDFORD</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCP</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN CORRIDOR</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATWICK DIAMOND</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON ARC</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON FRINGE</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON-GATWICK</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN WEDGE (LONDON)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA AVERAGE</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA OUTSIDE GROWTH DESIGNATIONS</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA OUTSIDE GROWTH DESIGNATIONS (EXCLUDING INNER LONDON)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Data in Figures 3 and 4*

3.5.13 In the absence of strong governmental spatial priorities, the market is likely to have an especially powerful influence. Whilst private investment must be central to performance, it is likely, if insufficiently managed, to run counter to key planning strategies. For example, the SCP strategy of shifting development to the north and east of the Greater South East is not the preference of the market. Nor will the market attend to the need for better

\(^{11}\) Cambridge Econometrics “Commuter Flows in London & the Wider South East” 2005
balance between labour market supply through the better co-ordination of housing and training and job demand.

### 3.6 Conclusions

#### 3.6.1 Each RPB is required to focus upon its own area and is prohibited from policy-making beyond its boundaries. As a result, and because insufficient coordination took place in the very demanding plan-making processes:

(a) there is no single spatial strategy either for the Greater South East or for the study area, and

(b) indeed there are implicit conflicts or gaps in treatment as between the same areas in different plans.

This means that there is very far from being any over-arching spatial strategy against which the contribution of the individual sub-regions and growth proposals can be assessed.

In practice, we conclude that the strategy implied by the proposals for growth appears to be one of a high level of diffusion across the study area. Apart from the Thames Gateway, the percentage increases in housing planned in each sub-region, Growth Area and corridor are broadly the same. There is relatively little difference between the percentage increase in housing in the London Arc and Fringe, where policy in the Plans has a significant element of restraint, and the rest. Some local communities clearly feel that there is a heavy concentration of growth in their areas, but from a strategic perspective, the distribution of growth is a wide one.

#### 3.6.2 There are 10 Key Centres for Development and Change and 10 Regional Hubs plus 28 Opportunity Areas within London, to say nothing of London’s 11 Metropolitan level town centres. The “spread” of development can also be witnessed in these Centres, Hubs and Opportunity Areas, whose growth figures are listed in Appendix B. Although there are some issues of definition, the planned growth in 17 of the 20 Hubs and Centres is between 5,000 and 16,000. The exceptions are in the Thames Gateway (Ebbfleet and Thurrock) and in Luton/Dunstable on the edge of the study area. None of the Opportunity Areas is planned to accommodate more than 10,000 new dwellings, except for the Thames Gateway and City Fringe, where very substantial growth is envisaged in the Lower Lea, City East, London Riverside, London Bridge, Greenwich and Woolwich. There is a similar concentration of employment growth in the Opportunity Areas in the City Fringe, but also in the Upper Lea Valley in the LSCP corridor and in Cricklewood/Brent Cross in the putative London – Luton corridor.

#### 3.6.3 The impact of “spread” extends to the Green Belt. The MGB is currently a major instrument of restraint. However, the East of England Proposed Changes and the South East Panel report suggest no fewer than 8 reviews of the Green Belt spread around the Study Area with the possibility of 10 other small MGB reviews, generally through the LDD process. This is discussed in detail in Part 3.

#### 3.6.4 In very broad summary, the overall spatial policy seems to be one of stimulating growth in the Thames Gateway, responding to growth pressures in and around central London and spreading residual growth incrementally around the rest of the study area. This conclusion

---

12 The figures in the South East Plan/Panel Report are for districts; the hubs are related to key urban centres, therefore they may not be taking the whole district allocation of housing. However, proportions are for individual LPAs to determine.
is supported by the recent analysis of ward data undertaken by Volterra for GLA Economics.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} Volterra “Grouping wards in London, South East and East of England GLA Economics Jan 2008
4 Investment and Implementation

4.1.1 In a fast growing area in which most space is occupied by a major city and a Green Belt, there will inevitably be powerful restraints upon development, and growth opportunities have to be maximised. Some have argued throughout the plan-making process in all three regions that development targets are unrealistically high: for example land is insufficiently available or the local planning authority is being either too passive or too ambitious. These concerns may be strongly held, but were addressed through the eiP process. The study looks at the restraints and opportunities in terms of the supply of infrastructure to support growth: transport, green, water, town centre and community infrastructure.

4.1.2 All 3 Plans include comprehensive consideration of the infrastructure implications of planned growth. The London Plan contains a chapter on Implementation, and the East and South East Plans are accompanied by a Regional Implementation Strategy and Plan respectively. The latter are both thoughtful and comprehensive documents (as the South East Panel noted). They both include proposals for a Regional Implementation Fund, and the East of England Plan Proposed Changes includes a Regional Partnership Board.

4.1.3 In the context of this study, their main deficiency is that the 3 sets of implementation proposals do not have a significant inter-regional dimension, despite the prominence of issues such as transport, green and water infrastructure which frequently cross regional boundaries. The South East Panel proposes that the RIP should be updated on a regular basis (more frequently than the Plan itself). A co-ordinated non-statutory exercise in updating all 3 implementation proposals would give the opportunity to introduce a strong inter-regional dimension. We consider below the topics that each might address in terms of improving inter-regional coherence.

4.1.4 All 3 RPBs are seeking to strengthen the internal co-ordination of RSSs and other regional plans, including housing, and to improve the correlation of timescales of delivery regimes. The EERA and SEERA Implementation plans both identify key delivery agencies with which they need to collaborate. Many of these agencies operate across regional boundaries so that the inter-regional dimension may need to be more clearly reflected. The pan-regional collaboration on waste disposal has shown how effective the IRF and RPBs can be in tackling difficult infrastructure and delivery problems.

4.1.5 The Mayor is initiating a set of Sub-regional Implementation Frameworks in each of the 5 London sub-regions. These will focus upon implementation and will include the delivery plans of the LDA and TfL. The FALP commits the Mayor to include the Regional Assemblies and Development Agencies of the East and South East in the process of creating these Frameworks. The South East Implementation Plan includes sub-regional investment frameworks for each sub-region and SEERA also intends to produce Sub-regional Frameworks. SEERA and EERA are collaborating on a joint Regional Implementation Plan: it would be helpful if this included a sub-regional dimension to assist in inter-regional co-ordination. The sub-region is often an optimal level for co-ordination, as it can mediate between the regional strategy and local circumstances and aid a cross-sector approach.

---

14 Although the South East Implementation Plan includes Annex 2, which looks at wider infrastructure and the FALP does note the collaboration between RDAs on implementation.
15 27.12.
4.2 Transport

4.2.1 The 3 RPBs and other stakeholders commissioned a study of commuter flows in the wider South East, which concluded that commuting to Central London to 2016 would increase substantially; that commuters in the South East might travel increasingly to workplaces within the region, but would tend to do so by car; and that jobs growth in the East of England would not keep pace with population increases, leading to more commuting to London. The need for new and improved transport infrastructure emerged as the strongest priority at the stakeholders’ workshop, partly reflecting the pressures envisaged in the commuter flows study.

4.2.2 Transport policy was a major theme at all the EiPs. In general, the South East Panel Report does not provide a detailed criticism or assessment of any deficit in inter-regional strategic transport planning apart from the general call for a stronger inter-regional policy context at national level. In the East of England Panel report, however, the Panel recommended that a key strategic objective of RSS should be to maintain and strengthen the region’s inter-regional connections, particularly by improving connections to London and other centres outside the region through investing in and supporting the radial rail network.

4.2.3 The East of England Panel discussed the problems of public transport provision in those parts of the Region closest to London, and emphasised the requirement in areas such as the London Arc and the Thames Gateway, with their ‘large number of closely-spaced, medium sized towns’, for area wide approaches involving integrated packages of different transport measures. Despite this, the East of England Draft Regional Implementation Strategy makes no mention of inter-regional transport relationships.

4.2.4 The South East regional implementation plan includes a table on the desirability of aligning national transport plans and programmes with the South East Plan. East-West Rail (outside the study area but potentially assisting in modal shift within it), Crossrail and Airtrack were all specifically mentioned at the South East EiP as regionally-significant new rail schemes that could benefit orbital connectivity and Thameslink is mentioned as a scheme that could benefit radial connectivity with Central London. However, the Panel noted that, as most of these schemes are still at an early stage of consideration, it would be unwise to base new settlement structures or to locate new growth points along these lines while their status is still uncertain. The importance of Thameslink and Crossrail in particular are shown by their inclusion in the East of England and London Plans, making them the only regional rail transport infrastructure referenced across all three plans.

4.2.5 Of the transport schemes named in the South East EiP Panel Report, only Thameslink, Crossrail, the Route Utilisation Strategies (RUSs) for main lines out of London and surface access improvements to Heathrow (all named as regionally significant transport infrastructure) are likely to have an inter-regional dimension. In addition to Thameslink and Crossrail, the East of England Plan seeks capacity and other enhancements on the Great Eastern Mainline, the East Coast Mainline, Fenchurch Street and Southend lines and the West Anglia line, all of which are likely to have inter-regional implications for London. Proposed improvements to the A13, the West Thurrock Regeneration Route, the

---

16 Cambridge Econometrics “Commuter Flows in London and the wider South East” 2005
17 2.5.
18 8.18.
19 8.15.
21 4.23.
M11 and so on will have implications both within the region and in London, although again the inter-regional dimension is not stated\textsuperscript{22}.

4.2.6 The London Plan EiP included a more detailed examination of the inter-regional potential for planning and included some observations on the implications of a lack of transport planning or co-ordination across regional boundaries. The Panel noted that the lack of such co-ordination could have serious effects on transport by car, specifically mentioning the potential for reverse commuting (due to higher housing targets within London but higher employment targets in adjoining regions). The Panel worried that at present such commuters would be unlikely to use public transport. In addition, more generous parking policies outside London are likely to act as an incentive for employers to set up shop in the Greater South East, further tempting car-borne commuting out of London. The Panel summarised its position clearly by stating: ‘It is absolutely apparent to us that there are cross-boundary issues which need to be examined. We consider that the key issues include[...]transport (including road and rail capacities, cross boundary commuting patterns, pricing structures and car parking policies); logistics; and the relationship between the location of housing and employment and transport links, including the proposed development of arcs and corridors’. It should be noted that some inter-regional transport processes are now beginning to develop, perhaps partly as a reaction to some of these comments at the EiPs- for example, all three regions have recently completed a joint transport prioritisation exercise across the Thames Gateway designation.

**Rail capacity**

4.2.7 Route Utilisation Strategies (RUSs) are currently being published for each of the rail main lines across Britain, and form short-term plans to facilitate planning by Network Rail and train operating companies. Each RUS projects forward the quantum of likely increases in demand on the route covered with reference to the planning context. The most important sources used in this were the Department for Transport’s Regional Planning Assessments for the Railways\textsuperscript{23}. These documents take account of the wider regional planning contexts, translating them into a number of implications for railway planning. Another important source of information used was the DfT’s TEMPRO database, providing ‘a single consistent view of future population and employment, taking into account the various spatial development plans, for use in transport planning’\textsuperscript{24}. All RUSs (with the exception of the Cross London RUS) cross regional planning boundaries in the study area and therefore offer a model of inter-regional transport planning that other bodies could refer to as a useful template for cross-boundary collaboration\textsuperscript{25}.

---

\textsuperscript{22} Tables, pp. 160-172.
\textsuperscript{23} The RPAs that cover the study area, all of which are available online at www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/rail/strategyfinance/strategy/rpa/, are the Thames Valley, Southern, South Eastern and Eastern RPAs.
\textsuperscript{24} East Coast Mainline RUS p75.
\textsuperscript{25} All RUSs completed so far are available online at www.networkrail.co.uk/aspx/4449.aspx
**East Coast Main Line**

4.2.8 The East Coast Mainline RUS projects an increase in passenger numbers at Kings Cross of 40% in the period 2006-2016 under a ‘do nothing’ (i.e. zero percent fare increases in real terms) scenario. Proposed infrastructure improvements include an extra platform at King’s Cross and capacity enhancements on the Moorgate branch.

