

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date of Committee 30th January 2007

Report Title Regional Spatial Strategy Phase 2 Review - Consultation on Proposed Options by West Midlands Regional Assembly

Summary The West Midlands Regional Assembly (WMRA) is consulting on its proposed options for Phase 2 of the Review of the Regional Spatial Strategy, covering district level housing growth figures, employment land, waste and some aspects of transport. The eight week consultation period is from 8th January - 5th March 2007. A report is being made to Cabinet on 22nd February 2007 recommending a response to the consultation. Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee is requested to take an overview of the proposed options and advise Cabinet on its conclusions.

For further information please contact Andy Cowan
Chief Planner
Tel. 01926 412126
andycowan@warwickshire.gov.uk

Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework? Yes/No

Background Papers None.

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:- *Details to be specified*

Other Committees

Local Member(s)
(With brief comments, if appropriate)

Other Elected Members Councillor P Barnes
Councillor Mrs A Forwood } for information
Councillor M Jones
Councillor P Morris-Jones }

Cabinet Member
(Reports to The Cabinet, to be cleared with appropriate Cabinet Member)

Councillor C Saint - for information.

Chief Executive

.....

Legal

I Marriott – comments noted.

Finance

.....

Other Chief Officers

.....

District Councils

.....

Health Authority

.....

Police

.....

Other Bodies/Individuals

.....

FINAL DECISION

YES/NO (If 'No' complete Suggested Next Steps)

SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS :

Details to be specified

Further consideration by this Committee

.....

To Council

.....

To Cabinet

22nd February 2007

To an O & S Committee

.....

To an Area Committee

.....

Further Consultation

.....

**Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee –
30th January 2007**

**Regional Spatial Strategy Phase 2 Review - Consultation on
Proposed Options by West Midlands Regional Assembly**

**Report of the Strategic Director for
Environment and Economy**

Recommendation

That the Committee take an overview of the proposed options for the Phase 2 Review of the Regional Spatial Strategy and advise the 22nd February 2007 Cabinet meeting of its conclusions in the light of the Director's comments and conclusions set out in the report.

1. Background

- 1.1 Under the new 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is the 'top-tier' of the statutory framework of development plan documents in the West Midlands. It takes over from the county structure plans in directing the broad spatial content of the lower tier 'local development documents' (LDDs) that used to be called local plans but now comprise the 'local development framework'. The RSS has to address the main strategic issues facing the Region and the policies and proposals to tackle them. It covers a wide range of subjects including housing, economy, environment including waste and transport. Whilst the West Midlands Regional Assembly (WMRA), as 'Regional Planning Body', has the job of producing the RSS and its reviews, it has to be approved, and can be changed, by the Government.
- 1.2 The existing RSS is underpinned by two principles:-
- (i) **Urban Renaissance** – developing out the Major Urban Areas in such a way that they can increasingly cater for their own economic and social needs – countering the unsustainable outward movement of people and jobs.
 - (ii) **Rural Renaissance** – meeting the economic and social needs of rural communities whilst enhancing the unique qualities of our towns and villages and the surrounding countryside.
- 1.3 Fundamental to delivering this urban and rural renaissance is the 'step-change' in the distribution of housing growth across the Region. Since World War II, new

household growth has been generated in roughly equal proportions by the Region's major urban areas and the surrounding shires. However, prior to the current RSS, two-thirds of new housing development has been directed to the shires and one-third to the major urban areas (MUAs). The RSS seeks to reverse this de-centralising trend by re-directing housing growth – and along with it, economic growth – so that the major urban areas take the larger share of future regional development (i.e. moving towards 60% of housing growth by 2021).

