Planning shapes the places where people live and work and the country we live in. It plays a key role in supporting the Government’s wider social, environmental and economic objectives and for sustainable communities.
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Planning Policy Statement 11: Regional Spatial Strategies

This PPS replaces Planning Policy Guidance Note 11: Regional Planning (PPG11).

Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) set out the Government’s national policies on different aspects of planning. The policies in this statement apply throughout England apart from London where the Mayor is responsible for preparing a spatial development strategy. These policies complement, but do not replace or overrule, other national planning policies and should be read in conjunction with other relevant statements of national planning policy.

Part 1 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act strengthens the role and importance of regional planning. It replaces Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) by statutory Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs). As at commencement of Part 1 of this Act, all existing RPG will, with a few exceptions, become RSSs. This policy statement sets out the procedural policy on the nature of these RSSs and focuses on procedural policy on what “should” happen in preparing revisions to them and explains how this relates to the Act and associated regulations.

The policies set out in this statement will need to be taken into account by Regional Planning Bodies in the preparation of revisions to RSSs.

Topic specific advice on the content of Regional Spatial Strategies will be found in specific PPGs or new PPSs with the exception of the Regional Transport Strategy, which is covered in Annex B. Annex A refers to the relevant PPGs, PPSs, other national policy statements and supporting guidance.
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Chapter 1  What is a Regional Spatial Strategy?

MAIN PRINCIPLES OF THE NEW REGIONAL PLANNING ARRANGEMENTS

1.1 The main principles of the new arrangements are to deliver policy better at the regional level and contribute to the culture change necessary to deliver the Government’s Sustainable Communities Plan, by:

- giving more weight to what is currently Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) by replacing it with a statutory Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), with which the new Local Development Documents (LDDs) have to be in general conformity, and by making it part of the development plan;

- ensuring that future changes to the RSSs are produced on an inclusive basis of partnership working and community involvement;

- making the RSS more regionally and sub-regionally specific with a focus on implementation, and subject to a statutory annual monitoring report which has to identify any necessary remedial action;

- better integration of the RSS with other regional strategies; and

- assisting in delivering the Government’s statutory purpose for plan making by requiring the regional planning body (RPB) to ensure that any draft RSS revision is prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF A RSS

1.2 Section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (the ‘Act’) sets an objective for the RSS to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The RSS, incorporating a Regional Transport Strategy (RTS), provides a spatial framework to inform the preparation of LDDs, Local Transport Plans (LTPs) and regional and sub-regional strategies and programmes that have a bearing on land use activities. It is a two-way relationship since the RSS should also take account of those strategies and programmes as they evolve. Information on the relationship with the Regional Sustainable Development Framework (RSDF) and the regional cultural, economic and housing strategies is set out in chapter 2. Other relevant strategies and programmes at national, regional or sub-regional level include but are not limited to air quality, biodiversity, climate change, education, energy, environment, health, soil use and sustainable development.

1.3 The RSS should provide a broad development strategy for the region for a fifteen to twenty year period. The following matters should be taken into account:

- identification of the scale and distribution of provision for new housing;
- priorities for the environment, such as countryside and biodiversity protection; and
- transport, infrastructure, economic development, agriculture, minerals extraction and waste treatment and disposal.
1.4 The RSS vision might, however, need to look beyond the end of this period in certain instances, since some relevant forecasting horizons are longer term, for example, adaptation to climate change.

1.5 The RSS should confine itself to matters of genuine regional and, where appropriate, sub-regional importance. Policies in the RSS will need to be sufficiently detailed to provide clear guidance for LDDs, LTPs and/or other regional or local strategies and programmes. However, it is important that they strike the right balance between providing a clear strategic framework and avoiding unnecessary or inappropriate detail. The level of detail will vary depending on the particular policy topic concerned, the way in which the policy is to be implemented, and regional circumstances. For example, the RSS will need to provide housing figures for individual districts or appropriate sub-regional housing market areas for which joint Development Plan Documents (DPDs) are to be prepared. Where districts are preparing joint DPDs to cover a functional housing market area it may be appropriate for the RSS to provide a figure for that area, rather than for the individual districts, provided that the means of implementing the policy are clear. Where this is not the case, RSS will need to provide individual housing figures for each district. It may also be appropriate for RSS to define figures for a particular settlement or settlements if this is necessary for the implementation of the RSS.

1.6 The Government’s policy on spatial planning goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function. More information on this is set out in draft Planning Policy Statement 1 ‘Creating Sustainable Communities’ published by ODPM in February 2004. In line with this, RSS policies should draw out the links with related policy initiatives and programmes to deliver the desired spatial change. The RSS can also include policies to manage regionally or sub-regionally significant uses and development. These might include, for example, demand management policies to reduce traffic volumes. Although RSS policies have to be related to the development and use of land within the region under section 1(2) of the Act, they should not be restricted to policies that can be implemented through the grant or refusal of planning permission.

1.7 The RSS should:

- articulate a spatial vision of what the region will look like at the end of the period of the strategy and show how this will contribute to achieving sustainable development objectives;
- provide a concise spatial strategy for achieving that vision, defining its main aims and objectives, illustrated by a key diagram, with the policies clearly highlighted;
- address regional or sub-regional issues that will often cross county or unitary authority and, on occasion, district boundaries, and take advantage of the range of development options that exist at that level. The RSS should not address local issues which should be the subject of a LDD;
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– be consistent with and supportive of other regional frameworks and strategies, including the RSDF and the regional cultural, economic and housing strategies;
– be specific to the region: whilst it should have regard to national policies it should not simply repeat them nor resort to platitudes. It should provide spatially specific policies applying national policies to the circumstances of the region;
– be locationally but not site specific, while not going into the level of detail more appropriate to a LDD;
– be focused on delivery mechanisms which make clear what is to be done by whom and by when;
– provide a clear link between policy objectives and priorities, targets and indicators. It should be monitored annually against the delivery of its priorities and the realisation of its vision for the region, and reviewed as appropriate;
– should apply the test of adding value to the overall planning process; and
– contribute to the achievement of sustainable development in line with section 39 of the Act.

1.8 The Government’s policy on the role of the RSS in relation to each policy topic mentioned in paragraph 1.3 above, is set out in the topic specific PPSs with the exception of the RTS which is covered in Annex B. Annex A refers to the relevant PPG, PPS, other national policy statements and supporting guidance.