**Greater Anglia**

4.2.9 Across the region, Network Rail expect to see the greatest demand increases under a ‘do-minimum’ scenario on the West Anglia branch into Liverpool Street of 37% by 2016 and 42% by 2021. Elsewhere in the region, the Thameside routes serving the Thames Gateway are projected to grow in demand by 15% by 2016 and 17% by 2021 and the Great Eastern mainline by 8% in 2016 and 9% in 2021. The RUS notes that the high increases on demand on the West Anglia network are driven by the growth of Stansted airport.

**South West Main Line**

4.2.10 The South West Main Line RUS does not provide straightforward projections for demand increases at Waterloo station or along the lines into Waterloo, perhaps partly due to the complexity of the network that it covers. The lack of reference to housing or employment growth within its region is more troubling, as it seems to us that growth in the Western Wedge, the London Fringe, the Western Corridor and the London-Gatwick corridor will inevitably demand additional capacity on this network of routes.

**Cross London**

4.2.11 The Cross London RUS clearly and extensively relates housing and employment growth in (inner) London and in Opportunity Areas with capacity and demand forecasts. It appears unlikely that the portions of the network that carry passengers will act as a constraint to development, not least (as acknowledged in the document) because of the investment being planned for the London Underground, which is likely to interact with the growth projected for inner London to a far greater extent here than for other RUSs.

**South London**

4.2.12 The South London RUS forecasts growth in background demand across the network of around 14% by 2019. Adding to this existing “suppressed” demand, it is anticipated that provision for growth of 25% will have to be made over the RUS period. Extensive referencing of growth in the area served by the network is made, including reference to the London Plan, the South East Plan and the Department for Transport’s RPA for the South East.

4.2.13 RUSs are still being produced (for example, in the study area, we await the Great Western, the Chiltern, the Midland Main Line and the West Coast Mainline RUSs) and until they have been completed it is difficult to make a blanket statement about whether rail capacity in the study area will act as a constraint to growth. However, it would appear, from the RUSs that are complete, that Network Rail appear at least confident that demand and capacity increases can be catered for if the funding and delivery of the desired rail infrastructure takes place. One notable shortcoming of the RUSs and the DfT High Level Output Specification (HLOS)\(^\text{26}\), is a lack of sectoral integration across the study area rail network; line after line appears to be treated in isolation throughout. For example, it is not clear from either the RUSs or from the HLOS what impact, if any, more complex additions

---

\(^{26}\) A summary of investment and infrastructure improvements across the rail network which broadly summarises those infrastructure improvements treated in more detail by the RUSs: available online at www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/rail/strategyfinance/strategy/hlos/
to the study area rail network such as Crossrail, the new Eurostar stations at Stratford and Ebbsfleet, Thameslink 2000 and the delivery of Crossrail will have on demand and capacity projections on other lines. The main problem with the RUSs as they stand is that their treatment of lines in isolation leads in every RUS to a perhaps unconvincingly optimistic picture of future capacity; although they consider constraints, in no RUS were any bottlenecks treated as insurmountable over the planning period.

**Transport for London**

4.2.14 Transport 2025\(^{27}\), TfL’s plan for transport enhancements in Greater London to 2025, aims for an additional public transport capacity of around 40 per cent from 2006 to 2025. It plans to achieve these increases, by a combination of investment in London Underground, Crossrails 1 and 2, National Rail through 35-40% capacity enhancements to existing lines, DLR, Light Transit Schemes, the Thameslink Programme and a 20% increase in bus supply. London Underground will benefit from an additional capacity of 25%, while it is stated that ‘the main aim of Crossrail is to deliver the extra capacity needed to support job growth in central London and the Isle of Dogs and to serve the east-west core jobs corridor and to support the development of new areas and the additional jobs in the Thames Gateway’. Crossrail, now committed, is expected to add 10 per cent to the overall capacity of London’s public transport network, on top of the level expected to be delivered on the Underground, supporting development potential in excess of 260,000 jobs and 70,000 people within key opportunity areas (Isle of Dogs City fringe, Lower Lea Valley, Paddington). Meanwhile, the Thameslink programme, also now committed, would significantly increase capacity on the rail network to and through London, supporting development around King’s Cross, London Bridge and Cricklewood (75,000 jobs and 32,450 people).

4.2.15 T2025 also examines the inter-regional dimension: ‘Long distance commuting into London is growing rapidly and originates from areas well beyond London’s boundaries. The Rail 2025 programme also includes the key priority of ensuring that the local networks and systems are enhanced to integrate with, and complement, the regional schemes’ as connections with London are perceived to be essential for the rest of the country\(^{28}\).

4.2.16 Of all the transport strategies published for the study area, T2025 most explicitly plans for and acknowledges the link between transport improvements and growth. The strategy justifies its strongly radial strategy for improving public transport capacity into central London by relating it to the spatial pattern of development proposed: ‘Central London currently accounts for more than one third of all employment in London. By 2025, around 360,000 more jobs are predicted to be located in central London. The job growth will be concentrated in an east-west corridor stretching from White City through the City of London to the Isle of Dogs and Thames Gateway, including Paddington and King’s Cross’\(^{29}\).

**Road capacity**

4.2.17 On the roads, the Department for Transport’s Regional Network Reports (RNRs) fulfil a similar role to the RUSs, but unlike RUSs, do not cut across regional boundaries. Two have been produced that cover the Study Area - the East of England RNR and the South East RNR, with strategic road capacity within London the responsibility of TfL (see below).

---


\(^{28}\) Ibid, p.74.

\(^{29}\) Ibid, p.29.
East of England RNR

4.2.18 The RNR firstly sets out clearly its relationship and alignment with the East of England RSS and the Regional Transport Strategy. It then goes on to assess how Growth Areas, major roadside developments, rail schemes, and existing and future patterns of commuting will affect the road network.

4.2.19 After assessing these variables, and inputting the likely impact of planned Highways Agency schemes, the RNR concludes by modelling the resulting changes in network stress between 2005 and 2021. The results are projected stress levels in 2021 with a notable improvement on the 2005 picture, with less stress in particular on the M1, M25 and A12. However, the reduction in stress projected for the northern M25 is difficult to square with the large-scale growth already proposed within the London Arc for locations including Welwyn Hatfield and Hemel Hempstead (although the London Arc designation is referenced in the RNR, no mention is made of any growth planned within its boundaries).30

South East RNR

4.2.20 The South East RNR takes a more sub-regional approach than the East of England RNR, and concludes the following for each study area sub-regional designation:

- Kent Thames Gateway: ‘By 2026, most of the Kent Thames Gateway sub-regional trunk road network is predicted to experience high levels of stress despite the improvements currently under construction’.31.
- London Fringe: ‘The effect of the allocated London Fringe development, assuming that current travel trends continue, combined with other background growth (including nominal levels of growth at Heathrow, Gatwick and key ports and other sub-regional growth) will lead to very severe levels of network stress, such that most of the London Fringe trunk road network will be unable to cope with the resulting demand’.32
- Western Corridor: ‘In 2026, the number of links experiencing stress to the point where the network is unlikely to be able to cope with demand increases significantly’.33
- Gatwick: ‘The A23 suffers from significant levels of congestion in 2026 but congestion on the section of the A23 from Handcross to Warninglid is relieved by the planned improvement scheme. Following this improvement, stress on this section of the A23 is not as severe as other links. The A23 from Pyecombe to Burgess Hill remains a 2 lane dual carriageway and experiences an extremely high level of stress in 2026. This level of stress would not be deliverable in practical terms and will therefore require further attention if the SE Plan is delivered in line with published housing allocations’.34

4.2.21 It is interesting to contrast the far gloomier assessments of the South East RNR above with the optimism of the East of England RNR, particularly given that they represent the projections of the same agency and were presumably generated with reference to similar modelling programmes.
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31 Ibid., p.32.
32 Ibid., p.41.
33 Ibid., p.49.
34 Ibid., p.65.
The RAC Foundation’s recent ‘Roads and Reality’ report provides a further viewpoint on demand growth for the British road network to 2041. It models traffic stress to give a broad indication of where average flows are reaching the effective capacity of the strategic roads and where congestion therefore occurs. Although it provides a useful alternative point of view for the debate on future transport capacity across the study area, it should be stressed that its production by a car-users group inevitably demands a degree of caution in interpreting its findings.

Modelling first to 2015, it finds capacity shortfalls across the study area, most notably on the M1 to and from London, on ‘most of the London radial routes as they approach the M25’ and on the A12 to the east. There were also orbital capacity shortfalls on the M25. However, ‘although in many places busy, most of the (national) network [would operate] at traffic levels below maximum capacity’. The study then goes on to forecast that without demand management measures such as road pricing, there will be by 2041 a 39% increase nationally in traffic on motorways. This increase would stress the entire motorway network within the study area to an extent 50% or more above the stress level that indicates peak congestion.

The study notes that ‘where the scale of forecast demand is 30-50% above the stress benchmark, it is appropriate to consider new roads because of the scale of the long term mismatch between supply and demand’. The roads in the study area where this is projected to occur are London-Ipswich on the A12, London to Cambridge on the M11, London to Peterborough on the A1, London to Rugby on the M1, London to the South West on the M3 and other London radial routes, including the M20, A3, M23, M4, M40, and A12, as well as the London orbital M25.

The conclusion of ‘Roads and Reality’ is that these forecasts indicate that in future, even with demand measures such as road pricing, on current levels of growth 600 lane kilometres per year (roughly equating to 1990s levels of road-building) will need to be delivered to the middle of the 21st century to avoid economically paralysing levels of congestion.

---
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4.2.26 Within London, in contrast to the above, T2025 proposes no increase in road capacity through road building or widening, proposing instead to increase public transport road space on existing roads and make the use of existing roads more efficient, mainly through ensuring the co-ordination of infrastructure improvement programmes such as roadworks\(^{38}\); the current system of demand management (congestion charging) would, of course, also continue.

**Aviation**

4.2.27 Airport growth is clearly important in respect of all spatial policies for the Greater South East regions; however, as noted at the South East, the London and the East of England EiPs, aviation planning is at present decided at a national level. For the purposes of the current report, therefore, we do not consider the impact of airport growth on regional spatial planning (except insofar as it affect surface transport connections, such as the increased demand forecast on the West Anglia rail route, as noted above). However, the extent to which expansion of Heathrow, Gatwick, Luton or Stansted would impact on wider housing and employment development in the study area (whether regional or inter-regional) is clearly an important issue for future debate, particularly given the broadly consistent and strongly expressed concerns of all three regions over the policies hinted at by the Government’s Aviation White Paper, which advocates some degree of expansion at every airport within the study area\(^{40}\).

**Freight**

4.2.28 Freight transport, although important in terms of how it relates to planning study area growth, is a major separate issue beyond the remit of this report, except insofar as it was specifically mentioned as a potentially fruitful area for inter-regional collaboration at the regional EiPs. The road and rail constraints outlined above do, however, affect its free movement, meaning that any future inter-regional working in the area of transport should treat freight considerations as a vital input to capacity modelling.

**Transport conclusions**

4.2.29 Future levels of transport congestion are very difficult to assess in relative terms; from the evidence presented above, the picture on the study area road network appears particularly unclear. For the purposes of this report, assumptions have to be made based on the various policies, projections and reports currently available, but it has not been easy reconciling their views (which, in any case, relate to differing timescales) to create a definitive picture of exactly how growth will impact upon transport capacity. Some documents (most notably the RUSs, with a short timescale) present a rosier picture of a future with few capacity constraints, while others (including some Highways Agency projections and, perhaps less surprisingly, Roads and Reality) are less optimistic.