- 1.4 When the RSS was published in June 2004, the Secretary of State agreed with the broad strategy but asked for selected aspects to be reviewed, indicating his priorities. As a result, the WMRA undertook to carry out a phased 'partial review' of these aspects to support the underlying strategy, not a full review i.e.
- (i) Phase 1 – Black Country Study - submitted to the Secretary of State at the end of May 2006. Examination in Public begins on 9th January 2007.
 - (ii) Phase 2 - Launched in November 2005, issues being examined include housing figures, employment land, strategic city and town centres, transport and waste.
 - (iii) Phase 3 – beginning 2007, to look at critical rural services, recreational provision, regionally significant environmental issues and the development of a framework for provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites.
- 1.5 The current consultation relates to the proposed options for Phase 2 of the RSS Review. The WMRA's programme includes a launch on 8th January in Birmingham; a questionnaire sent (post and online) to all development plan consultees Region-wide; and strategic authority led events (WCC's on 17th January 07, Shire Hall 5-7pm). (The WMRA's 100 page Consultation document can be found on www.wmra.gov.uk and copies are available in the members rooms).
- 1.6 The RSS Phase 2 Review is expected to take another two years to complete, given the latest timetable i.e. milestones include submission of the preferred option to the Secretary of State in December 2007; Examination in Public - Mid 2008; Secretary of State's consultation on Proposed Changes - Late 2008; and Final RSS Phase Two Review approved by Government - Early 2009.
- 1.7 The WMRA's Spatial Options set out future development choices or directions for the Region until 2026, principally for housing growth and employment land but also on centres, waste and limited aspects of transport - reflecting the priority given by the Secretary of State when the RSS was published in 2004. The starting point was advice from the Strategic Authorities – often referred to as the "Section 4(4) authorities" because they have a legal right under S 4(4) of the 2004 Act to put forward the first detailed sub-regional proposals for the RSS. A year ago these authorities (inc WCC) were asked by WMRA to advise on how the Phase 2 Review topics should be addressed. In particular, the WMRA brief asked how housing growth down to district level might be handled - taking into account the (then new) household projections just published by Government (the

2003 based projections) - indicating levels to 2026 up to 51% higher than currently planned for in RSS.

- 1.8 The Section 4(4) authorities in this Sub-region worked together, with the shire borough/district councils, through the CSW Forum to respond to the WMRA's brief. A robust technical response, including a strategy for addressing growth in the Sub-region, was agreed by the Forum (see **Appendix A**) and subsequently endorsed by WCC's Cabinet on 25th May 2006. Cabinet agreed that the strategy endorsed by CSW Forum would provide a basis for evaluating the options to be put forward later by the WMRA (i.e. this current consultation).

2. Housing

- 2.1 The WMRA has re-examined regional and sub-regional housing needs and requirements and how these can be met in the Region up to 2026, taking into account the existing RSS strategy, urban capacity and local market housing areas. As a result, it has identified three Options, for the 25 year period 2001-26, to provide the housing numbers for each local planning authority area to steer city/borough/district LDF Core Strategies:-

- (i) 381,000 gross new dwellings (i.e. continuation of existing RSS levels).
- (ii) 491,200 gross new dwellings (i.e. the level of additional growth capacity indicated by the strategic authorities*).
- (iii) 575,000 gross new dwellings** (i.e. meets total housing demand from Government's 2003- based household projections).

The detailed figures describing the three options are set out in **Appendix B**.

NB. *The difference between options 2 and 3 is largely due to the metropolitan authorities' assessment of limits on urban capacity and growth ambitions to meet the household growth they are expected to generate.

** Option 3 is the only option that meets Government's expectations in terms of meeting projected demand.

- 2.2 Government believes that by substantially increasing the level of house-building, general affordability will improve. However, this will not necessarily help all those who cannot compete in the open market. Planning is only one tool among several to provide new affordable housing and evidence from monitoring suggests that no more than 3,000 affordable houses, with subsidy, are likely to be built each year across the Region – as compared with the existing 6-6,500 RSS target. Therefore RSS and LDFs can only provide a partial response by identifying land (strategically and locally), and set out policies for S106 agreements and the threshold targets for negotiation with developers.