STATUS OF A RSS

1.9 RSSs are put on a statutory basis by section 1(1) of the Act. By virtue of section 24(1)(a) of the Act LDDs must be in general conformity with the RSS. Under section 24(2) of the Act all local planning authorities (LPAs) in England outside London must request the opinion in writing of the RPB as to the general conformity of a DPD with the RSS and that opinion must be provided by the RPB. The same will apply to a county council in preparing a minerals and/or waste DPD. PPS12 contains procedural policy on the conformity process (see paragraphs 4.19 to 4.22 of PPS12). The test of general conformity means that only where an inconsistency or omission in a LDD would cause significant harm to the implementation of a RSS, would the LDD be considered not to be in general conformity.

1.10 Under section 38(3) of the Act, the RSS is part of the statutory development plan. Under the plan-led system, this means that the determination of planning applications will be made in accordance with the RSS and the relevant DPD or DPDs, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.
1.11 The RTS, as an integral part of the RSS, provides a regional and sub-regional context for the preparation of LTPs and will also be relevant to the preparation of LDDs. Annex B sets out procedural policy on the preparation of RTSs.

GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE

1.12 The geographical area covered by each RSS corresponds, with the exception of the National Parks, to the boundaries of the eight English regions outside London as set out in statute in Schedule 1 to the Regional Development Agencies Act, 1998. The National Parks are each covered by a single RSS, even when they cross regional boundaries.

SUB-REGIONAL DIMENSION

1.13 Although the focus of a RSS is on regional issues and regional priorities, it should also address sub-regional issues where appropriate. It is the responsibility of the RPB, in consultation with LPAs and other stakeholders to identify the circumstances in which a sub-regional approach to spatial policy development is required. Indeed section 5(3) of the Act requires the RPB to consider the desirability of making different provision in relation to different parts of the region. When making this assessment, RPBs should be mindful of the following two key principles:

– the definition of need for a sub-regional approach should be based on an assessment of the functional relationships between settlements, such as journey-to-work patterns, or land uses within the area affected by the same strategic planning issue or issues which may well differ from administrative boundaries. This could include consideration, for example, of how the strategic planning system can assist not only in creating and sustaining the economic competitiveness of a city or a cluster of towns but in spreading the benefits of a prosperous city to the wider region (the concept of a ‘city-region’); and

– the sub-regional definition should be based on a clearly recognisable ‘strategic policy deficit’ which cannot be adequately addressed by general RSS policies or by LDDs on their own. In some parts of a region, LDDs may be capable of being prepared within the context of the generic policies of a RSS. In some cases this may need to be on a joint LDD basis and the RPB may need to encourage the relevant LPAs to produce a joint LDD in order that the RSS can be effectively implemented. However, in many cases there will be sub-regional strategic issues which cannot be tackled through a joint plan or where the LDDs require a more detailed strategic policy context which cannot be provided by generic policies in a RSS. Therefore, it will be common to have sub-regional policies as part of the RSS revision.

1 London is covered by its own legislation – the Greater London Authority Act 1999, which places responsibility for strategic planning with the Mayor, requiring him/her to produce a ‘Spatial Development Strategy’, also known as the ‘London Plan’.

2 The North Yorkshire Moors and Yorkshire Dales National Parks are covered in full by the RSS for Yorkshire and the Humber. The Peak District National Park is covered in full by the RSS for the East Midlands. When designated as a National Park, the New Forest will be covered in full by the RSS for the South East.
1.14 There is a distinction between splitting the region into a series of sub-regions for the purposes of developing distinct sets of policies for each sub-region and sub-regional divisions in the RSS for the purposes of distributing provision for housing or employment. It is up to each RPB to decide how best to take sub-regional matters forward and to define the sub-regions in the draft RSS revision. What might be an effective sub-regional approach in one region may not necessarily suit the circumstances and geography of another. Procedural policy on how to carry out sub-regional planning is set out in chapter 2.

1.15 Exceptionally, for example in the growth areas identified in the Sustainable Communities Plan, it may be necessary to develop a non-statutory sub-regional framework to address issues that cut across regional boundaries and aim to make longer term development more coherent. This framework would then constitute draft revisions to the relevant RSSs in two or more regions to be considered at one examination-in-public (EiP) where possible. These draft revisions, following the examination and subsequent changes by the Secretary of State, would then be incorporated in the relevant RSSs.

**LOCATIONAL SPECIFICITY**

1.16 The RSS must not identify specific sites as suitable for development. The DPD is the place for site allocations. Consideration of specific sites could dominate and delay the production of a RSS revision and cause unnecessary blight. The EiP process is not suitable for the hearing of site-specific representations.

1.17 The RSS should, however, establish the locational criteria appropriate to regionally or sub-regionally significant housing, business, retail and leisure uses, or to the location of major new inward investment sites. The RSS should only do so where LDDs need this strategic framework. The broad location of such development may be identified in the RSS itself. By “broad location” is meant the area of search suitable for the development in question, consistent with criteria set out in the RSS, within which a number of suitable sites may exist. Broad locations may include town or city centres.

**FORMAT**

1.18 The RSS should:

- make clear whether its policies are:
  
  (i) strategic development control policies which are to be implemented directly through the grant and refusal of planning permission;
  
  (ii) to be delivered through LDDs and LTPs; or
  
  (iii) to be delivered through other means of delivery as agreed with the bodies concerned.
Either as part of the RSS or as a separate but cross-referenced document there should be an implementation plan (see 3.2);

- set out where possible the output targets and indicators related to each policy so that progress can be monitored and if necessary, remedial action taken or a revision triggered;
- distinguish policies clearly from supporting text, which should explain and where necessary justify the policies but not elaborate on them. Section 1(4) of the Act makes clear that where there is a conflict between the policies in the RSS and any other part of the RSS, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policies;
- contain a key diagram, which should illustrate the policies for the development and use of land, which will comprise the strategy for spatial development for the region (see Regulation 9(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Regional Planning) (England) Regulations, 2004 (“the Regulations”). In the event of a conflict between policies and the key diagram, the policies should prevail when interpreting the RSS;
- where the key diagram includes insets to show selected areas in greater detail, the location of any insets should be clearly identified on the key diagram (see Regulation 9(3));
- set out the title of the RSS on these diagrams and include an explanation of any symbol or notation used (see Regulation 9(4)); and
- not set out these diagrams on a map basis (see Regulation 9(4)).