4.2.30 In the meantime, the tentative conclusions may be that co-ordination as opposed to ‘spread’ of growth, and rail-based as opposed to road-based sub regional designations appear to present the most favourable models for the study area. If this is the case, radial or orbital corridors for co-ordination along a rail spine (e.g. London-Luton, London-Gatwick) appear less problematic designations, particularly when taking into account the potential for rail transport growth driven by the increased rail capacity linked to employment growth in central London as projected by T2025. Such corridors contrast with designations along a road spine only, particularly those involving a non-hierarchical pattern of ‘spread’ growth (e.g. London Arc along the M25) where it is very difficult to
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\(^{38}\) p.40.

envisage a ‘spread’ pattern of housing growth close to a number of orbital roads without substantial increases in car-based transport and road congestion higher even than currently exists in the area.

4.2.31 There is nothing wrong with orbital designations per se, but it would seem that unless orbital public transport can be provided in the right place then they are likely to exacerbate the pressures noted above. A current example is capacity improvements to the North Downs Line, which should assist modal shift in the orbital London Fringe designation. In the absence of orbital rail capacity, a number of radial rail links cross the ‘arcs’ so, on paper, inter-regional co-ordination on a polycentric basis from London to the study area and beyond (e.g. Milton Keynes and Cambridge) along these axes appears a preferable solution in these cases for reducing transport capacity constraints and for decoupling economic development from increased road use and associated carbon emissions. Even if ‘Roads and Reality’s case is overstated, and the Highways Agency’s slightly more optimistic picture of reductions in road congestion is correct, growth designations based partially or entirely on rail transport should be preferred over designations biased more towards road transport.

4.3 Environmental pressures and opportunities

4.3.1 We have examined two of the most significant environmental influences upon development: open space and climate change.

4.4 Open space

Metropolitan Green Belt

4.4.1 The single most substantial constraint upon development is the MGB, which covers most of the study area outside London, wrapping tightly around most of the main settlements. MGB policy may be a restraint upon delivery of housing and other growth because the large number of proposals for Green Belt reviews through the LDD process is likely to result in protracted local battles, which may often defeat or delay the achievement of development targets.

4.4.2 As the Royal Town Planning Institute has repeatedly observed, the origins of Green Belt policy were “an element of urban policy, to contain sprawl and encourage regeneration, or to protect the settings of historic towns. Following the Rural White Paper’s policies to encourage economic diversification in the countryside, the reality is that green belts are now better “protected” against development than the countryside generally – and this is not to their environmental nor their economic benefit”. The strategic context of the MGB in particular is now quite different from what it was more than 50 years ago at its inception: it sits around one of Europe’s most dynamic and fast growing cities; the settlements inside it are expected to absorb around 700,000 new population in the next 20 years; and the activities for which it has been and will be used have changed dramatically. As climate change and sustainable development dominate the policy agenda, the Green Belt can come to be associated with lengthier journeys and carbon emissions needs to be considered.

4.4.3 However, there is very little alignment of overall spatial strategy with the MGB in the three Regional Plans. Although “exceptional circumstances” may permit MGB development in all three Plans, in line with national policy, the fundamental approach is prohibitive. The Plans are different in their planned approach to release of MGB land. The London Plan contains no proposals at all, arguing that intensification and full exploitation of development opportunities can absorb growth without incursion into the MGB. The East of

See for example “Modernising Green Belts” RTPI, 2002.
England Proposed Changes have four “strategic” reviews involving major growth at Harlow, substantial growth at Stevenage and growth at Hemel Hempstead and Welwyn Hatfield, together with a local review at Broxbourne. The Milton Keynes South Midlands Sub-regional Strategy requires a review at Luton/Dunstable. In the South East, the Panel makes three firm recommendations for MGB review, with the possibility of at least 9 other small MGB reviews, generally through the LDD process. 43

4.4.4 These proposed reviews mainly reflect the need for Hubs or Key Centres to absorb some growth, with smaller expansions in some lower order settlements. They do not reference back convincingly to overall spatial strategy for the study area or to spatial constructs such as “growth areas” or corridors. Nor do they reflect the very great variation in the quality of landscape and value of activities in different parts of the MGB. No reviews are proposed for the Thames Gateway. The presence of some MGB areas was given as a reason for opposition to the London-Luton “development corridor” and the London-Gatwick “development corridor” by EERA and SEERA respectively at the FALPEiP.

London

4.4.5 Development in London has consistently used about 96% of previously developed land and there has been a small net increase in open space 44. London Plan policies are very protective of open space and there is a strong drive to increase the amount of and access to open space through, for example, the East London Green Grid. However, it remains surprising that there are no proposals at all for MGB review or change in a city with such heavy growth pressures.

Urban fringe

4.4.6 Many of the MGB reviews will focus upon the fringes of settlements within the MGB. The Countryside Commission has pointed to the potential for better use of the urban fringe 45. In practice, much of the metropolitan fringe is now being addressed by Green Arc partnerships, involving a range of public, voluntary and private bodies. These are bringing a very pro-active approach. Their engagement in the re-appraisal of the strategic approach to the MGB suggested above could be valuable.
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43 In East, at Luton/Dunstable; Stevenage; Hemel Hempstead; Hatfield and Welwyn; Harlow and Broxbourne. In South East, reviews at Guildford; Woking; Redhill & Reigate; and possible LDD changes at Elmbridge; Epsom & Ewell; Mole Valley; Runnymede; Spelthorne; Tandridge; Sevenoaks; Windsor & Maidenhead and Wycombe.
4.5 Climate Change

4.5.1 The 3 regions have undertaken some valuable cross-boundary collaboration on climate change policy and practices. As a general rule, spatial policies that encourage relative spatial concentration of growth and larger-scale developments are likely to benefit efforts at adaptation and mitigation. For example, larger-scale and coordinated development can facilitate the provision of infrastructure for supply of decentralised energy and CCHP/CHP networks. There will often be economies of scale if concentrated demand for renewable sources of energy can be supported by spatial planning policies. Concentration of development is more likely to generate the levels of demand needed to sustain public transport. This argument for more focused allocation of growth is not necessarily, however, an argument for very high density of development, which can exacerbate heat island effects. There is the potential for planning frameworks for larger development areas to integrate climate change policies with other planning and design issues, as some Opportunity Area Frameworks in London have demonstrated.

4.6 Water, drainage, sewerage issues

4.6.1 All 3 RPBs have devoted an increasing amount of attention to water and related issues. The South East Panel notes that "the most effective inter-agency collaboration by the Regional Assembly relates to water interests" and its own report pays careful attention to the implications of water supply, waste water and flood risk in each sub-region. The Environment Agency carried out a study of the implications of the South East Plan for water supply and quality, flood risk and bio-diversity. Whilst the approach to these issues is rather less fully developed, the East of England authorities commissioned a Capacity Delivery Strategy on wastewater from Halcrow and the Proposed Changes to the East Plan include several water-related policies. The FALP includes a chapter on London’s water systems, “the Blue Ribbon” and extensive policies on water and flood risk matters and the Mayor has published a draft Water Action Framework.

4.6.2 The policies of all 3 Plans towards water quality and supply, restraint of demand, sewerage, drainage and flood risk are generally highly compatible. However, there appears to have been quite limited pan-regional collaboration on integrated water management, relating spatial planning to river basin management plans and to water systems that often cross regional boundaries. Some of the major growth proposals within the study area are alongside rivers that cross boundaries, such as the Thames (Thames Gateway), Lea (L-S-C-P) and Wandle (London-Gatwick). The East of England RIS points out that water resource plans are produced through a quite separate process; it notes the value of Water Cycle Studies and the need to find resources for them. It particularly identifies the potential conflict between the timetables for growth proposed in the RSS and in the Asset Management plans regulated by Ofwat.

4.6.3 The Environment Agency is a key actor in these fields: it has its own regional boundaries, which do not necessarily fit well with planning boundaries. The Agency is developing a management plan to prevent flooding along the tidal Thames this century. Consultation began in late 2007 and the outcome will be a key input for future Plan reviews. The
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forthcoming consultation on water resource management plans should have an inter-regional dimension.

4.7 Town Centres

4.7.1 The hierarchy of centres in the study area is dominated by Central London. The 11 Metropolitan Centres of London tend to be much higher up the list of town centre rankings than the town centres outside London. These Metropolitan Centres are in Outer London and generally draw significant numbers of consumers from towns outside London. For example, there are several strongly performing Metropolitan Centres in South London, which act as an attraction for people living in the smaller towns within the southern part of the MGB.

4.7.2 Although town centre policy is generally consistent across all 3 Plans and seeks a full range of activities and services within centres, there is little pan-regional co-ordination of town centre or retail policy. Indeed policy tends to be competitive, rather than collaborative, as each town seeks to optimise its retail, leisure and office performance. The Mayor has argued that parking policies in town centres just beyond London are more liberal than within the capital, disadvantaging centres in its outer areas. Some weak town centres around London stay weak as they lack the critical mass to perform more strongly, but resist collaboration with neighbours to develop a more effective hierarchy.

4.7.3 The current pattern of competitive behaviours is understandable in terms of local politics, but does not necessarily provide consumers with access to a range of town centre services in the most effective way. The GLA has commissioned a comprehensive analysis of long-term retailing, which will look at expenditure forecasts not just for London, but also for its hinterland: the results could provide an important basis for collaboration on town centre and retail policy in the next round of Plan reviews.

4.8 Social Infrastructure

4.8.1 Most social infrastructure planning will take place at the local rather than the regional or sub-regional planning scale. However, the South East Implementation Plan does include a set of assumptions about the need for and cost of a series of local infrastructure requirements in its annex 4, based upon work by Roger Tym. Whilst RPBs and others expressed concerns about the potential constraints of infrastructure costs, the EiP Panels did not support the inclusion of policy to suggest that development might be deferred if key infrastructure funding were not available. However, the multipliers used by Tym to assess infrastructure requirements could be used to quantify infrastructure needs across boundaries in, for example, growth areas and co-ordination corridors in the study area.

4.8.2 The Study Area outside London is characterised by a “multi-centric” pattern of small and medium sized towns. These generally do not have the “critical mass” of demand that is usually needed to support higher order social infrastructure, such as universities and theatres, or some higher order retail services. Such higher order activities typically appear with resident populations of over 100,000. The East of England RIS suggests “There needs to be more emphasis upon place-making, with more focus within LAA, and more co-ordinated regional and sub-regional delivery, particularly to unlock the potential of the network of medium sized cities.”

4.8.3 The East of England Regional Investment Strategy points out that: “Service providers have highlighted the difficulty of providing compensatory increases in local infrastructure

52 South East Counties – The Cost of Funding Growth in South East England”, Roger Tym and Partners.
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and services in areas experiencing modest levels of incremental growth. The level of development in these areas will mean that it may take some considerable time for new capital investment and increased revenue expenditure to be triggered, placing additional burdens on existing infrastructure and service capacity.\textsuperscript{55}

4.9 Opportunities

4.9.1 The analysis above tends to focus upon constraints to growth, because these are substantial over much of the study area. However, there are parts in which the key issue is to maximise opportunities for growth. This is especially true in the east, where major public investment is not yet producing economic performance at a rate comparable with the rest of the Greater South East. There are also parts of Outer London, notably in the east and south, where the economy is under-performing. Croydon town centre is one example of a becalmed local economy, despite its relatively excellent transport infrastructure. Gordon and Hall have suggested that it is essential to strengthen the skills base of the local population if the opportunities created by infrastructure improvements are to be taken.\textsuperscript{56}

4.9.2 At the stakeholders’ workshop, the point was made that many towns in the study area have strong visions, which encompass growth as a part of place making and are taking opportunities to encourage development. However, much of this growth is necessarily in small increments within existing urban areas and is not of a scale sufficient to attract substantial new infrastructure. This progressive accumulation of growth without supporting infrastructure was said to be “losing hearts and minds”.