Comments:

- 2.3 The implications of the WMRA's three options for housing growth are the most significant. Increased housing growth numbers are inevitably controversial because of perceived as well as real environmental and traffic impacts. However, the economic and social importance of housing growth looms even larger nowadays as it increasingly drives consumer led private investment in business expansion and public investment in infrastructure – transport, health and education facilities. Consequently, the scale, rate and distribution of housing growth is the single most important factor in delivering the RSS's urban and rural principles through the 'step-change' (referred to in paragraphs. 1.2 and 1.3 above). The table at **Appendix C** sets out the WMRA's three options putting comparative building rates and percentage distributions alongside the totals. Attention is drawn to the following features:
- 2.4 **Option 1** just rolls forward the current RSS housing levels, ignoring the increased levels of housing demand indicated by Government's 2003 based household projections. As such, its value is limited to providing a base-line comparison for options 2 and 3. For example, option 1 demonstrates how, on the basis of previous demand forecasts, the RSS's 'step-change' has been planned to reduce the level and rate of housing development in Warwickshire by 40% compared to the past 5 years.
- 2.5 **Option 2** proposes that Warwickshire meets the 52,500 housing demand generated in the County over the 25 year period (2001-26). It distributes this growth in line with the CSW strategy (**Appendix A**), implying building rates at a County level significantly lower than experienced over the past 5 years, albeit inevitably higher than implied by current RSS rates. Growth rates are still lower (by 13% compared to the past 5 years) across the towns where the CSW strategy focuses growth - the North-South corridor from Nuneaton through Coventry to Warwick/ Leamington, and to Rugby town as the sub-regional focus (identified as a growth location in existing RSS). In the latter case, Rugby town would increase its housing stock by about 50% over the 25 years. Under this option, Warwickshire would take the lion's share of new housing growth in the CSW Sub-region - 58%, as compared to the 48% of total Regional housing growth directed to the Shire areas as a whole. This would therefore represent a significant faltering in delivery of the RSS's 'step-change'.
- 2.6 **Option 3** adds 25,000 of the total 'shortfall' under option 2 to Warwickshire, pushing the scale and rate of housing development overall to just above that experienced in the past 5 years. It is proposed to be distributed to the more sustainable locations identified in the CSW strategy, as follows:
- (i) 2,500k each allocated to Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough and Warwick District, pushing building rates in both by 100 dwellings per annum – higher than experienced in the past five years for NBBC but still lower in this respect for Warwick/Leamington.
 - (ii) 20,000 to Rugby town - given its sub-regional focus role identified in existing RSS. This scale of growth for Rugby town would involve

doubling the size of the town in 25 years with building at a scale and rate previously associated with new towns.

- 2.7 Under option 3, Warwickshire's share of total Regional housing growth would be the same as under option 2 (11%) but its share of CSW Sub-regional growth would reduce to 52% (as a consequence of Coventry being allocated 20,000 more dwellings). This would take the County closer to the Shires' overall figure of 50% and would represent a marginal/slight improvement on the position of the 'step-change' in the CSW Sub-region compared to option 2.
- 2.8 **Infrastructure:** Options 2 and 3 are not mutually exclusive (i.e. they are 'options' not alternatives). It would be possible to progress from option 2 levels, rates and distributions of new housing growth to those depicted in option 3. It mainly depends on the degree of public infrastructure and private business investment that can be applied to the locations taking the growth. However, this investment is always limited and many places in the Region and adjoining regions will be competing for it. Arguably, under both options, for example, the scale of investment required to support increases in the size of Rugby town of 50% and 100% respectively would compete with Coventry's requirements to support housing growth of 24,000 and 44,000 respectively (and vica versa).
- 2.9 **Sustainability:** In recent years, local planning authorities have tended to underestimate the amount of suitable brownfield land that will come forward for new housing development. Assessments of urban capacity have tended to take a cautious approach to re-allocation of redundant factory sites for housing and the prospect of high density apartments replacing low density housing. That said, options 2 and 3 are likely progressively to require development of land on the edges of the main growth towns of Nuneaton, Warwick/Leamington and, especially, Rugby, later on in the plan period. Inevitably, some of this land will be greenfield. However, in sustainability terms, it is better that greenfield land is developed for housing in the right locations – with access to jobs, transport and community services – than brownfield land developed in the wrong locations, such as remote rural former military establishments or industrial sites. Housing development in the locations identified in CSW's 'Core Development Area' and at Rugby (in sustainability terms, the 'right locations') will inevitably involve a mixture of greenfield and brownfield land. It also means that, outside of the CSW growth locations, in North Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon and the rural part of Rugby Borough, delivery of affordable housing will be less able to be delivered on the back of planning permissions for market housing. RSS should therefore ease the position in these districts by reducing the threshold level for negotiating affordable housing contributions from private housing developers.
- 2.10 **Government Policy:** Government has recently published 'Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing (PPS3)' on (29th November 06) and the Barker Review of Housing Land Supply on (5th December 06). For the purposes of this report, both documents place an overriding emphasis on the delivery of new housing supply to meet the new household growth demand projections in full. PPS3 is almost equally robust on the provision of new housing that saves energy and minimises climate change impact. Subject to these quantitative and qualitative imperatives, Government is prepared to allow local planning authorities to exercise their discretion in deciding the appropriate brownfield/greenfield targets