1.19 The RSS should be as concise as is consistent with its purposes. Supporting material should be published separately from the RSS as required in the Regulations. Where possible the text should simply cross-refer to supporting documents and published technical detail rather than duplicate this material. However, annexes may be necessary where there is background information which is critical to the RSS but is inappropriate to be published as separate background documents.

1.20 Within the above parameters, RPBs are encouraged to be innovative in making the RSS as understandable as possible.
Chapter 2  Requirements for Preparing a Regional Spatial Strategy Revision

WHEN SHOULD RSS REVISIONS BE PREPARED?

2.1 The RSS is part of a continuous planning process, not a document that is set in stone over its fifteen to twenty year life span. Although the core strategy and vision in the RSS should be reasonably robust, RSS revisions will be required periodically. These will include revisions made in response to evidence from the monitoring process that policies in the existing RSS are not working as they should or where there have been changes in national policy. Revisions may be to parts of a RSS or they may be a comprehensive revision of the entire RSS. The Act does not distinguish between an alteration and a replacement plan and this PPS adopts the same approach of referring to both as revisions. This PPS refers to revisions of the RSS, since at commencement of Part 1 of the Act, it is intended that the latest version of RPG, as issued by the Secretary of State, will constitute the RSS. This is with the exception of those RPGs which have not been subject to a public examination and/or are replaced by the Mayor’s spatial development strategy (‘the London Plan’).

WHO PREPARES A DRAFT REVISION OF THE RSS?

2.2 RPBs have principal responsibility for the preparation of draft revisions to a RSS. As of 1 April 2003, the RPB, in all regions outside London, is the Regional Chamber (known as the Regional Assembly). They should not be confused with the proposed elected regional assemblies. Under section 2 of the Act, the Secretary of State has the power to withdraw recognition of an RPB. Under section 2, at least 60% of the members of the RPB must be members of one of more of the following authorities within the region:

- a district council;
- a county council;
- a metropolitan district council;
- a National Park authority;
- the Broads Authority.

2.3 In addition to the above, under Regulation 4, continued recognition of the RPB, and the funding that this entails, is dependent on at least 30% of members of the RPB not also being members of a relevant authority as defined above. As a safeguard, commercial interests of any members should be declared and where a matter under debate directly affects these, they would not be entitled to vote on that matter.
2.4 Section 5(3) of the Act sets out certain matters to which RPBs must have regard in preparing a RSS revision. These are:

- national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State. National policy will apply unless a regional justification for not doing so is supported by the Panel following an EiP and accepted by the Secretary of State. The draft RSS revision should also be consistent with national Public Service Agreement (PSA) targets. The key national documents by policy topic are set out in Annexes A and B;

- the RSS for each adjoining region;

- the London Plan if any part of the RPB’s region adjoins Greater London;

- the Wales Spatial Plan if any part of the RPB’s region adjoins Wales;

- the resources likely to be available for implementing the RSS; and

- the desirability of preparing sub-regionally specific policies which the Act refers to as “different provision in relation to different parts of the region”.

2.5 In addition, RPBs should take account of inter-Governmental and European Union (EU) legislation, policies, programmes and funding regimes that impact on the regions. Among these European considerations, the European Spatial Development Perspective and the results of the INTERREG IIIB and ESPON Community Initiative programmes will be particularly relevant. EU Structural Funds programmes are increasingly required to be underpinned by spatial planning policies that work across a variety of levels, including the transnational level, as illustrated by INTERREG IIIB programmes. Although the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) take a leading role in the Structural Funds programmes, the wider spatial framework provided by RSS can make a significant contribution to the Single Programming Documents required to access EU Structural Funds. It is important therefore that the RDAs’ strategies, RSSs and the Single Programming Documents share consistent visions for the future of the regions.

2.6 The EU requirement to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of any proposed RSS revision from July 2004 should also be complied with, and is the subject of separate regulations and guidance issued by ODPM in October 2003. This guidance was, however, an interim measure to assist compliance with the Directive by the implementation deadline of July 2004. The guidance has been integrated into guidance on a wider Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which RPBs are required to carry out under the Act. This is set out in the consultation paper ‘Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks’, published by OPDM in September 2004 (see also paragraph 2.40 below).

2.7 Under Regulation 10 RPBs must have particular regard to the relevant provisions of EU Directive 96/82/EC (COMAH) concerning the prevention of major accidents.
2.8 Regulation 10 also requires an RPB to have regard to the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) prepared by the RDA and where any part of its region adjoins Scotland to the National Planning Framework for Scotland.

2.9 Section 62(2) of the Environment Act 1995 requires ‘relevant authorities’ to have regard to the statutory purposes of National Park designation (see section 61 of the Environment Act 1995). In addition, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 places a similar duty on ‘relevant authorities’ to have regard to the statutory purposes of the Broads (section 97) (as per section 2(1) of the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act 1988), and to the statutory purposes of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) (section 85). These include RPBs. RPBs will be expected to demonstrate how they have taken the statutory purposes of the National Parks, AONBs and the Broads into account during preparation of a RSS revision and in the implementation, monitoring and review of any RSS, which covers either in whole or part of a National Park or the Broads or which would have a significant indirect effect on a National Park or the Broads, for example on the landscape setting.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGIES AND REGIONAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS

2.10 The RSDF or equivalent (some regions use a different name) is the high level statement of the regional vision for achieving sustainable development and provides an essential part of the background against which all regional strategies are prepared. It should be the starting point for developing a RSS, putting sustainable development at the heart of a spatial strategy in accordance with section 39 of the Act. The RSDF also has a key role in identifying and resolving any conflicts between the RSS and other regional strategies to ensure a fully integrated approach to sustainable development. Advice on RSDFs is set out in ‘Guidance on Preparing Regional Sustainable Development Frameworks’, published by the then DETR in February 2000.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGIES AND OTHER REGIONAL STRATEGIES

2.11 It is essential that the RSS both shapes, and is shaped by, other regional strategies. If the RSS and other strategies are not aligned in their key objectives and vision, and support one another, the region’s ability to deliver will be compromised. The RSS provides the long-term spatial planning framework for these other strategies. The RES is specifically referred to in Regulation 10 since it is the only strategy other than the RSS to have a statutory basis.
However, there are a large number of other regional strategies which will also be relevant. These include, but are not limited to:

- air quality strategies;
- biodiversity strategies;
- cultural strategies;
- environment strategies;
- forestry strategies;
- health strategies;
- higher education and skills strategies; and
- housing strategies.