4.10 Encouraging Collaboration

4.10.1 All planning authorities are now enjoined to engage in “collaborative planning”.\textsuperscript{57} There are strong and growing pressures to collaborate up, down and sideways. For example, the requirements for greater community involvement have intensified and the need for stronger corporate and inter-sector co-ordination has increased with vehicles such as LAAs. These demands are thrown upon planning agencies with limited resources, not least at the regional level. Voluntary partnerships are often hard to sustain, especially when the number of partners is large. The workshop involving stakeholders placed particular emphasis upon the problem of finding capacity to handle all these demands. Better inter-regional collaboration is necessary in the study area, but it is essential to be realistic about where and when collaboration is necessary to the delivery of core strategy, and where and when it is “nice to do”.

4.11 Strategic collaboration

4.11.1 The \textit{Inter-regional Forum} was established in 2000 as the main co-ordination body for the 3 RPBs. It is composed of 15 representatives nominated by the 3 RPBs. The Forum meets 3 times a year in closed session, though its minutes are public. Its Protocol says that the Forum was established to have an “advisory role” and “to build consensus and to add value to the work of the parties.” There is no discrete budget or permanent staffing and administrative support is providing by each RPB in turn. The Forum has developed a program of joint research on matters such as housing markets, natural resource management, transport and waste.

4.11.2 The Panel Reports from all 3 EiPs were critical of the Forum’s role in achieving collaboration at the regional level. The FALP Panel Report in particular suggested that a much more vigorous approach to inter-regional collaboration was needed, including a

\textsuperscript{55} para 11.5.
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recommendation that "work should commence on a broad inter-regional review to be completed before the end of 2008." This should be arranged under the auspices of the Forum, but carried out by independent persons, properly resourced.

4.11.3 The practicalities of day-to-day life in constraining real integration and cross-boundary working were vividly illustrated by one senior regional planner's remark to a consultancy team member recently: "Haven't really managed to look at neighbouring regions' RSSs….not core business, I'm afraid".

4.11.4 Discussion about the future of the Forum now has to take into account the Government's Review of sub-national economic development and regeneration. This proposes that the regional tier of government should be strengthened. There should be a single integrated regional strategy, which sets out economic, social and environmental objectives. RDAs would have executive responsibility for developing this strategy, which would include a regional economic growth objective and plans for housing growth. Local authority leaders would agree the strategy with the RDAs and scrutinise RDA performance, probably with a Ministerial reserve power role in case of disagreement.

4.11.5 Government Offices have a role in co-ordinating pan-regional planning in the Study Area. However, this role is somewhat restrained in the East and South East by their ultimate role in the final executive processes of plan making. The GOs see their particular role being to ensure that government policy is implemented through the plans, notably in terms of housing growth. The increasing imperatives of the latter are likely to drive GOs to take a more active role, especially in the Growth Areas.

4.11.6 There is co-ordination between the Regional Economic Strategies and current Regional Spatial Strategies. However, the new regional strategies are likely to place more emphasis upon "functional economic geography" in identifying key growth areas; to be more assertive about allocating housing growth to support economic development; and to more strongly resist local and environmental group pressures opposed to growth. Strategies led by the RDAs are likely to favour more concentrated development in support of key growth areas such as the Western Corridor and key regeneration areas such as the Thames Gateway. This will doubtless be contested, not least by some local authority leaders, who are likely to have significant influence upon the process.

4.11.7 The RPBs have drawn attention to the need for greater engagement with the national and regional investment programs of other bodies: the South East RIP for example includes a Table showing the responsibilities and review period for implementation agencies in all the main sectors. Many of the agencies, such as water companies and rail operators, deliver across regional boundaries and there is a case for stronger co-ordination of the relationships with these bodies.

4.11.8 Local authorities in the study area have differing levels of commitment towards growth and towards collaboration with neighbours, as the EiP Panels have observed and as variable rates of progress on LDFs indicate. As Gordon, Hall and others have noted, local authorities, which adopt collaborative behaviours are generally more likely to promote the economic and other needs of their communities than those that are dilatory or introspective in their behaviours.

4.11.9 The private sector has shown a growing desire to engage with strategic planning as globalisation and information flows increase the spatial scale of major market decision-
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Greater clarity about the spatial strategy for the study area as a whole would assist the private sector to align itself more closely with public policy making.

4.12 Conclusion

4.12.1 Although the Forum and RPBs have undertaken a number of joint studies on key matters, there have been relatively modest amounts of joint work on major pressures and opportunities in the form of need for infrastructure. However, the constraints involved in under-capacity of transport, water and drainage systems and in quite rigid application of Green Belt policy will have major impacts upon the implementation of current plans and the shape of future plan-making. All 3 RPBs need to understand better the relationship between spatial policy and infrastructure provision. In particular, they should consider the extent to which the present diffused pattern of growth tends to undermine the case for improvements in infrastructure. If strategic planning for the study area is to be better coordinated, it will need to find more effective means of reconciling the different kinds of stakeholders and their often divergent policies and practices.

4.12.2 In the final section of the report we offer some overall conclusions and suggestions as to how joint planning and implementation might be strengthened in the study area.

---

5 Conclusions

5.1.1 Our analysis has confirmed that the inter-regional elements of the 3 regional Plans are unsatisfactory, and that both the plan making and delivery processes would benefit from improved co-ordination. In this part of the report we suggest some ways in which this could be done. We are mindful of the powerful reasons why co-operation has proved difficult: they were articulated at the workshop, and we take them into account in making suggestions that are realistic.

5.1.2 First, each RPB is responsible only for its own area and there are explicit prohibitions on policy formulation outside its boundaries. The Inter Regional Forum has the role of co-ordination, but has no powers of prescription. There is no national spatial strategy to provide a context for regional plans. The capacity to undertake inter-regional collaboration is limited by shortage of resources and the demands of other forms of collaborative working.

5.1.3 Second, there are significant differences in the machinery of the GLA and the 2 Regional Assemblies. The Mayor has strong executive powers and is responsible for all parts of the plan process, whereas the Regional Assemblies have to reach agreement amongst a large and varied set of representatives, and the final stages of plan production rest with Government. One result is that London has gone through 3 rounds of plan making since 2000. Clearly the co-ordination of timescales becomes problematic. It is also easier for the Mayor to drive through strong policies, such as those on congestion charging and climate change, without as great a need to find consensual approaches in the way the RAs often have to.

5.1.4 Third, identification with the regional level tends to be relatively weak in the Greater South East, where regional boundaries do not relate strongly to settlement structures or historic boundaries. The promotion of local interests by both elected and voluntary bodies tends to be much more vigorous than the promotion of regional or inter-regional interests. The requirement to accommodate growth is often relegated below the local concern to protect environments. This is especially true in many parts of the study area outside London, where there has been for many decades a fear that the city’s growth might overwhelm local communities and environments.

5.2 Plan making processes

Analysis and appraisal

5.2.1 There is currently a window of opportunity for the RPBs to co-ordinate the next round of regional planning, as the EIP Panel for the FALP observed. Timescales will not be exactly aligned, nor need they be. The next Alteration to the London Plan is expected to focus quite narrowly on proposals related to Crossrail, so that the Mayor is unlikely to undertake a fuller review of the London Plan in advance of the other 2 RPBs. There is an opportunity for all 3 to co-operate where appropriate on some of the earlier stages of review.

5.2.2 In particular there is the chance over the next couple of years to share evidence and analysis on some major issues of common concern. These include transport and other strategic infrastructure matters. The Government Offices particularly noted the dependence of the Regional Assemblies on evidence from other parties that was not necessarily fit for purpose, and suggested that a stronger joint evidence base was essential for better collaboration.

5.2.3 We have found no evidence-based projections of all-mode transport capacity relating to projected growth for the study area. Strategic policy modelling of a variety of transport and growth scenarios is desirable across the study area to inform sub-regional decisions. The
same holds true for strategic supply of and demand for water and drainage and for flood prevention, where joint information gathering and analysis across boundaries and between agencies would result in far more robust policy making and more effective delivery. We discuss this later.

5.2.4 There are opportunities to consider consistent criteria for application in the 3 Plans in their next round. For example, environmental constraints are especially sensitive in the study area, which is under such heavy growth pressure. The RPBs could jointly assess and prioritise the weighting to be given to different environmental factors. Whilst each Plan would ultimately set out its own environmental policies, these could be informed by that joint prioritisation exercise. This seems an especially useful approach in considering the Green Belt and moving towards a more consistent approach that takes fuller account of the environmental quality of different parts of the MGB.

5.2.5 The Government Offices also argue for more joint appraisal of regional plans as they proceed through their stages. At present, the main point of assessment of the impacts of regional plans upon other regions comes at the EIP when the process is at a very advanced stage and where the process rather formalised in its nature. More informal mutual appraisal at earlier stages would strengthen consistency between plans. The Forum receives reports on progress on the 3 Plans, but could facilitate a fuller, more interactive role at the earlier stages of planning.

Formulating strategy

5.2.6 We have seen that the Regional Plans have many common policies, but that there is no coherent spatial strategy for the study area. Ultimately, each RPB is responsible for its own strategy, but there are serious risks in failure to have a broadly complementary strategy in such an inter-dependent study area. We believe that the RPBs should support an informal joint process of strategy analysis for the next round of Plans. It would look at current strategy across the 3 Plans, would project forward the main issues to be faced by the study area over the next 20-30 years and would consider possible options in terms of a spatial approach. This would not result in a recommended strategy for the whole area. It would offer a contextual framework for the 3 RPBs, to which they could refer back together at each main stage of plan making. We suggest this for the study area, but the same approach could be taken for the Greater South East as a whole, as the FALPEIP Panel suggested.

5.2.7 It seems to us that a central question for such an analysis should be the collective approach to location of growth. It might ask whether the current policy, which we characterise as “spread” is sustainable in the longer term in the study area. It could consider the costs and benefits of such an approach. The joint analysis would consider alternative strategies for the study area. It is not the role of this study to recommend future strategy, but we set out below examples of the spatial options that the analysis could consider.

5.2.8 Polycentric development implies a hierarchy of settlements for which complementary, but different policies and targets apply to the appropriate levels. The study area has a global level urban centre surrounded by relatively quite small and local centres inside and outside London. These relatively small centres characteristically compete with each other, for example for employment and retailing. Partly in consequence, many of them operate below the level of true sub-regional centres – for example, in terms of having the “critical mass” to support strong universities and higher order cultural institutions. This makes them even less able to resist the draw of central London. The emerging spatial strategy for the study area tends to re-inforce this weak urban structure by spreading growth around in relatively small increments.
5.2.9 There are exceptions to this diffusion of growth, such as the major expansion proposals for Reading and Harlow, which would significantly strengthen their status as sub-regional centres. These proposals point out the potential of a more strongly evolved polycentric development strategy in which a tier of stronger sub-regional urban centres could be facilitated by more selective and ambitious growth.

5.2.10 The concept of "co-ordination corridors" offers another instrument though one that has attracted criticism from several sources. The five inter-regional "corridors" (Thames Gateway, LSCP, London – Luton, Western Wedge, London- Gatwick) all offer, to greater or lesser extent, the chance to co-ordinate larger development points (Opportunity Areas, Hubs, Centres) along strong lines of communication without the need to invade those areas of MGB and open space that lie between these development points.

5.2.11 Some argue that "corridors" have little effective purpose (EiP Panel report from East of England), threaten the MGB and open areas, and place further burdens on already overloaded transport systems. However, corridors offer some advantages; the London – Gatwick corridor, for example, would co-ordinate planning for South London, an area suffering from economic near stagnation, with places that are experiencing excessive economic and labour market pressures in areas of severe environmental restraint. The Western Wedge would co-ordinate areas on either side of the London boundary, which have very strong similarities of character, economic functions and infrastructure pressures.