for their areas. This sharpening of Government focus presents a clear steer towards option 3.

3. Economic Development

- 3.1 The WMRA is asking for views on a proposal to include in RSS a requirement for LDFs to maintain a five year “reservoir” of available employment land based on past trends; further regionally significant employment sites including potential demand for Regional Logistics Sites, Regional Investment Sites and need for additional Major Investment Sites. It is also asking for views on the investment priorities for the strategic centres, including the balance between ‘in centre’ and ‘out of centre’ office development, alongside a Regional hierarchy of centres for directing additional retail development. This has, of course, to be viewed in the context of the parallel process being led by Advantage West Midlands (AWM) to review the Regional Economic Strategy (RES). AWM is carrying out a consultation on policy choices that ends on 28th February 2007. The choices being canvassed cover the key themes of enterprise, innovation, skills, economic activity, quality of life, infrastructure, the role of places and sectors.

Comments:

- 3.2 **Employment Land:** the mechanism of a rolling reservoir of available employment land should be supported but a 5-10 year time-frame would be preferable to just 5 years because it would allow for a wider choice of different sites covering a range of qualities to cater for a changing sector requirements. This will be particularly important in taking on-board the output of the RES Review.
- 3.3 **Regional Sites:** Identification of regionally significant sites should be separate from the employment land requirements to meet CSW Sub-regional needs. Progression of the Ansty site for a high-tech/medi-park should be recognised as meeting MIS objectives for re-structuring the Regional economy. Other similar projects in the pipeline intended to promote economic re-structuring in the Sub-region should be supported by RSS e.g. those with planning permission at Fen End (motor sports industry) and Stoneleigh Park (rural centre of excellence), together with the emerging proposals for Warwick University expansion and the ‘World Class Stratford’ projects to regenerate the Theatre and Waterfront area. On Regional Logistic Sites, RSS should acknowledge the existing provision at DIRFT and Hams Hall straddle Warwickshire and continue to direct large scale future provision towards the north and west of the Region. The CSW Forum has requested that the Peugeot site at Ryton be regarded as site to meet CSW Sub-regional employment land needs. However, there is a gap in the provision for a Regional investment site linking the Coventry-Solihull-Warwickshire High Technology Corridor and the Nuneaton-Coventry Regeneration Zone and RSS should provide for a suitable location to be identified at the Sub-regional level.
- 3.4 **Shopping:** Finally, the WMRA’s identification of Leamington town centre at the 3rd level of centre for retail development (i.e. 30,000 m²) and Nuneaton and Rugby town centres at levels 4/5 (i.e. 20,000 m²) does not reflect the housing growth options. In particular, growth of Rugby and Nuneaton at housing option 3 levels would inevitably require retail growth that would require retail floor space

growth of their town centres to at least the level of tier 3 centres, alongside Leamington.

- 3.5 **Offices:** The indicative estimates of office floor space demand from the 'Centres Study' appear to be high compared to past trends. Therefore, the WMRA's suggestion that at least 40% of new office development is located in centres is reasonable - so long as it is justified in the context of the local employment land portfolio and subordinated to the 'reservoir' approach to employment land (which does take account of past trends). Again, the indicative growth levels for Rugby appear inconsistent with the level and rate of housing growth for the town set out in option 3.

4. Transport

- 4.1 Building on the current Regional Transport Strategy incorporated in the RSS, the WMRA is canvassing views on strategic park and ride; car parking standards; road user charging; and the role of the airports:

- 4.2 **Strategic Park and Ride Facilities** aim is to increase the use of public transport in congested areas, making a positive impact on climate change, environment and health. WMRA point to evidence to support the principle of identifying strategic park and ride locations as "Edge of Major Urban Area" or "External Town".