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO IMPROVE STRATEGY INTEGRATION

2.12 Although the above are all important strategies to which the RPB should have regard in preparing a RSS revision, it is critical that there is sufficient integration between the RSS, including its regional transport and waste strategies, the Regional Housing Strategy (RHS) and the RES and its related action plans. Where a region decides it wants an elected regional assembly, that assembly will be responsible for all three strategies. In the meantime, Government is introducing a system which will ensure a more consistent approach whether regions have elected or non-elected assemblies. There are three important dimensions to this:

- Firstly, there is the action being taken by Government consequent upon Kate Barker’s report: ‘Delivering Stability: Securing our Future Housing Needs’ published by the Treasury in March 2004. This recommended a merger between the RPBs and the Regional Housing Boards (RHBs) to create single bodies responsible for managing regional housing markets, delivering the region’s affordability target and advising on distributing resources for social housing. The report also recommended that this should be supported by an expert analytical body responsible for providing public and independent advice which would increase the transparency of the political decisions which determined the final form of a RSS revision and the RHS. The report suggested there would be merit in extending the remit of this expert analytical body to provide the evidence base for the RES. No final decision has yet been taken on how this merger should take place but the proposal on which OPDM is consulting would involve making the assembly responsible for both the RHS and the RSS. Social housing is a responsibility of the RHS. Market housing is delivered through the planning system with
the numbers for every LPA being determined through the RSS. Making the assembly responsible for both strategies recognises that a consistent view needs to be taken on housing needs. Getting the strategy right in the RSS and matching funding to the priorities there and in the RHS, and indeed the RES, is vital to effective delivery of housing;

– Secondly, advice is being prepared by Government to promote an improved economic evidence base for both the RSS revisions and RESs. A sound evidence base to regional strategies and a sufficient spatial dimension to RESs are critical both to effective RSS revisions and to the delivery of regional economic convergence; and

– Thirdly, there are experimental regional advisory board pilots in the South East and Yorkshire and the Humber. These Boards consist of regional stakeholders and will be used to explore how such groups can advise on transport programs aimed at delivering the best outcomes for housing, employment growth and other priorities.

REGIONAL ACTION TO IMPROVE STRATEGY INTEGRATION

2.13 The Regional Assembly, working with the Government Office (GO) and other key regional stakeholders, should consider what more it can do to join up these different strategies, building on existing best practice and on the foundations laid by the RSDF. In doing so, RPBs will need to take account of the outcome of the consultation being carried out by Government on a new sustainable development strategy since this consultation asks about the future of RSDFs.

2.14 The RPB should consider including on its RSS revision steering group, as well as RDA representation, representatives from all the relevant regional strategies to ensure better integration.

2.15 Although the various regional strategies operate to different timeframes and may be revised at different times, the RPB should explore with its regional partners whether joining up regional consultation exercises is feasible. This would assist in an integrated approach to tackling common issues, achieving economies of scale and reducing ‘consultation fatigue’.

2.16 Unlike the RES and the RHS, the RTS is an integral part of a RSS. The RSS is therefore an integrated planning and transport spatial strategy. By shaping the pattern of development and influencing the location, scale, density, design and mix of land uses, planning can help to reduce the need to travel, reduce the length of journeys and make it safer and easier for people to access jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking, and cycling. Conversely, good transport planning can provide access to economic and leisure activities, support or initiate regeneration, and promote sustainable land use choices. Annex B provides more detailed procedural policy on the RTS.
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND PARTNERSHIP WORKING

Role of the statement of public participation
2.17 Although the RPB has the leadership role in preparing a draft RSS revision for submission to the Secretary of State, this should be carried out on the basis of partnership working with regional stakeholders and community involvement. The RPB is required under section 6 of the Act to prepare, publish and keep under review a statement of public participation. It is essential that the public is able to be involved throughout the RSS revision process and this should include broad public consultation rather than relying on targeted consultation with particular groups. The statement of public participation should set out how the RPB intends to achieve this, including the stages of public participation in the SA process. It should also identify who the RPB’s main partners will be and how it intends to work with them in undertaking the RSS revision. Guidance on how to secure public involvement and the role of the statement of public participation is set out in Annex D.

Role of the pre-submission consultation statement
2.18 When it submits a draft RSS revision to the Secretary of State, the RPB is required under Regulation 13, to publish a ‘pre-submission consultation statement’. Under Regulation 11, this statement has to set out how the RPB has consulted both ‘bodies’ and ‘persons’ in the revision process prior to submission of the draft revision, a summary of the key issues raised and how these shaped the draft document. Despite the reference in its title to ‘consultation’ it is important that this statement does not restrict itself to how consultation has been carried but goes further and summarises how the RPB has engaged stakeholders and the wider public in the preparation of the revision on a basis of active participation. It is essential that this pre-submission participation is not viewed as a one-off and fixed period of consultation on an early draft of the revision. Rather, it is a more continuous process of proactive involvement as explained above. This more active participation process is the concern of the statement of public participation and the ‘pre-submission consultation statement’ should record how the participation was actually carried out by the RPB. This can then be compared with what the RPB said it intended to do in its statement of public participation.

Use of a steering group and focus groups
2.19 Since the publication of PPG11, RPG revisions have involved RPBs establishing focus or topic groups of stakeholders, reporting to a central steering group, chaired by the RPB but with other key regional institutions also represented, including the RDA. RPBs should ensure that that at least 30% of this steering group is from non-local authority representatives. As well as representation from those responsible for relevant regional strategies, consideration should be given to including representation from organisations responsible for planning and funding key infrastructure and services critical to RSS delivery. Guidance on partnership working is set out in Annex D.
Who should be involved?

2.20 Regulation 2 contains a list of ‘specific consultation bodies’ which the RPB, under Regulation 11, must involve in preparing a draft RSS revision, in so far as the RPB thinks the draft revision is likely to affect the body. Where there is any doubt, the RPB should involve the body. In the case of a section 4(4) authority (see paragraph 2.21 below) the RPB has no discretion and must seek their advice where they are an authority within its region. The sub-regional provisions of the Act, as referred to in paragraphs 2.27 and 2.28 below, may also apply. Although the list of ‘specific consultation bodies’ provides a statutory minimum it is important that this list is not seen as an exhaustive baseline. It is not a comprehensive list of all the bodies, which should be involved on a partnership basis in the production of the draft RSS revision. Guidance on who else might be involved is set out in Annex D but the RPBs should use their own discretion and not restrict themselves to the bodies mentioned. Regulation 2 also provides a list of ‘general consultation bodies’ which, under Regulation 11, the RPB is required to consult as the RPB considers appropriate. In the preparation of a RSS revision, the RPB should involve those bodies from each category of ‘general consultation body’ which it feels is sufficiently representative. It is important that there are opportunities for the community to be kept informed and involved outside of the main stages of more formal consultation referred to below. Guidance on community involvement is set out in Annex D.