5.2.12 Figures 3-5 make clear that very large proportions of growth in the study area, driven by the London Plan, are projected to occur in and around central London. Many of the local authorities that will witness this high level of growth (e.g. Westminster, Islington, Lambeth and Southwark) are not part of any corridor designation, as those corridors partly in Greater London tend to be radial, stretching from the outer London boroughs into the South East and the East of England. However, there have been some moves within London to extend the corridors closer to the centre: for example the Western Wedge starting at Paddington and Camden being included in the London –Luton prospective corridor.

5.2.13 One spatial policy option is that of continued urban intensification. Although many of the urban settlements in the study area are planned to absorb significant growth, including much of Outer London, where densities have increased substantially after the London Plan. However, densities in much of the study area are often relatively low and certainly lower than in other "mega city regions". Alternatively, many would argue that many towns within the Study Area are already suffering from excessive intensification and are at risk of losing their individuality through coalescence. This suggests that an "intensification" option would need to be defined carefully – it could probably not just be "more of the same".

5.2.14 The RDAs suggest that more attention should be paid to functional economic geography, for example in order to address imbalances between labour supply and demand and to optimise the economic performance of the study area. Government strategy favours greater development in the eastern sector of the study area, but the west is perhaps the most important economic engine in the UK outside London and we have seen that potential labour imbalances to the west of the study area are not significantly addressed in the current Plans. The relationship between economic growth policy for central London and the rest of the study area is a fundamental one that should form part of the analysis.

5.2.15 We do not argue that any one of these options should be adopted (indeed none of them are exclusive of others). We do believe they, and other possible spatial strategies, merit joint consideration as the next main round of regional planning begins. We believe that such an analysis will help to identify which will be the key areas in which inter-regional collaboration will be essential to effective regional planning. We set out below those areas
that might be central to pan-regional co-ordination as an example of the sort of approach that might be taken. These would not have the status of sub-regions. We suggest that an informal and light-touch spatial planning framework could be drawn up as part of the early stages of the next round of regional planning.

5.2.16 In 2004, the 3 RPBs collaborated with the then ODPM to produce an “Interregional Planning Statement”\(^\text{62}\). This was a relatively quick exercise, resulting in a 30 page report. It set out the key spatial strategy, the essential transport components, and an indication of the numbers of homes and jobs to be planned for to 2016. There was consultation with key stakeholders. It was a non-statutory document, but gave a “collective framework until regional plans reach fruition.” This form and level of informal framework would act as a useful and realistic model for the frameworks we suggest below.

5.3 Joint work on key areas for inter-regional co-ordination

5.3.1 There are a number of criteria that could justify cross-boundary collaboration in the study area:

1. Where growth areas across regional boundaries could more effectively exploit existing public transport routes or justify new or improved ones by co-ordinating their planning and implementation.

2. Where one growth area within the Study Area could provide increased housing/labour supply to support the economy in another area where there are constraints on housing/labour growth.

3. Where a growth area could accommodate activities that are needed in another area, which has constraints on future growth: for example providing manufacturing or distributional activities.

4. Where a group of settlements, which cross regional boundaries, would benefit from a co-ordinated spatial strategy: for example, a polycentric form of development with concentration of growth in a “central” settlement and mutual organisation in a settlement hierarchy.

5. Where the exceptionally large scale of growth in areas in different regions will have a significant impact upon each other and will benefit from co-ordination of, for example, the nature and phasing of the respective developments.

6. Where there would be environmental benefits in the co-ordination of growth across boundaries in order, for example, to minimise impacts on the MGB or to minimise climate change impacts.

5.3.2 We have applied these criteria to the main designated areas and our suggestions are below.

London (Brent Cross) - Luton Co-ordination Area

5.3.3 The Mayor has accepted the EiP Panel recommendation that “the regional and local authorities will jointly examine timescales and mechanisms for the strategic co-ordination” of London – Luton. The proposal fits several of the criteria for collaboration and especially the need for co-ordination of several very substantial growth points and for co-ordinated

\(^{62}\) “Growth and regeneration in the Thames Gateway” ODPM 2004
planning of development and transport infrastructure. Within London, there have been and are planned to be high rates of growth in the boroughs adjacent to the M1 and Thameslink routes and focus should particularly fall upon the Opportunity Areas of Brent Cross/Cricklewood and Colindale, each of which is planned to accommodate 20,000 new homes, with 20,000 new jobs in the Brent Cross Area. The Wembley Opportunity Area might arguably be included in the corridor. Outside London lie 3 Key Centres with substantial planned housing growth: Watford (c 4,000 dwellings), Hemel Hempstead (c 12,000 dwellings) and Luton/Dunstable (c 22,000 dwellings) are all Key Centres with substantial planned housing growth, and all except Watford are designated as regionally significant employment locations. These 5 growth points alone will accommodate at least 80,000 new homes as well as considerable new economic development.

5.3.4 This scale of development over an area about the same length as the Thames Gateway is sure to generate issues of phasing and co-ordination: how can housing and job creation best be managed? It will also place major new burdens on already congested strategic roads and public transport routes, including the M1 and the Thameslink services. How can these collective pressures best be negotiated? All 3 Key Centres are scheduled to have MGB reviews, and an overarching spatial framework could offer a strategic context for them.

5.3.5 The area would benefit from an informal strategic planning framework, which could consider housing, labour market and transport infrastructure issues and look at the phasing and inter-relationship of development at the 5 major growth points, including their impacts on transport systems. This could be commissioned and jointly owned by authorities along the length of the area, could be kept under review and could provide an input to the next regional plan reviews. A partnership that included regional and sub-regional authorities and representatives of the 5 main development areas could supervise this work with the Forum and its successor offering a supervisory role and ensuring that the partnership continues to monitor and to co-ordinate strategic delivery.

5.3.6 Authorities in the East of England are unconvinced that another corridor would add value, and fear that it could be a recipe for growth throughout its length. Others, including the North London Strategic Alliance, have argued that the corridor should be extended to Bedford and to Camden in inner London. There are, of course important linkages with Hatfield and Welwyn and other settlements in Hertfordshire; and Luton falls on a major east-west corridor. However, the larger the area and number of parties, the more difficult it generally is to sustain collaborative mechanisms and behaviours. It would be prudent to begin with a mechanism focused on the 5 key growth points, which took due account of wider linkages. Clearly a major focus for the framework would be the identification of priority transport infrastructure improvements for the whole area.

The Western Wedge

5.3.7 The 2002 Arup report for GLA, LDA, SEERA and SEEDA identified some powerful synergies across the "Wedge" and included a substantial number of policies for the management of the economically strong areas on both sides of the regional boundary. The Wedge is the only part of the study area that fulfils all the criteria for collaboration listed above. Hall has pointed to the strong functional inter-relationships between central London and the growth areas that lie within the Wedge, which argues for the inclusion of Paddington as the London “anchor”. There is and will continue to be a severe imbalance of jobs to resident workers within the Western Corridor that West London may have some capacity to address, although job growth will be substantial here too. The strongest reverse commuting in the study area takes place here. There are mutual problems of transport overloading. The EIP Panel suggested that the Western Corridor lacked spatial planning focus.
5.3.8 Within the London Plan, there are 5 Opportunity Areas within the Wedge; Paddington has indicative growth of 23,000 jobs and 3,000 homes; White City has 24,000 jobs and 3,500 homes; Wembley has 5,500 jobs and 5,000 homes and the major Heathrow Area has 11,000 jobs and 11,000 homes. There are 4 Metropolitan centres at Harrow, Ealing, Hounslow and Uxbridge. Within the South East Plan, Slough, Basingstoke, Aylesbury and High Wycombe are designated as “Hubs”, as is Reading, which has proposed growth of over 10,000 jobs and 12,000 homes.

5.3.9 The Wedge covers a very wide area and previous experience suggests that it is too large to sustain a long-term partnership. There is however, a powerful argument to suggest that an informal grouping of key authorities in the Wedge might draw up a spatial framework for the Wedge, building on the earlier work by Arup and that this should form an input to the next round of regional planning. The framework might be monitored by the IRF or its successor and by a mechanism such as an annual assembly of main stakeholders. The Arup study was essentially employment-led; this framework would need to address transport capacity issues, including the potential of Crossrail and Airtrack and the capacity of the M4, environmental pressures and questions of labour supply and co-ordination of the substantial quantum of housing and employment growth across the whole area and in particular in the main growth nodes listed above.

London (Croydon) - Gatwick

5.3.10 There are much lower levels of growth envisaged within this area than in the others. Croydon is a Metropolitan Centre and an Opportunity Area with identified capacity for 5,500 jobs and 2,700 homes and the Wandle Valley is seen in the London Plan as a key regeneration and intensification area; in the South East Plan, Reigate & Banstead is allocated over 9,000 new homes by the Panel, and Crawley 7,500. There have been suggestions that the area could be extended to Wandsworth. A proposal in the FALP to extend the “corridor” to Brighton was withdrawn by the Mayor in response to representations by SEERA.

5.3.11 There is a particular set of issues that would more realistically be dealt with by a smaller partnership within the core area, which has strong existing and potential economic functionality. These include the problems of labour supply around Gatwick, the potential for airport related supply activities in the Wandle Valley, the need for stimulation of the economy within this part of London, including Croydon, and the importance of protecting sensitive parts of the Green Belt. The EiP Panel suggested that Gatwick’s strategic role as a Gateway needs strengthening and that this should be done in relation to London.

5.3.12 The South London Partnership has been very active in fostering cross-boundary collaboration, has established the Wandle Forum and is a member of the Gatwick Diamond Group. These two bodies might usefully join with others to produce an informal spatial framework designed to address these issues.

London (Upper Lea Valley) -Stansted

5.3.13 A core co-ordination area would most sensibly run from the Upper Lea Valley through Harlow to Stansted. The Upper Lea Valley Opportunity Area has an indicative capacity of 15,000 jobs and 7,000 homes. Harlow has a growth allocation of 16,000 homes, is a regionally significant strategic employment location and is a priority area for regeneration. Development at Stansted Airport envisaged in the Government’s Proposed Changes will be within an area with very restricted capacity for other growth: labour is intended to come from Harlow and nearby towns.

5.3.14 This area does not form a “growth corridor”; as the EiP Panel noted; there are many parts in which growth is unsuitable. However, there is a coherent co-ordination area, in which powerful housing, employment and transport linkages can be addressed; for example,
there is likely to be a need for airport related employment and industries from North East London as well as Harlow and for transport capacity improvements between the main nodes in the corridor. The North London Study noted that most sites outside the Lea Valley were relatively small and suited to housing rather than employment, so that there is potential for labour supply.63

5.3.15 There is a good argument to extend the area into the major development areas of the Lower Lea Valley. However, this area has its own very complex development agenda, including the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Experience in the Study area suggests that a more limited area with fewer key growth points is more likely to achieve sustained results.

5.3.16 Again, there is a powerful case for a spatial framework for the area. It should consider issues of labour market supply between the nodes, including Stansted, and at transport capacity, including linkages to the Lower Lea Valley and the City of London and to the Thames Gateway. There are some key agencies including the new Harlow LDV, the North London Strategic Alliance and the Stansted authorities. An informal partnership based on a limited number of key stakeholders, supported by Growth Area funding should be durable enough to monitor the delivery of the framework.

Thames Gateway

5.3.17 The performance of the Gateway delivery model has been criticised64 and the Gateway has been characterised by a lack of “institutional sustainability”65 in which planning and implementation responsibilities and mechanisms have undergone frequent change. Nevertheless, it is very strongly established in terms of strategy and investment. It has perhaps been weakened by regular changes in institutional arrangements. The 3 RPBs undertook an exemplary exercise in collaboration with Government to produce an Inter Regional Planning Statement in 2004 (which might act as a model for the spatial frameworks suggested for other corridors).66 The final Gateway Plan is awaited and should be able to take into account the 3 RSSs. At this stage, it would seem most realistic to allow these efforts at collaboration to work rather than introduce more policy or institutional change. The current mechanisms, including the sub-regional partnerships and LDVs, need time to deliver.