- 4.3 **Comment:** The principle of "Strategic Park and Ride" being included in RSS can be supported on the basis of facilities being located on the edge of the MUAs to serve the MUAs (e.g. Coleshill Parkway), providing RSS recognises that the benefits will mostly accrue to the MUAs but scheme delivery will largely be in the Shires. It follows that the necessary transport funding needs to be allocated accordingly to assist with that delivery. The same strategic approach may also apply to road user charging but it is too early to assess its feasibility in advance of the national scheme and its associated costs. It is not, however, appropriate for policies on local park and ride schemes (e.g. Stratford-upon-Avon) to be set at regional level since they require the support of different approaches to parking policy, standards and enforcement depending on the particular urban traffic conditions being addressed.

- 4.3 **Airports:** The WMRA is proposing that the RSS should be revised to take account of the Air Transport White Paper (ATWP) and the current position with the Region's airports. This would mean that RSS would be revised to support the extension of the runway and associated works at Birmingham Airport (BIA) and safeguard the development of a second runway and limit development of Coventry Airport to 1-2 million passengers per annum (mppa) - depending on the outcome of the last Public Inquiry into the proposed 2 mppa terminal. This reinforces BIA as the Region's principal international airport providing the full range of service and confines Coventry Airport to a complementary role.

- 4.4 **Comment:** Given the time-frame of RSS (to 2026) this is a realistic and expedient proposal that can be supported. However, in view of the economic significance of improved long haul flights at BIA to the CSW Sub-region, RSS

should make it clear that expansion to improve frequency and the choice of long haul services should be the first and main priority for expansion of BIA.

5. Waste

- 5.1 The main principle underpinning the WMRA's approach to waste planning is that each waste planning authority (WPA) should in future identify sites to manage all the waste arising within their own area, or sub-region, (municipal, commercial and industrial, construction and demolition) and only the residues from those treatment processes should be land filled. Government targets for waste recycling means that there will need to be a variety of new facilities from small composting sites to large recycling and recovery plants.
- 5.2 Despite significant increases in waste recycling levels, there is a substantial requirement for new waste management capacity. WMRA thinks that potential sites for waste management should be protected from competing uses - particularly given that waste management activities are often suitable uses for, and located on, employment land. It is not proposing to specify the numbers of facilities but has developed 3 scenarios relating to the 3 levels of housing growth options, specifying the tonnages of municipal waste and commercial and industrial waste that WPAs should manage. WMRA proposes that RSS should allocate to each WPA a quantity of waste for diversion (to recycling/re-use) and a quantity of residual waste that remains to be managed by whatever means that might be appropriate e.g. landfill. It is up to each Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) how they choose to manage the municipal waste arising in their area, which means re-using, recycled or recovering value from waste (such as energy) or, at the bottom of the 'waste hierarchy', land filling.

Comments:

- 5.3 **Municipal Waste:** The main impact of the RSS Review in this area will be in the area of municipal waste because of the higher levels of housing growth being addressed. The size and number of facilities will depend on the technology chosen by the WDA. Some technologies are commercially viable managing 50,000 tonnes of waste per year in which case just over 50 facilities would be needed in the Region (i.e. 5 in Warwickshire). However if WDAs choose to work together using a technology that is more economical at a larger scale, for example 250,000 - 500,000 tonnes per year, there may only be a need for 5 or 10 facilities (none or just 1 in Warwickshire). In the CSW Sub-region, the WDAs are already working together on the issue. The spatial strategy for provision of facilities in Warwickshire will be brought forward through the Warwickshire Waste Development Framework's Core Strategy.
- 5.4 **Other Waste:** WMRA have put forward scenarios for industrial and commercial waste using the Government's 'Waste Strategy 2000' as the starting point. For Warwickshire, this could mean 10-15 facilities operating at around 50,000 tonnes per annum or 3 large scale operations handling 250,000 tonnes per annum. For similar reasons as for municipal waste, new facilities for treating this industrial and commercial waste should be located in or close to the 'Core Development Area' – Nuneaton – Coventry – Warwick/Leamington and Rugby. Construction and demolition waste will continue to be managed largely on site

and reused in the construction and development processes. WMRA think that the future disposal of hazardous waste it is only likely require the provision of one or two facilities in the Region. There is no particular reason why Warwickshire of the CSW sub-region are especially suitable as a location for this purpose.