Advice from county councils and local planning authorities

2.21 RPBs are required under section 4 of the Act to seek the advice of bodies with strategic planning expertise when preparing, keeping under review and monitoring the implementation of a revision of the RSS. These bodies are defined in section 4(4) of the Act as a county council, metropolitan district council, National Park Authority or a district council for an area for which there is no county council. Section 4(5) of the Act also enables the RPB to enter into appropriate arrangements agreed with these section 4(4) authorities or district councils. “Advice” is the opinion of a section 4(4) authority while “arrangements” relate to the commissioning of substantive work from the section 4(4) authority or district council, which may be under a contractual agreement, to provide specified outputs. These arrangements are to be agreed between the RPB and the section 4(4) authority or district council. Section 4(6) of the Act provides that the RPB is able to reimburse the other party for this work if necessary. These arrangements are quite separate from the sub-regional provisions of the Act under which the detailed proposals for “different provision for different parts of the region” must first be made by a section 4(4) authority and for which it cannot demand payment by the RPB (see paragraphs 2.27 and 2.28 below).

Partnership working with section 4(4) authorities and district councils

2.22 An “arrangement” for partnership working between an RPB and a section 4(4) authority or a district council does not necessarily mean that a formal agreement has to be entered into. However, a formal agreement can remove doubt about what is expected by both parties. It is, therefore, up to the RPB and the section 4(4) authority or district council to decide
whether this is necessary. There is a long history of such partnership working without contractual arrangements or any reimbursement for work carried out. All authorities, including the districts, are expected to continue to assist RPBs as partners in the preparation of draft revisions as they have done in the past, including through the assistance of their staff and other resources. In partnership working, the RPB should be particularly careful to ensure that it achieves RSS ‘buy-in’ by its partners while avoiding a ‘lowest common denominator’ approach (i.e., one that avoids dealing with contentious issues), in tackling the key issues which the RSS has to address.

2.23 All section 4(4) authorities and district councils have important survey and monitoring responsibilities either in the Act or in the Regulations. On the basis of these they should be able to provide information to assist the RPBs in preparing draft revisions to the RSS and in subsequent monitoring of the impact of those revisions. All these authorities have an important role in the development of RSS policy and in its implementation. RPBs should obtain advice from them and indeed are required to do so in the case of section 4(4) authorities under the Act, as mentioned above. RPBs will need to take account of how authorities can help deliver the emerging RSS revision through their service responsibilities, such as the education and transport responsibilities of county councils and unitary authorities. This should be a two-way process in that priorities in these service areas can help shape RSS revisions as appropriate.

2.24 RPBs should consider with section 4(4) authorities and district councils whether joint studies could inform both revisions to the RSS and DPDs. This both provides economies of scale and enables each authority to benefit from the lessons learnt by others. One of the key policy areas for such joint working is transport planning. In the two-tier areas, co-operation between the county council and district councils is critical to ensure complementarity of the LTP and LDD policies. However, joint working will also be important more generally in tackling transport issues which cut across transport authority boundaries.

2.25 The following are examples of the work which an RPB and a section 4(4) authority or district council might consider appropriate to assist the RPB and which may or may not involve formal “arrangements” under the Act:

– providing technical expertise to assist with the RSS revision, including in the district distribution of housing figures or employment land (in the case of a section 4(4) authority this might be over and above being the first to provide detailed proposals under section 5(5) of the Act – see paragraph 2.28 below);

– facilitating public participation in sub-regional studies/policies on behalf of the RPB;

– assisting in or taking the lead as appropriate in sub-regional work specified by the RPB, for example, cross boundary implications of major development proposals and, in the case of the county councils in the two-tier areas, helping to ensure integration of land use planning and transport at the sub-regional level. In the case of a section 4(4) authority, this might be over and above being the first to provide detailed proposals under section 5(5) of the Act – see paragraph 2.28 below;
– in the case of county councils, providing advice to the RPB on general conformity issues with Local Development Documents in the two-tier areas; and
– monitoring change in the region or sub-region and reporting on the implementation progress of key plans and programmes and the achievement of RSS output targets to assist the RPB in preparing its annual monitoring report (e.g., new housing, economic development, retail provision, economic regeneration, transport improvements and environmental projects).

2.26 Where formal arrangements are entered into they should specify the work which is to be carried out and by when, including proposed expenditure which may be chargeable to the RPB. The arrangements may also need to clarify what the relationship is between a section 4(4) authority or district council officers and their members in undertaking this work for the RPB.

**Initial sub-regional working arrangements**

2.27 The RPB is under a duty to have regard to the desirability of preparing policies, as part of the RSS, which are specific to a particular part of the region. This PPS encourages RPBs to ensure that they do where appropriate. Section 5(3)(f) of the Act refers to these as “different provision in relation to different parts of the region”. In deciding whether to have such specific policies the RPB should have regard to the advice of the section 4(4) authorities. The RPB and the section 4(4) authorities will need to be careful that the areas are defined in relation to the strategic planning issues which need to be addressed rather than specific to particular authorities (see paragraph 1.13).

2.28 Where the RPB decides that it is appropriate to have RSS policies which are specific to a particular part or parts of the region, section 5(5) of the Act requires a section 4(4) authority or authorities to be the first to make detailed proposals, unless it is agreed that the RPB itself or a district council should do so instead. Providing these section 4(4) authorities agree, there is no reason why an RPB should not continue to take the lead, as it has in the past, in preparing detailed proposals on a partnership basis with these authorities and others. This could be confirmed by those authorities agreeing to the working arrangements set out in the RPB’s project plan. However, where this is not agreed under Regulation 8, to assist the section 4(4) authority or authorities in making these detailed proposals and to ensure that they respect the RSS revision context, the RPB will prepare an indicative brief referred to as “information” in Regulation 8. This brief should be prepared in consultation with the section 4(4) authority or authorities. Under Regulation 8(2), this might include: the geographical areas to be covered by the different provision, which may include the area in part or in whole, of more than one of the authorities; the broad subject matter of the different provision; other bodies that the RPB considers should work with the authorities in making the detailed proposals for the different provision; and which of the authorities the RPB considers should lead in making the detailed proposals for the different provision. The section 4(4) authority or authorities will then work up the first detailed proposal, working with other partners, and provide them to the RPB. The section 4(4)
authority or authorities should work in accordance with the indicative brief and cannot
demand payment for this work which is being done in pursuance of a statutory duty.