Collaborative approaches to main settlements

5.3.18 Clearer co-ordination of policies for the main Hubs, Centres and Opportunity Areas can partly be achieved through their incorporation into the “light touch” co-ordination corridor approach suggested above. In addition, there is a strong case for a more polycentric development approach across the several towns and town centres in Hertfordshire and North London: this could assist the case for strategic public transport improvements and create a more coherent town centre hierarchy. Analysis of this proposal could be led by the Hertfordshire local authorities and North London Strategic Alliance. There is also an argument for a joint approach towards policy for major town centres within South London and in the London Fringe. A joint analysis of issues could be led by the London Fringe Partnership and South London Partnership.

---

63 Roger Tym “LSCP Corridor: initial assessment of growth potential in London” Mayor of London 2004
64 For example, by a recent Select Committee Report.
Sub-regions

5.3.19 The sub-regions identified in the 3 Plans have some weaknesses, as our earlier analysis showed. However, they have survived the scrutiny process of the EIPs. Our view, on balance, is that it would aid consistency and “institutional sustainability” in regional planning in the study area if they were retained. Their contribution to distinctive policy making seems to us modest and it might be better for the reviews of regional plans to focus resources upon the Growth Areas, corridors and urban centres as suggested above. The sub-regions provide an appropriate level at which to develop implementation frameworks as suggested below and there could be benefits in focusing sub-regional work upon the delivery process.

5.4 Implementation

Implementation plans

5.4.1 The next round of Regional Implementation planning should include a much stronger inter-regional dimension. In the meantime, the South East Panel proposes that the Regional Implementation Plan should be updated on a regular basis (more frequently than the Plan itself)\(^{67}\). A co-ordinated non-statutory exercise in updating all 3 implementation proposals would give the opportunity to introduce a stronger inter-regional dimension and to allow each RPB to benefit from the innovatory practices that each have undertaken in fields such as water, flooding and drainage.

5.4.2 There could be value in the formulation of informal inter-regional implementation frameworks for key places such as the Growth Areas and co-ordination corridors: the production of these would need limited resources since they could draw upon the sub-regional frameworks for each relevant sub-region and reconcile them across regional boundaries.

5.4.3 The Mayor is initiating a set of Sub-regional Implementation Frameworks in each of the 5 London sub-regions. These will focus upon implementation and will include the delivery plans of the LDA and TfL. The FALP commits the Mayor to include the Regional Assemblies and Development Agencies of the East and South East in the process of creating these Frameworks. The South East Implementation Plan includes a set of delivery proposals for each sub-region and SEERA also intends to produce Sub-regional Frameworks. SEERA and SEEDA are collaborating on a joint Regional Implementation Plan: it would be helpful if this included a sub-regional dimension to assist in inter-regional co-ordination.

Tackling delivery pressures and opportunities

5.4.4 We have suggested that the current tendency to “spread” growth across the study area is likely to be ill-suited to efficient delivery of infrastructure of all forms, because it fails to maximise demand, requires more extensive delivery networks and leads to higher supply costs. The experience of delivery of the current plans needs to be fed into the next round of regional planning so that deliverability becomes a basic criterion.

5.4.5 In particular, spatial planning for the study area has to be more effectively synchronised with transport capacity. In order to examine the complex evidence base of the relationship between transport and growth in the South East, a computer programme that can model transport congestion under a variety of scenarios and timescales by aggregating and manipulating the current disparate variables of growth and capacity, would be an essential tool. The LASER model, developed by the Department for Transport, could be a

\(^{67}\) 27.12.
useful basis for a fully-integrated region-level model of this type. Without this kind of evidence base, the ability of the RPBs to advocate transport improvements is diminished. Each RPB is likely to be required to justify its assumptions about transport in government spending rounds and at the next set of EiPs so that each will probably need to undertake such studies; they could add value by building in a study area dimension to these studies.

5.4.6 In effect the 3 Plans juxtapose, within the study area, the most dynamic growth in the UK and a strong restriction upon growth in the Green Belt. As the RTPI has advocated, policy for the MGB needs:

- Co-ordination with spatial development strategies
- A set of criteria to enable more consistent decisions about what should and should not be released

5.4.7 The 3 regions need to get together with central government to address the MGB issue with some urgency, not just to include more relevant policy in the next reviews, but also to stop the review process in each of up to 18 places from sinking into a local dogfight in which strategic issues are largely ignored. The aim should be to agree a common set of criteria for assessment of MGB, which might include:

- Quality of land and landscape and of access to them
- Identified functional role(s) of each specific section of MGB
- Value of existing and potential new uses
- Potential for sustainable and polycentric development in accordance with overall spatial strategy
- Potential for substitution

5.4.8 Issues of water supply and flood risk create significant constraints in some parts of the Greater South East and collaborative spatial development planning could help to mitigate these. The successful exercise in co-ordinating waste disposal across the 3 regions might be replicated for other forms of infrastructure such as water supply. Inter-regional collaboration in growth areas and co-ordination corridors could facilitate opportunities to consider, for example, joint development of decentralised energy networks across boundaries.

Implementation Mechanisms

5.4.9 Most of our suggestions could be delivered through existing institutions if the necessary resources were made available and if there was a will to collaborate. However, there is a strong case for the strengthening of the current mechanisms for collaboration in the study area (and Greater South East) before the Sub National Review recommendations are implemented. In 2004 the London Assembly undertook a thoughtful review of inter-

---

70 The Glasgow and Clyde Valley provides an example of a set of unitary authorities in a metropolitan area voluntarily coming together to produce a Joint Structure Plan. They agreed to form a joint
regional arrangements and made some suggestions for strengthening these that are still worthy of consideration.  

5.4.10 There is a case for the inclusion of other bodies on the Forum: most obviously the RDAs, which will become the successor bodies. The inclusion of GOs on the Forum, perhaps as observers, is worthy of consideration. The London Assembly Review suggested that there might be a yearly “assembly” in which all key stakeholders participated in an effort to improve understanding and the timing and content of delivery plans.

5.4.11 Below the regional level, there are a variety of collaborative mechanisms, which could be used to improve pan-regional working in the study area. The fullest of these is the Strategic Partnership model of Thames Gateway, in which a ministerial level co-ordinating body co-ordinates development across the whole area, supported by a substantial budget and staff. The model could operate more effectively, but it seems fundamentally sound for delivering such large, long-term growth and the last thing that is needed is yet another change in institutional arrangements. We do not believe that arrangements of this size and complexity are necessary elsewhere in the study area. However, we do see value in informal joint working focused upon the spatial frameworks for key corridors and groupings of urban areas as propose above. Experience suggests that this should be driven by a core group of main stakeholders, but that is should have a strong consultative component.

5.4.12 Some other collaborative mechanisms, such as Local Delivery Vehicles and Multi-Agency Agreements, are likely to be inappropriate for the inter-regional scale of collaboration, although LDVs like the one established for Harlow may well be important players in co-ordination corridors.

Feasibility of proposals

5.4.13 We have made a number of suggestions to improve inter-regional planning and delivery in the study area. We believe that these are practical proposals because:

- they can be absorbed into early stages of next cycle of regional Plan making

- most of the analysis and assessment of policy options and potential for delivery will need to be done anyway as part of each regional Plan review: there will be limited amount of "additional" work involved in doing this on a collaborative basis and there are likely to be some savings by sharing costs

- sharing each others’ considerable best practice and evidence should be relatively easy way to add value within each region

- there would be greater potential for support for joint working from agencies such as the Government Offices and RDAs as well as bodies like the Environment Agency

- they should be done with a light touch and on an informal basis

- there is much expertise within the regional and local authorities to tap into

committee, which has been responsible for a highly regarded Plan, impressive levels of institutional collaboration and the leveraging in of substantial resources. There are important geographical and political differences, but this example does show that voluntary co-operation at a regional level can add substantial value. See Goodstadt in "Strategic Planning for Regional Development in the UK", Dimitriou and Thompson, Routledge 2007

5.4.14 The Forum’s work towards a co-ordinated approach to waste management offers an example of what can be done. The pressures created by the export of London’s waste into the Greater South East has been a major source of contention, not least at the first London Plan EiP. The Forum has co-ordinated joint work by officers from the RPBs and local authorities. Substantial progress has been made in resolving serious problems of technical complexity and high political and local sensitivity, including an increasing reconciliation of policies in the regional plans.

5.4.15 A phased approach could be taken to implementing the suggestions in this report in order to establish confidence and test working methods. For example, one joint study of infrastructure needs could be undertaken as a first step: joint modelling and analysis of transport in the study area would be a clear priority. Similarly, one of the co-ordination areas might be looked at as a trial measure, from which a toolkit for spatial framework production might emerge. The Brent Cross - Luton area would be a prime candidate, since the FALP EiP Panel recommended such a study and since no substantial work has been done for it thus far.  

5.4.16 The failure to improve co-ordination would carry serious risks. There would continue to be a spread of development and pressure upon many settlements and environments in forms that are likely to be ineffective in use of infrastructure and natural resources. It would be harder to construct a strong case for funding for infrastructure. It seems unlikely that a Government intent on delivery of growth in the study area would tolerate evidence of failure to collaborate sufficiently in subsequent planning and delivery processes.

5.4.17 It is understandable that the first phases of plan making have been rather introverted. Each RPB is a relatively new institution charged with producing a new form of spatial strategy, across complex regions with heavy growth impetus and strong environmental and other constraints. Having reached an advanced stage in the first round of regional planning, the RPBs should now have more time, experience, resources and inclination to work together in the implementation phase and in the next round of plan making.

72 Although NLSA has initiated some discussion with others in the area.
Appendix A – Assessment of Sub-regions and growth proposals

East Thames Gateway

Status

The Gateway is now a long-standing policy area with clear boundaries that have been extended to include South Essex (Figure 7). It is one of the Growth Areas designated in the Sustainable Communities Plan. Of all the areas in the study area it is the most widely recognised (apart from the Green Belt).

Figure 7: Extent of Thames Gateway

Policy

Strategic policy for the Thames Gateway was set out in RPG 9A. Subsequently, the three RPBs and Government collaborated to produce an Inter Regional Planning Statement in 2004. In October this year, Government published the Interim Plan for the Gateway with the intention of producing the final Plan following this year's public spending review. The Interim Plan sets out a target of 160,000 new homes and 180,000 new jobs by 2016. Policy has consistently focused upon regeneration and sought to identify the main growth centres. The Interim Plan describes four “transformational locations” at Canary Wharf, Stratford/Lower Lea Valley, the Ebbsfleet cluster and the London ports cluster.
Added value

Spatial and sectoral policy for the Gateway is significantly more fully developed than regional policy, which is in any case split between the three RPBs. Investment strategies for the Gateway are also relatively well developed.

Ownership

There is a Strategic Partnership for the Gateway as a whole, chaired by a Minister and supported by the Thames Gateway Directorate within DCLG. The three RDAs share a Gateway Program Manager. There are relatively very active partnerships for each of the three regional elements in the Gateway: TG South Essex, TG Kent, TG London. At the more local level there are strong partnerships including the London, Thurrock and Southend UDCs, Basildon Regeneration Partnership, and partnerships in Kent Thameside, Medway and Swale.

Inter-regional

Despite the role of the Strategic Partnership and the Directorate, the reports of all three EiP Panels were critical of co-ordination across the Gateway regional boundaries. In the South East, the Kent Thames Gateway was said to operate too much in isolation; and the East of England report said that South Essex should “recognise and make use of its complementary role in relation to London, especially in east London and Stratford and elsewhere.” The London report referred to “a very considerable level of concern about the co-ordination mechanisms for both Growth Areas” (ie the Gateway and LSCP corridor). It also argued that the Gateway needed to be planned and marketed as a whole. However, it should be said that the RPBs took an important initiative by coming together with central government to produce the Inter-regional Planning Statement, in which all three regions took a constructive and positive approach.