- 5.5 **Sites and Transport:** Support should be given to WMRA's proposal to revise RSS to protect suitable sites for waste management facilities on land allocated for employment. In addition, the RSS should also be revised to safeguard existing wharves and railheads to minimise the need to transport recycled materials and waste materials by road and promote sustainable distribution to the built up areas.

6. Conclusions – Director's Overview

- 6.1 The three options developed by WMRA for addressing housing growth, in reality, present only a limited choice. Option 1 just represents a bench-mark. Choosing it would be to pretend that pressures for growth will just go away and affect somewhere else. This is unrealistic as most of the new households will come from within the Region. Option 3 implies radical change in addressing household demand pressures in full. This is impractical to deliver because it assumes levels of infrastructure and economic investment that are beyond the capacity of existing delivery agencies. Option 2 is a 'halfway-house' between meeting future demand and our current limited delivery capacity. It could represent a starting point for negotiating additional infrastructure funding if Government insists (as it is likely to) that provision is made for the full demand.
- 6.2 In the context of recently published Government policy imperatives (PPS3 and Barker), the real choice facing the Region's planning authorities is option 2 moving towards option 3. It will mean that the RSS's 'step-change' will be more of a shuffle than a step as, at best, we can expect the MUAs to take half of the Regional and CSW Sub-regional housing growth. Without the CSW strategy directing Sub-regional growth, a resurgence of the former 'overspill' times is on the cards – with the metropolitan areas yet again spilling their housing requirements over into rural Warwickshire locations i.e. unsustainable locations short on transport, jobs and facilities.
- 6.3 The CSW strategy (**Appendix A**) provides a basis for directing growth across Warwickshire and its Sub-region to sustainable locations – the 'Core Development Area' and Rugby - where the best chances of managing its implications are likely to be in the longer term interests of Warwickshire. Even so, serious challenges will have to be faced i.e.
- (i) Our Sub-regional and local planning needs to anticipate the pressures on infrastructure, edge of town greenfield/Green Belt land, town centre expansion, urban traffic congestion and housing affordability. We can expect these issues to be magnified in the towns of Nuneaton and Bedworth, Warwick/Leamington and, especially Rugby in the context of a 'new town' scale and rate of growth.

- (ii) We will need to identify the levels of housing growth needed to maintain the sustainability of life in villages and small rural towns outside of the major sub-regional growth locations, especially in North Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon and the rural part of Rugby Borough.

These topics may not be new but they are likely to have even greater force than before.

JOHN DEEGAN
Strategic Director for Environment and Economy
Shire Hall
Warwick

5th January 2007

**Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee -
30th January 2007**

**The CSW 'Strategy' for Addressing Growth in the Sub-region –
as Endorsed by Warwickshire County Council's Cabinet
on 25th May 2006.**

(Extract from Strategic Director's Report).

"2.3 In the context of these findings and CSW Forum's agreed vision for the Sub-region, the joint officers have produced a development strategy on which to base the response to the RPB's request for advice. The main elements of this Strategy were accepted by Forum (with specific emphases) as indicated below:

- (i) Support for the principles of the RSS – of 'step-change' with urban and rural renaissance - in meeting the appropriate higher housing levels generated by local needs and migration into the Sub-region. However, the Revised RSS11 needs to recognise that policy changes may be needed accommodate the much higher levels of housing need reflected in the latest ODPM projections referred to in the RPB's Brief. Forum agreed this approach, emphasising that the projections should not dictate policy and further work is needed to qualify them.
- (ii) Focus most of the housing development in the North-South Corridor running from the vicinity of Nuneaton in the north, through Coventry to Warwick/Leamington in the south. This would become the CSW Core Development Area. Growth of Solihull would be focused on the urban area with particular emphasis on its Regeneration Zone. Minima housing levels will apply to the two MUAs, and a maxima to all other districts. In supporting this, Forum emphasised the need for RSS to recognise the difference circumstances that apply to Coventry and Solihull as MUAs.
- (iii) Adopt a specific sub-regional focus role for Rugby town related to the situation and needs of the CSW sub-region, acting as a "gateway" location for growth moving north-westward from the South East to the West Midlands and capitalising on its potential for more sustainable growth by absorbing inward migration pressures on North Warwickshire and Stratford-upon-Avon. Forum accepted this approach, emphasising that further work was needed to clarify Rugby's 'gateway' role.
- (iv) Limit housing growth in North Warwickshire and Stratford-upon-Avon, to accommodating housing growth just to meet local needs. In recognising that these districts have less sustainable settlement patterns, Forum emphasised the need for RSS to recognise the need for regional housing funding allocations to reflect the fact that these districts would, as a consequence, be increasingly less able to rely on the delivery of affordable housing through the planning system.