2.29 It is the executive and not the full council which should exercise the responsibilities under
sections 4(2) and 5(5) of the Act. Therefore, the Local Authorities (Functions and
Responsibilities) (England) 2000 Regulations have not been amended to provide that an
authority, in exercising its responsibilities under section 4(2) and 5(5) of the Act, should
do so as the full council.

2.30 The above arrangements recognise the particular expertise which the section 4(4)
authorities have in relation to sub-regional matters. Once the section 4(4) authority or
authorities have made these detailed proposals, they may need further development. This
should also be on a partnership basis with planning authorities and stakeholders as
elaborated in Annex D. This may or may not involve entering into a formal arrangement
with a section 4(4) authority to undertake further work. The more complex sub-regional
issues may require a sub-regional study to build upon or contribute to the detailed
proposals referred to above. A sub-regional study may well be necessary in deciding on the
distribution of housing down to district and, where appropriate, housing market level.
Again this should be in the context of an agreed brief drawn up by the RPB. In all cases the
final decision on the nature of the draft policies and proposals to be submitted to the
Secretary of State rests with the RPB.

**KEY STAGES IN THE RSS REVISION PROCESS**

2.31 Figure 2.1 sets out the key stages in preparing a draft revision to a RSS, including any sub-
regional proposals, which are then explained in the subsequent text. The diagram also
provides a target timetable, further details of which are provided in the summary table after
paragraph 2.53. The target timetable is between approximately two years six months to two
years eleven months depending on the complexity of the revision and the matters identified
for examination. The Government expects this timetable to be achieved or even bettered,
particularly in the context of more frequent revisions of particular aspects of the RSS. The
GO will need to be presented with very good reasons for agreeing to a longer timetable.
Where a minor change is proposed which would have no significant effect on the rest of the
RSS, then the RSS should be capable of being revised quickly. A key issue will be whether
the change will need to be considered at an EiP, although the strong presumption is that it
would. It will only be in the exceptional circumstances of a minor revision, and subject to
the criteria set out in section 7(4) of the Act, that the Secretary of State may decide that an
examination is unnecessary. Further information on the EiP process is set out in Annex C.

2.32 Meeting the timetable agreed with the GO is a key element on which RPB performance will
be judged, which in turn could affect future RPB funding. Other key factors to judge
performance include comprehensiveness of stakeholder engagement and robustness of
policy output. Both the project plan and the statement of public participation should be
kept under review and revised as appropriate.
Figure 2.1 – RSS Revision Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Identify the issues for a revision / prepare project plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Develop options and policies, assess effects and develop draft revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 15.5</td>
<td>As above plus technical / survey work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 24-25.5</td>
<td>Publish draft RSS and formal consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 26-28.5</td>
<td>Examination-in-public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 32-34.5</td>
<td>Issue of final RSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- Planning Authorities, stakeholders and the public
- Regional Planning Bodies
- Central Government / Government Offices
- Panel
- Sustainability Appraisal*

*Note: the stages within the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process are taken from draft guidance on SA.
Stage 1 – Drawing up a Project Plan

2.33 Having identified the revision issues, the RPB should discuss with the Government Office (GO) the best way of handling preparation of the draft revision and the timetable consequences. A draft project plan should be drawn up, agreed with the GO, consulted on, revised in agreement with the RPB and then published. As part of the project plan there should be a statement of public participation (see paragraph 2.17 above) as required by section 6 (1) of the Act. It is essential that the public are consulted on this plan and Annex D advises on how this might be done. The project plan should cover the following:

– the objectives of the revision with reasons why they were chosen;
– the areas to be considered and the timetable for preparing the revision, including the timing of key milestones;
– the staff resources needed, as appropriate, to prepare the revision;
– how the revision is to be aligned with other relevant regional strategy revisions;
– identification of relevant research and technical studies, including any sub-regional studies; and
– the involvement of the community and partnership working (where the statement of public participation is part of the project plan).

Stage 2 – Developing Options and Policies

2.34 The RPB, working on the basis of community involvement and partnership working referred to above, should identify different strategic options for delivering the vision that it wishes to see for the region in relation to the policy area which is being revised. Among the matters which should be taken into account in developing these options are the objectives outlined in the project plan, a realistic assessment of resources, the plans of relevant infrastructure and service providers, other relevant regional strategies and the RTS as an integral part of the RSS (see Annex B), technical work (such as urban housing capacity studies) and the SA. RPBs should consider testing the sensitivity of different options to different scenarios of, for example, socio-economic and demographic change as part of the SA process. The favoured option can then be developed along with the detailed policies necessary to deliver it. It is important that the RPB continues to involve the community and work on a partnership basis as issues and options papers are produced, further SA work undertaken and policies established in the light of technical work and analysis.

2.35 RPBs, in preparing draft revisions, must comply with the general duty in the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 to promote race equality. This duty means that they must have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups. Community involvement in the revision process will need to address the involvement of different racial groups. RPBs should also comply with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. This places a duty on all those responsible for providing a service to the public not to discriminate against disabled people by providing a lower standard of service. Service providers now have to consider making reasonable adjustments to the way they deliver their services so that disabled people can use them.
The Sustainability Appraisal

2.36 The sustainability appraisal (SA) is not a separate stage, but an integral part of producing a draft revision of a RSS. It should be started as soon as a RSS revision is first considered, and should provide input at each stage when decisions are taken. It should also be used in developing the arrangements for monitoring the implementation of the RSS, in order to identify problems and inform the next revision. The findings from the SA as it evolves should be available to partners and the community in considering options, further developing the revision and in advance of formal publication and submission with the draft revision to the Secretary of State. The more continuous and proactive engagement of the community in the process of preparing a draft revision means that the SA evidence and analysis needs to be correspondingly kept up-to-date and publicly available throughout the process as well.

2.37 SA is based on the four aims for sustainable development outlined in Planning Policy Statement 1:

– social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;
– effective protection of the environment;
– the prudent use of natural resources; and
– maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

It should ensure that these four aims are tackled in an integrated way, in line with the principles for sustainable development set out in the Government’s sustainable development strategy ‘A Better Quality of Life – A Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK’.