Resources

According to the Interim Plan, £7 billion was spent by Government in the Gateway over the period 2003-06. Continued substantial expenditure is envisaged in the SCP. The Interim Report estimates that £38 billion will be attracted in private investment.

Effectiveness

Although there are targets in place for the Gateway, the Public Accounts Committee recently made strong criticisms of disjoined project management and poor monitoring and control mechanisms in the Gateway.

North East and South East London

The FALP retains the priority given to East London in the original London Plan although this area is now split into two sub-regions, each of which includes part of Thames Gateway. This caused comment at the EiP but the Panel concluded that, on balance, the Gateway was strongly enough established to overcome problems the split might create. There is a strong correlation between the Opportunity Areas in these two sub-regions and the Gateway Growth Areas (see Figure 8). This suggests that there are real corridors within which major development is anticipated at least within London.
Figure 8: Opportunity Areas in Greater London (Diagrammatic)
Figure 9: Opportunity Areas and Areas of Intensification in London (Actual extent)

North East

London-Stansted-Cambridge –Peterborough

Status

This Growth area was designated in the Sustainable Communities Plan. It was criticised by the Panel and has effectively been relegated in the Government's Changes, where it does not appear on the Key Diagram. The Changes note that it has never been the intention that the Growth Areas would be continuous corridors of development. Rather they are "broad areas based on urban areas to deliver significant sustainable growth." (3.7). The Government has produced a map of the LSCP Area (Figure 10), which is extremely widely drawn (as compared for example to the Thames Gateway). The Stansted/M11 sub-region, which originally set out policy in the Study area beyond London, has been deleted altogether, leaving LSCP as a policy instrument that appears to be incompatible with the spatial policy in the Government’s own Changes. Harlow is now identified in the Plan as a Centre rather than a key sub-regional centre within the LSCP Area. The Area is included in the London Plan and the Government has again produced a very wide definition of the area, which includes large swathes of suburban London in, for example, western Enfield and eastern Redbridge, which seem unsuited to designation as a Growth Area.
Figure 10: Study Area portion of London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough growth area

Figure 11: Greater London portion of London–Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough growth area
Policy

There is no dedicated policy statement for the LSCP in the Changes. Most policy is now to be found in the London Fringe sub-region, for which policy is essentially protective rather than growth-oriented and in the Harlow Centre, for which policy is focused on the wider urban area rather than a sub-region. Policy 5B1 and 5C1 of the London Plan support the Growth Area concept.

Added Value

The LSCP Growth Area now appears to be a source of confusion in policy and funding terms.

Inter-regional

The inter-regional dimension has effectively disappeared now that the Stansted/M11 sub-region no longer provides the link to London. The London Fringe is the ‘point of contact’ with North and North East London, but the more meaningful links are with Harlow and Stansted.

Ownership

The LSCP policy is "owned" in the SCP. However this is of limited value since the statutory RSS will not contain policy for it and there are no significant mechanisms to support its development. There are LDVs at Harlow and Cambridge and a strong network in London co-ordinated by the NLSA with support from the LDA.

Resources

SCP includes some resources for the Growth Area. However, these are spread over a wide geographical area.

Effectiveness

There are no clear criteria to determine where and when growth should take place in the Growth Area.

North East London sub-region

The LSCP corridor is included in this sub-region. There is a strong corridor of substantial Opportunity Areas running up the Lea Valley, suggesting that this is an important corridor of development within London.

The London Arc

Status

The Arc is included in the Government’s most recent Changes (Figure 12). However, the Panel criticised “the uncertain extent” of the sub-region and the confusion created by the “overlay” of the Thames Gateway and LSCP corridors. The latter has been to some extent resolved by the removal of the Stansted/M11 sub-region and by differentiating between the Gateway and the Arc on the Key Diagram. The Panel itself differentiated between the east and west parts of the Arc.
Policy

The Government's Changes sharpen policy to add the need for urban regeneration and for MGB reviews at Hemel Hempstead, Welwyn Garden City and Hatfield. Other towns will develop their existing roles within its “polycentric structure” – although it is arguable that there is no clear urban hierarchy usually associated with polycentric policy.

Added value

Beyond the reference to MGB reviews, which are not unique to this sub-region, the added value in policy terms is marginal at best. The removal of Harlow from the Arc seems to relegate the Arc more emphatically to the generic RSS policy of MGB restraint and exploiting limited urban opportunities.

Inter-regional

The strong case made by NLSA at the EiP for stronger linkages is reflected in an explicit policy in the Changes that “Across the London Arc the local authorities should work with those in Greater London…..to ensure opportunities presented by radial public transport routes secure “mutually – supporting poles of development at nodal points” and a network-wide approach to inter-urban journeys by public transport” (LA1).

Ownership

There appears to be no formal implementation partnership for the Arc. The exclusion of Harlow from the London Arc removes the most important growth centre from its wider sub-region.
Resources
No dedicated resources are apparent.

Effectiveness
The requirement for MGB reviews has reduced the clarity of planning criteria for the Arc.

North West

London – Luton

Status
The Mayor has accepted the Panel recommendation that “the regional and local authorities will jointly examine timescales and mechanisms for the strategic co-ordination” of London – Luton and possibly extending to Bedford. This would potentially be a “co-ordination corridor”. There is no definitive boundary in the London Plan and no reference to this corridor in the East of England Plan. Figure 13 indicates the broad area that might be included in the corridor as advocated by the North London Strategic Partnership.

Figure 13: London-Luton Corridor

Policy
The London Plan states that there is a series of areas within the Corridor with development potential, which need strategic co-ordination. Policy 5B1 commits to joint working with other authorities on this.

Added value
The London Plan commits the Mayor to investigate the proposal for this “co-ordination corridor”. There are a set of linear regeneration and development areas including Opportunity Areas and Luton as a
Key Centre. However Luton is part of other policy areas, so would this corridor cause confusion and over-complicate planning as authorities in the East of England argue?

Inter-regional

There may be advantages in the co-ordination of infrastructure and investment and of the phasing of development.

Ownership

NLSA are strongly supportive of the corridor designation, but authorities in the East of England at all levels have been opposed.

Resources

No resources appear to have been allocated.

Effectiveness

The corridor’s effectiveness is yet to be established.

North London sub-region

There are Opportunity Areas at Brent Cross and Colindale, which suggests that there is a significant corridor of major development at least within London (refer to Figure 8). The LDA has published the North London Development and Investment Framework, which identifies where development is happening in North London.

West

Western Wedge

Status

The Western Wedge is included in the London Plan as a Co-ordination Corridor in which the regional and economic development bodies will promote co-ordinated forms of sustainable development (Policy 1.3). However, there is no specific boundary in the Plan and that contained in the 2002 Arup Report has no statutory status (Figure 14). The Wedge is not included in the South East Plan as a concept or area, although an international/interregional corridor is identified running through the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley sub-region and Western Wedge into central London, as well as a number of regional spokes (identified as management and investment priorities).
Policy
London Plan policy 5F1 for West London repeats the intent to co-ordinate across regional boundaries. The 2002 Arup report for GLA, LDA, SEERA and SEEDA includes a substantial number of policies for the management of the economically strong areas on both sides of the regional boundary.

Added value
There would seem to be substantial added value in policies which co-ordinate growth of housing and jobs and the management of transport in highly congested areas with common environmental issues. The Crossrail proposal would add another important cross-regional link.

Inter-regional
The initial impetus behind the Wedge was powerful with the key regional agencies collaborating. However, since the Arup report, this momentum has largely evaporated as symbolised by the lack of reference in the South East Plan, and the Wedge's westernmost areas now designated as the ‘Western Corridor’ instead (which does not extend into London).

Ownership
At present there appears to be no strong driver of collaboration on the Wedge.

Resources
No dedicated resources are apparent.
Effectiveness

Immediate impacts have proved short-lived.

Western Corridor

Status

This sub-region has its antecedents in RPG9’s “Western Policy Area”. There seems to be little dispute about the validity of this sub-region, with its strong economic growth. The Blackwater Valley has been added: this lies beyond the Study Area and the logic of merging the two was questioned at the EiP, though the Panel accepted the rationale for including it. The boundaries in the draft Plan (Figure 15) coincide quite well with those of the western half of the Western Wedge, except that the latter include south and central Oxfordshire.

Figure 15: The Western Corridor

Policy

The strategy is to continue to support the area’s leading role in the economic life of the region and nation without allowing over-development. The Panel accepts the former role but notes that SEERA projections indicate that the current imbalance of nearly 116,000 jobs over resident employees could potentially widen by over 90,000 over the Plan period. The Panel therefore makes proposals to increase housing provision by 20% to 107,000 by 2026. It also argues that a clearer strategy is needed that emphasises the role of urban hubs, notably of Reading

Added value

The Panel said that there is a ‘very strong case for a sub-regional approach’ to dealing with the difficult issues faced by the WCBV, but that the sub-regional policy “lacks any real sub-regional
specificity in relation to development of environmental considerations.” It accepts the emphasis upon smart growth but argues that this should be treated as a regional issue.

Inter-regional

The sub-region is essentially radial rather than orbital in nature. However, there is no mention of the Western Wedge and very little reference to the West London sub-region despite the powerful existing links and the potent impact that Crossrail will potentially have upon this.

Ownership

The Panel notes the complexity of local government in the area, with 6 unitaries, 7 districts and 3 counties, though it commends the work of the Joint Berkshire Strategic Planning unit in their part of the sub-region. There are only weak supporting partnerships covering the whole of the sub-region, but some notable groups representing the ‘western corridor’ sector (such as Thames Valley Economic Partnership and Berkshire Strategic Transport Forum).

Resources

Transport, including Crossrail.

Effectiveness

The issue here is the ability or otherwise to balance growth with environmental protection and infrastructure capacity.

West London sub-region

There are substantial Opportunity Areas around Heathrow (refer to Figure 8), which suggest that there is major growth potential within outer West London.

South

The London Fringe

The London Fringe covers most of Surrey and a small area of west Kent (Figure 16). Outside the urban areas, it is entirely in the Metropolitan Green Belt. Although the Panel report describes the urban structure as polynuclear, there is no clear hierarchy, although there are three regional hubs: Guildford, Woking and Redhill, and Epsom, Staines and Sevenoaks are also identified for investment to maintain their town centre roles.
Figure 16: London Fringe

Status

At the EiP there was significant disagreement about the designation and even title of the sub-region. There are two powerful foci operating across different parts of the sub-region, namely Heathrow and Gatwick. The boundary with the Gatwick sub-region is “not widely agreed” and Kent disputed the inclusion of Sevenoaks. The Panel concluded that “on balance” the sub-region had a “functional logic.” The anxieties about the sub-region are rather similar to those expressed about the London Arc, which the Panel similarly supported “on balance”.

Policy

The Panel reported that “there was little agreement in the EiP debates about the coherence of the sub-regional strategy.” The draft Plan aims to support sustainable economic growth and meet housing needs “as far as possible”. However, the Panel found that policy was too restrictive towards growth in the three hubs and indeed they could not operate effectively as hubs without some capacity for expansion, which would be enabled by MGB boundary reviews. Small -scale MGB reviews may also be needed in Epsom & Ewell, Tandridge, Mole Valley, Spelthorne and Sevenoaks, Elmbridge and Runnymede. There is already a significant excess of jobs over housing and the draft Plan would increase this by over 50,000 by 2026. The Panel recommends an increase of about 9,000 dwellings to 46,000 in total would mitigate, but by no means eliminate, the jobs excess. The Government has identified Reigate as a New Growth Point, although the EiP Panel point out that this is not reflected in the housing target in the draft Plan and recommend accordingly.

Added value

The policies of both the draft Plan and as amended by the Panel do not appear to add significant value to national policy, particularly for MGB or to the draft Plan’s generic policies for the region as a whole. Indeed the sub-regional strategy statement itself directly cross-references the overarching policy of sustainable development in Chapter C. Beyond a small and flexible difference in the
affordable housing target and the housing and employment targets and policies on regional hubs, there is little that is distinctive.