- (v) Allocate employment land sufficient to provide for the job needs of the sub-region's workers and its strong economic integrity and growth potential. It should be allocated in sustainable locations relative to the North-South Corridor Core Development Area, Rugby and north Solihull which are and will be the principal growth engines of the sub-region. In supporting this, Forum emphasised the need for continued development of regional assets of the area including the High Technology Corridor and to ensure housing growth is balanced with employment land to provide job opportunities as close to where people live as possible.
- (vi) The Sub-region's strategic centres should act as the primary focus for investment in retailing and for mixed use development of offices, civic, leisure and housing. They should also be the focus for significantly upgraded public transport infrastructure.
- (vii) Achieve a balance of waste management provision relative to the needs generated by the sub-region, in sustainably accessible locations, and where proven need is justified to accommodate Regional requirements.
- (viii) Upgrade strategic transportation infrastructure, particularly public transport based on rail and bus modes, hand in glove with the levels of housing and economic development being planned. This needs to be funded mainly by the development industry and supported through the Local Transport Plans (LTPs)".

NB. Given the time constraints in preparing this Advice, it was not possible for all CSW authorities to seek their individual council's formal views or for wider consultation to be carried out. However, the CSW Forum and WCC's Cabinet acknowledged that there will be the opportunity for public consultation at the options and subsequent stages in the Phase 2 RSS revision process.

Appendix B of Agenda No

**Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee -
30th January 2007**

Table One: Potential Distribution of New Dwellings 2001 – 2026 gross figures

	Number of Households 2001 ¹	Option One Dwellings 2001-2026	Option Two Dwellings 2001-2026	Option Three Dwellings 2001-2026
Birmingham	390,792	70,800	83,600	92,000
Coventry	122,353	19,000	24,400	44,000
Black Country	438,869	³79,400	⁴99,900	⁵106,700
Solihull	80,930	11,000	15,000	18,000
Metropolitan Area Total	1,032,944	180,200	222,900	260,700
Shropshire	117,301	24,800	29,100	29,100
Bridgnorth	20,925	4,300	3,200	3,200
North Shropshire	23,149	3,900	7,000	7,000
Oswestry	15,656	2,900	4,200	4,200
Shrewsbury and Atcham	40,308	10,800	9,700	9,700
South Shropshire	17,262	2,900	5,000	5,000
Telford and Wrekin	63,738	24,000	30,000	36,000
Staffordshire	328,234	51,300	67,900	77,900
Cannock Chase	37,104	6,000	7,000	7,000
East Staffordshire	42,717	7,700	² 15,000	² 15,000
Lichfield	37,501	6,500	11,000	16,000
Newcastle-under-Lyme	50,738	7,200	7,500	7,500
South Staffordshire	41,971	5,000	5,000	5,000
Stafford	50,025	9,500	12,900	12,900
Staffordshire Moorlands	38,796	5,500	5,500	5,500
Tamworth	29,382	3,900	4,000	⁹ 9,000
Stoke-on-Trent	103,196	15,000	21,000	21,000
Warwickshire	210,900	39,000	52,500	67,500
North Warwickshire	25,176	3,100	3,900	3,900
Nuneaton	48,683	10,000	13,100	15,600
Rugby	36,483	7,100	13,100	² 23,100
Stratford-upon-Avon	47,202	7,200	9,300	9,300
Warwick	53,356	11,600	13,100	15,600
Worcestershire	223,048	31,100	47,300	62,300
Bromsgrove	35,167	3,800	4,700	7,200
Malvern Hills	30,070	3,600	6,300	6,300
Redditch	31,652	4,300	² 8,200	² 13,200
Worcester	39,060	7,200	² 11,800	² 16,800
Wychavon	46,819	7,600	11,600	14,100
Wyre Forest	40,280	4,600	4,700	4,700
Herefordshire	74,282	16,000	20,500	20,500
Shire and Unitary Authorities	1,120,699	201,200	268,300	314,300
Major Urban Areas ⁶	1,186,878	202,400 (53%) ⁷	251,400 (51%) ⁷	289,200 (50%) ⁷
Other Areas	966,765	179,000 (47%) ⁷	239,800 (49%) ⁷	285,800 (50%) ⁷
WESTMIDLANDS REGION	2,153,672	381,000	491,200	575,000