2.38 The SA should examine whether the RSS’s objectives are consistent with sustainable development objectives, taking into account the guidance referred to below and the objectives set out in the RSDF. The SA should then consider the draft options and policies, and advise on the impacts and their implications for sustainable development as part of the process of developing these options and policies. Decisions can then be made that accord with sustainable development.

2.39 Where different streams of work in preparing a RSS revision could have significant implications for each other, a check needs to be kept on the interrelationships from an early stage. Furthermore, it is important that pulling together the key aspects of the revision is not left to the last minute. RPBs may wish to consult the public and other stakeholders on the key aspects of the overall RSS revision and their regional and sub-regional sustainability implications before the draft revision is submitted to the Secretary of State. This is likely to be particularly important where the separate streams of work could be expected to have significant effects when considered together. Early consultation on these key issues could reduce the risk of major changes to the RSS revision following submission. However, this does not mean that a full draft of the revision should be consulted upon prior to submission.
Draft guidance is available on how to ensure that the analysis of the economic and social impacts is carried out in the SA on a comparable basis to that required by a SEA. SEA is required by the EU Directive 2001/42/EC, “Assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment”, which came into force in July 2004. The relevant advice is set out in the consultation paper “Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks”, published by OPDM in September 2004. This replaces the SA guidance issued by the then DETR in October 2000.

**Stage 3 – Submission of the Draft Revision to the Secretary of State**

When submitting a draft revision of the RSS, the RPB may also wish to set out in a separate letter or report any potential changes in national policies that it sees as helpful in implementing the draft strategy. These should be included as a publicly available letter or report accompanying the draft. However, the draft revision to the RSS must not be predicated on the assumption that those changes will be made.

Under Regulation 12, the RPB should provide one electronic copy of the draft revision of a RSS to the Secretary of State. Under the same regulation this must be accompanied by:
- the SA report;
- the ‘pre-submission consultation statement’ (see paragraph 2.17 above); and
- any supporting technical documents which the RPB considers support the draft revision.

Under Regulation 13 the RPB must also:

(a) make copies of the draft revision documents available for inspection at the RPB’s principal office during normal office hours and other places within the region as it considers appropriate;

(b) publish on the RPB’s website:
- the draft revision documents;
- details of where and at what times hard copies of the draft revision documents are available for inspection;
- the subject matter and area covered by the draft revision;
- the period within which representations on the draft revision must be made;
- the address to which and, where appropriate, the person to whom written representations and representations by electronic communication must be sent;
- a statement that any representations made may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the publication of the revised RSS;
- an explanation of the procedure under Part 1 of the Act for considering representations on a draft revision and publishing a revision of the RSS; and
2.44 Prior to publication of the draft revision of the RSS, the RPB should provide all LPAs and county councils in the area affected by the draft revision with sufficient copies of both the draft revision documents and the “draft revision matters”, as Regulation 13 calls them, covering all the matters listed in (b) above. This will enable the LPAs and county councils, in accordance with Regulation 13, to make sufficient copies available for inspection at their offices from the date of publication.

2.45 Regulation 13 also enables the Secretary of State to vary the period of representations depending on whether the draft revision constitutes a minor amendment or not. This can vary between a minimum of 6 weeks for a minor amendment and no less than 12 weeks for a more substantial amendment. For this to work, the RPB should send the GO a near final version of the draft RSS revision prior to formal submission of the final draft. This is in order that the Secretary of State can decide on the length of the consultation period. Any correspondence between the GO and the RPB on the details of the above requirements, including the examination venue and the appointment of the Panel, should be made available if requested.

2.46 In order to prevent the RSS revision process being slowed down, a Panel Chair, other Panel members, a Panel Secretary and Panel Assistant will be appointed on a shadow basis prior to the submission of the draft revision to the RSS. The RPB will be able, when it seeks representations on the draft RSS, to say that these should be sent to the Panel Secretary and provide contact details. There is a strong presumption that an EiP will be held. It is only in the exceptional circumstances of a minor revision, subject to the criteria set out in section 7(4) of the Act, that the Secretary of State may decide that an examination is unnecessary.

2.47 Where publicity for the draft revision and the probable EiP is unlikely to be secured by means of a press release, the RPB should consider with the GO whether one or more newspaper advertisements would be cost effective. Placing an advertisement in papers with a regional coverage is the normal means of reaching additional people with an interest, but other more creative options should also be considered. Where this is not practicable one or more newspaper advertisements should be made. Annex D provides guidance on this.
Stage 4 – The Examination-in-Public (EiP)

2.48 The main purpose of the EiP is to provide an opportunity for discussion and testing in public, before a Panel appointed by the Secretary of State, of matters selected by the Panel to test the soundness of the draft revision to the RSS. The RPB should not make significant changes to the draft or introduce major new material in the run-up to the examination. To do so would be to prejudice the consultation process on the submitted revision to the draft RSS. Further information on the EiP process is set out in Annex C.

2.49 The RPB should ensure that the RSS is sound when submitted for examination. The Panel will need to satisfy themselves that it is sound. The main criteria for assessing soundness are:

(i) whether it is a spatial plan, including in particular, does it properly take into account related policy initiatives and programmes relevant to meeting regional economic, environmental and social needs, where these directly impact on the development and use of land, and does it contain policies which sufficiently link with those related policy initiatives and programmes to deliver the desired spatial change;

(ii) whether it meets the objectives for a RSS, as set out in paragraph 1.7 of this PPS;

(iii) whether it is consistent with national planning policy and if not whether the case has been adequately made for departing from national policy;

(iv) whether it is consistent with other relevant regional strategies for the region, including the regional housing, economic and cultural strategies, and with RSSs for neighbouring regions where cross boundary issues are relevant. Any major inconsistencies will need to be justified;

(v) whether the policies in it are consistent with one another;

(vi) whether it is founded on a robust and credible evidence base;

(vii) whether community involvement and partnership working have been satisfactory, including whether the RPB has taken proper account of the views expressed;

(viii) whether it is realistic, including about the availability of resources, and is able to be implemented without compromising its objectives;

(ix) whether it is robust and able to deal with changing circumstances;

(x) whether it has been subject to a satisfactory SA and whether alternative options were correctly ruled out taking account of the SA findings;

(xi) whether in all other respects it has been prepared following the proper procedures, as set out in the Act, Regulations, this PPS and related guidance; and

(xii) whether it has clear mechanisms for monitoring and implementation.
Stage 5 – The Panel Report

2.50 The report of the Panel into the EiP will normally be completed within two months of the end of the examination, although this will depend on its length and complexity. The RPB and other interested parties should not make representations on the report except in the context of the Secretary of State’s proposed changes to the draft revision. To do so would undermine the examination process and be prejudicial to other participants. The Panel report will be published as soon as practicable after the Secretary of State receives it and in advance of the proposed changes.