**Inter-regional**

The sub-regional strategy is largely silent about links with London (although these are picked up in the regional part of the plan, for example in the Town Centres chapter) and implies its main role is “containing London.” The Panel say that inter-authority working must include other sub-regions on the edge of London. We discuss the question of the inter-connectedness of the Fringe, Gatwick and South London sub-regions elsewhere.

**Supporting mechanisms**

A study group developed policies for the Fringe and a working group still exists, which includes representation from the South London Partnership.

**Resources**

No dedicated resources at this stage.

**Effectiveness**

Criteria for evaluation have been blurred by the tensions around the degree of restraint/growth in the sub-region.
London-Gatwick

Status

This inter-regional corridor was included in the 2004 London Plan and remains in the Further Alterations as identified on the Key Diagram. A proposal to extend the corridor to Brighton was withdrawn by the Mayor in response to representations by SEEDA. The Mayor accepted the Panel’s suggestion that it should be known as a “co-ordination corridor”. There is no definitive boundary for the corridor, which is not referred to in the draft South East Plan. Within London, it would clearly be centred on the Wandle Valley and the Opportunity Area of Croydon. It might extend into Wandsworth to the north, but there is no clarity about its northern, eastern or western boundaries (Figure 17 shows a notional area).

Figure 17: London Gatwick Corridor

Policy

The London Plan now says it will “support the strategic co-ordination of the development corridor from Gatwick towards Gatwick and collaborate with SEERA, SEEDA and local authorities”.

Added Value

The potential added value would reside in managing the economic and transport linkages, especially between the Airport and its hinterland along the north-south axis of the Wandle Valley and M25.

Inter-regional

There are no effective policy linkages because the corridor spans 3 sub-regions and sub-regional policy in the London Fringe and Gatwick sub-regions does not recognise the corridor.
Ownership
The FALP Panel suggests that specific arrangements are made for collaborative work, but these do not exist at present. The SLP is a strong advocate of the corridor and has engaged with bodies outside London, notably the Gatwick Diamond.

Resources
No dedicated resources are apparent.

Effectiveness
No clear criteria at present.

Gatwick

Status
The Panel heard “widely differing views about the role and rationale for the Gatwick Area sub-region and the appropriateness of its boundary”. Some said it had little cohesion; SEEDA was concerned about the exclusion of Redhill/Reigate, which is included in the Gatwick Diamond partnership (Figure 18). The Panel decided against disturbing the joint working arrangements developed through the evolution of the sub-regional strategy, but felt close relationships with Redhill and Reigate were needed.

Figure 18: Gatwick Sub-region

Policy
Sub-regional strategy is to maintain the character of the area and manage growth at a rate that can be assimilated by local communities. The Panel recommended that policy should be sharpened to “seek
sustainable economic growth based in part on Gatwick Airport’s gateway role” whilst protecting the sub-region’s distinctive environmental assets. Housing targets should be increased by 4.5% in response to local needs, especially for affordable housing (with the possibility of small MGB reviews around Reigate and Banstead).

**Added Value**

The Panel commented that many participants found little that was spatially distinctive about sub-regional policy and could see little difference from the overall regional policy in Chapter C.

**Inter-regional**

The draft Plan says little about the linkages in London, which seems surprising in view of the economic connectivities associated with the Airport. The Panel suggests that stronger reference is needed to joint working, including recognition of the relationship with South London.

**Ownership**

The Gatwick sub-region has a strong economic partnership, including Redhill/Reigate and indeed the South London Partnership. This appears to be a strong driver, albeit one focused on business interests.

**Resources**

No dedicated resources are apparent but strong private sector investment potential is evident.

**Effectiveness**

Not much evidence on which to judge.

**South London sub-region**

There is a rather less pronounced corridor of major development potential, but there is an Opportunity Area at Croydon and the Wandle Valley is described as “a strategic opportunity for regeneration”.
Appendix B - Growth proposals in the 3 Plans

Table 1: Key Centres for Development & Change (East of England)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Centre</th>
<th>Housing growth to 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hemel Hempstead</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welwyn Garden City &amp; Hatfield</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watford</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton/Dunstable</td>
<td>26,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Regional Hubs (South East Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>Plan housing to 2026</th>
<th>Panel housing to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>7,740</td>
<td>9,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woking</td>
<td>4,840</td>
<td>5,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>10,420</td>
<td>12,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Wycombe</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Adds 1,000 to Kent TG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebbsfleet</td>
<td>20,000 (Dartford/Gravesend)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Opportunity Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Indicative employment capacity&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt;2001-2026</th>
<th>Minimum homes&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt;2001-2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King's Cross</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euston</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottenham Court Road</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Lea Valley (including Tottenham Hale)*</td>
<td>3,133</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricklewood/Brent Cross</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colindale</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Areas for Intensification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Indicative employment capacity&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt;2001-2026</th>
<th>Minimum homes&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt;2001-2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arsenal/Holloway</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Hill East</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey Heartlands/Wood Green</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hampstead Interchange</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborn</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farringdon/Smithfield*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | **4,011** | **96,100** | **44,750** |
### Table 4: Opportunity Areas in North East London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity Areas</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Indicative employment capacity&lt;sup&gt;(3)&lt;/sup&gt; 2001-2026</th>
<th>Minimum homes&lt;sup&gt;(5)&lt;/sup&gt; 2001-2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Dogs</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Fringe (Bishopsgate/South 489</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreditch)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Lea Valley including Stratford*</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City East/Royal Docks</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Riverside</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilford</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,836</strong></td>
<td><strong>259,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5: Opportunity Areas and Areas for Intensification in South East London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity Areas</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Indicative employment capacity&lt;sup&gt;(3)&lt;/sup&gt; 2001-2026</th>
<th>Minimum homes&lt;sup&gt;(5)&lt;/sup&gt; 2001-2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Bridge/Bankside</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant &amp; Castle</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Creek/ Greenwich Riverside</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham-Catford-New Cross</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich Peninsula &amp; Charlton</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich, Thamesmead &amp; Charlton</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley Riverside</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Areas for Intensification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Indicative employment capacity&lt;sup&gt;(7)&lt;/sup&gt; 2001-2026</th>
<th>Minimum homes 2001-2026&lt;sup&gt;(8)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water/Surrey Quays</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidbrooke</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,570</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 6: Opportunity Areas and Area for Intensification in South West London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Indicative employment capacity&lt;sup&gt;(7)&lt;/sup&gt; 2001-2026</th>
<th>Minimum homes 2001-2026&lt;sup&gt;(8)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall/Nine Elms/Battersea</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area for Intensification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wimbledon/Colliers Wood</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>469</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7: Opportunity Areas in West London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Indicative employment capacity <em>(9)</em> 2001-2026</th>
<th>Minimum homes 2001-2026 <em>(10)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow (including Hayes, West 821 Drayton, Southall, Feltham, Bedfont Lakes and Hounslow)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>10,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Royal/Willesden Junction</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembley</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White City</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,802</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C – Local Authorities within the Study Area

Subregional designations covering the local authority area are shown in brackets after its name.

**Greater London:**

1. Barking and Dagenham (Thames Gateway)
2. Barnet (London-Luton-Bedford)
3. Bexley (Thames Gateway)
4. Brent
5. Bromley
7. Croydon (London-Gatwick)
8. Ealing (Western Wedge)
9. Enfield (London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
10. Greenwich (Thames Gateway)
11. Hackney (London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
12. Hammersmith and Fulham (Western Wedge)
13. Haringey (London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
14. Harrow
15. Havering (Thames Gateway)
16. Hillingdon (Western Wedge)
17. Hounslow (Western Wedge)
18. Islington
19. Kensington and Chelsea (Western Wedge)
20. Kingston upon Thames
21. Lambeth
22. Lewisham (Thames Gateway)
23. Merton (London-Gatwick)
24. Newham (Thames Gateway)
25. Redbridge (London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
26. Richmond upon Thames
27. Southwark
28. Sutton (London-Gatwick)
29. Tower Hamlets (Thames Gateway)
30. Waltham Forest (London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
31. Wandsworth (London-Gatwick)
32. Westminster

(note: Data was not gathered for City of London on all study area analyses, for example population projections; it is therefore excluded from above list)

East of England
33. Basildon (Thames Gateway)
34. Braintree (London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
35. Brentwood (London Arc)
37. Castle Point (Thames Gateway)
38. Chelmsford
40. East Hertfordshire (London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
41. Epping Forest (London Arc, London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
42. Harlow (London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
44. Luton (London-Luton-Bedford)
45. North Hertfordshire (London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
46. Rochford (Thames Gateway)
47. South Bedfordshire (London-Luton-Bedford)
48. Southend on Sea (Thames Gateway)
49. St Albans (London Arc, London-Luton-Bedford)
50. Stevenage (London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
51. Three Rivers (London Arc)
52. Thurrock (Thames Gateway)
53. Uttlesford (London Stansted Cambridge Peterborough)
55. Welwyn Hatfield (London Arc)
South East
56. Bracknell Forest (Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley)
57. Chiltern
58. Crawley (London-Gatwick, Gatwick)
59. Dartford (Thames Gateway)
60. Elmbridge (London Fringe)
61. Epsom and Ewell (London Fringe)
62. Gravesham (Thames Gateway)
63. Guildford (London Fringe, Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley)
64. Hart (Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley)
65. Maidstone
66. Medway (Thames Gateway)
67. Mole Valley (London-Gatwick)
68. Reading (Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley)
69. Reigate and Banstead (London-Gatwick, London Fringe, Gatwick)
70. Runnymede (London Fringe)
71. Rushmoor (Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley)
72. Sevenoaks (London Fringe)
73. Slough (Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley)
74. South Buckinghamshire (Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley)
75. South Oxfordshire
76. Spelthorne (London Fringe)
77. Surrey Heath (Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley, London Fringe)
78. Swale (Thames Gateway)
79. Tandridge (London Fringe, Gatwick)
80. Tonbridge and Malling
81. Tunbridge Wells
82. Waverley
83. Windsor and Maidenhead (Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley)
84. Woking (London Fringe)
85. Wokingham (Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley)
86. Wycombe (Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley)
Appendix D – Details of calculation in Tables 1-4

General

All tables cover only the study area as defined in Figure 1 and Appendix A.

All figures relating to sub-regional designations in the tables result from aggregating totals for the local authorities contained in each sub-region (this is also set out in Appendix A).

Some double counting may occur if sub-regional totals are added together, as some local authorities fall into two or even three different sub-regions. However, all totals for the study area as set out in the tables avoid double counting.

In all tables, ‘Study Area outside Designated Areas’ refers to the aggregated total figures for those authorities that do not fall into any sub-regional designation (again, set out in Appendix A).

In all tables, ‘Inner London’ is defined as those parts of central London not falling into any of the sub-regional designations, namely the City of Westminster and the London Boroughs of Islington, Lambeth, and Southwark (Camden is excluded as it falls into the ‘London-Luton-Bedford’ designation.)

Table 1

The number of dwellings for each sub-regional designation is based on an aggregate of that sub-region’s local authority dwelling number as set out in the Census, 2001.

The number of new dwellings proposed for each sub-region comes from the EiP documents for the relevant RSSs and from the London Plan Further Alterations.

Table 2

The number of workplace jobs for each sub-regional designation is based on an aggregate of that sub-region’s local authority workplace jobs as set out in the Census, 2001.

The number of workplace jobs proposed for each sub-region comes from the EiP documents for the relevant RSSs and from the London Plan Further Alterations.

Table 3

All population figures are taken from the National Statistics mid-year population estimates for each local authority, aggregated into sub-regional designations. The figures are caveated heavily on the website, as they are projections only.

Table 4

Table 4 calculates a workplace jobs to dwelling ratio based on the figures provided in Tables 1 and 2.
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