Notes:

1. Taken from Table KS20 "Household Composition" from the 2001 Census.
2. To accommodate housing growth may imply development in neighbouring districts.
3. Detailed distribution of this provision would be determined through a Black Country Joint Core Strategy. Indicative figures at present are:

Dudley:	21,000	Sandwell:	23,600
Walsall:	17,400	Wolverhampton:	17,400

4. Detailed distribution of this provision would be determined through a Black Country Joint Core Strategy. Indicative figures at present are:

Dudley:	23,800	Sandwell:	34,900
Walsall:	21,000	Wolverhampton:	20,200

5. Detailed distribution of this provision would be determined through a Black Country Joint Core Strategy. Indicative figures at present are:-

Dudley:	25,400	Sandwell:	36,400
Walsall:	22,400	Wolverhampton:	22,500

6. MUAs include Metropolitan districts plus Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle under Lyme.
7. The totals for the Major Urban Areas and the Other Areas are shown as a percentage of the total for the West Midlands region.

Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 30th January 2007

Regional Spatial Strategy Phase 2 Review - Consultation on Proposed Options by
West Midlands Regional Assembly

RSS Review Phase 2 Options Housing Growth 2001-26: Warwickshire Comparisons	Total Existing Households at 2001 (source: 2001 Census)	Actual average annual build rate 2001/2- 2005/6	on 1 Housing Growth 2001-2026 (i.e. existing RSS rolled forward five years)		RSS Option 2 Housing Growth 2001-2026 (i.e. based on Section 4[4]responses)		RSS Option 3 Housing Growth 2001-2026 (i.e. Option 2 plus 83.8k shortfall)	
			Total housing growth 2001-2026	Average rate per annum 01-26	Total housing growth 2001-2026	Average rate per annum 01-26	Total housing growth 2001-2026	Average rate per annum 01-26
North Warwickshire	25,176 (12%)	132	3,100 (8%)	124	3,900 (7%)	156	3,900 (6%)	156
Nuneaton & Bedworth	48,683 (23%)	572	10,000 (26%)	400	13,100 (25%)	524	15,600 (23%)	624
Rugby	36,483 (18%)	403	7,100 (18%)	284	13,100 (25%)	524	23,100 (34%)	924
Stratford-on-Avon	47,202 (22%)	640	7,200 (18%)	288	9,300 (18%)	372	9,300 (14%)	372
Warwick	53,356 (25%)	840	11,600 (30%)	464	13,100 (25%)	524	15,600 (23%)	624
Warwickshire	210,900 (51%)	2,627	39,000 (56%)	1560	52,500 (57%)	2100	67,500 (52%)	2,700
Coventry	122,353 (29%)	716	19,000 (28%)	760	24,000 (27%)	960	44,000 (34%)	1,760
Solihull	80,930 (20%)	537	11,000 (16%)	440	15,000 (16%)	552	18,000 (14%)	752
CSW Sub-region	414,183	3,880	69,000	2,760	91,500	4,412	129,500	5,212
All Major Urban Areas	1,186,878	7,648	202,400	8,096	251,400	10,408	289,200	11,568
All Shires Areas (i.e. excluding MUAs)	966,765	9,722	179,000	7,160	239,800	9,592	285,800	11,432
West Midlands	2,153,672	17,370	381,400	15,256	491,200	19,648	575,000	23,000