Stages 6 & 7 – Publication of Proposed Changes and issue of RSS

2.51 The Secretary of State’s proposed changes to the draft revision will then be published with a reasoned statement of the decisions, allowing at least eight weeks for comment. This may need to be accompanied by a revised SA report. The RPB, LPAs and county councils in the area affected by the revision will require sufficient copies of all these documents to make sufficient copies available for inspection at their offices from the date of publication by the Secretary of State as required under Regulation 16. Although at this late stage it is unlikely that the Secretary of State will be proposing any significant changes which have not already been the subject of a SA. The proposed changes will be based in a large part on the Panel report and the Panel will expect any alternative options put forward at the EiP to have been the subject of an SA, if not by the RPB then by those making the relevant representations. Following consideration of any representations made on the proposed changes, the RSS will then be published incorporating the Secretary of State’s final changes together with a statement of reasons for any further changes made. It is also the practice of the Secretary of State to publish a summary of the representations received which may form part of the document setting out the reasons for any further changes. The details of what will happen are set out at Annex C.

2.52 As soon as practicable after the RSS revision has been published by the Secretary of State, the RPB should publish a consolidated SA report of the entire SA process covering all RSS revision stages. Either at the front of the SA report or as a separate document there should be a statement, agreed by the Secretary of State and the RPB, summarising information on how the SA results and opinions received were taken into account, reasons for choice of alternatives and proposals for monitoring.

2.53 Table 1 summarises the RSS revision process which is described above in paragraphs 2.32-2.52.
### TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF THE RSS REVISION PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage:</th>
<th>Regional Spatial Strategy revision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Drawing up a Project Plan &amp; Statement of Public Participation</td>
<td>RPB in consultation with the GO draw up the draft project plan and a regional statement of public participation for the draft RSS revision, including the relevant regional objectives and likely issues, and consult and revise the plan. <strong>[up to 4 months]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing Options and Policies</td>
<td>RPB in co-operation with GO and other stakeholders, develops initial proposals, commences an SA of the impacts of these and then develops and refines options into a draft RSS revision involving the public on these as it does so. <strong>[up to 12 months]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Submission of the Draft Revision to the Secretary of State</td>
<td>RPB submits draft RSS revision, SA report, pre-submission consultation statement and any background documents to the Secretary of State. The draft revision is then published for consultation with a RPB letter inviting representations and a press notice issued announcing timing of the EiP. Written responses to Panel Secretary – within a 6 to 12 week specified period – which are copied to GO/RPB. <strong>[up to 3.5 months]</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Testing and the Examination-in-Public | Following receipt of responses:  
- They are analysed – 4 to 8 weeks depending on number and complexity;  
- First prelim meeting coinciding with start of consultation period on draft list of matters – 12 weeks in advance of EiP;  
- Revised list of matters – published at least 6 weeks in advance of EiP;  
- Second prelim meeting – at least 5 weeks in advance of EiP; and  
- EiP in front of independent Panel appointed by the Secretary of State – 3 to 6 weeks. **[5 to 6.5 months]** |
| 5. The Panel Report | Panel reports to the Secretary of State (which GO copies to RPB and other public examination participants) and report is published. **[2 to 3 months]** |
| 6. Publication of Proposed Changes to RSS revision | Following Panel’s report, Secretary of State publishes proposed changes to draft RSS revision with a statement of reasons. 8 week consultation period on these changes before final RSS and statement of reasons is issued. **[up to 6 months]** |
| 7. Issue of final RSS | RSS approved and issued by Secretary of State.  
**Total time from start of process: approximately 2 years 6 months to 2 years 11 months.** |

**Further Stages:**  
Local Development Documents and Local Transport Plan conformity: With support of RPB and Secretary of State (GO) to ensure that LDDs and LTPs are consistent with the RSS.  
Monitoring and Review: RPB, in liaison with GO and other stakeholders, to monitor achievement of RSS targets, identify remedial action and trigger further revisions where appropriate.
2.54 Structure plans will be ‘saved’ for a period of three years from commencement of Parts 1 and 2 of the Act or adoption of the structure plan, whichever is later, unless during that period:

(i) RSS revisions are published by the Secretary of State which replace the structure plan policies in whole or in part; or

(ii) the Secretary of State directs under sub-paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Act, that the three-year period should be extended.

2.55 With regard to (i) above, the RPB should identify which policies in the relevant draft RSS revision replace which policies in saved structure plans. This will give interested persons adequate notice and an opportunity to make representations before an examination is held. The RPB’s proposals for replacement of structure plan policies can then be tested at the examination into the RSS revision so that before the end of the three-year period these replaced structure plan policies no longer have effect. The same principles will apply after the three-year period for those policies included in a direction under sub-paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Act.

2.56 An RPB may decide that it does not wish to replace the saved structure plan policies during this three-year period but instead wait for the period to end. At the end of the three-year period, unless otherwise directed by the Secretary of State, the structure plan will cease to have effect as a development plan.

2.57 With regard to (ii) in paragraph 2.54, the RPB should consider, following discussion with the structure plan authority, whether any policies in the saved plan should be saved for a longer period to avoid a policy void. Where the RPB proposes to do so, it should make a case to the Secretary of State who will consider whether to direct that these policies should be saved for a further period in accordance with the following criteria:

(a) the saved policies are consistent with national planning policies appearing in White Papers and PPSs that have been published since the policies were adopted and are in general conformity with the RSS;

(b) the saved policies address an existing strategic policy deficit and do not duplicate national or local policy;

(c) the operation of policies to be saved for longer than three years is not materially changed by virtue of other policies in the old plan not being saved; and

(d) even where policies are not compliant with one or more of the above, the Secretary of State considers that it is appropriate for the policies to be saved for longer than three years. This would be where the Secretary of State agreed with the reasons provided by the regional planning body on why these policies should be retained.
2.58 If there is any conflict between a RSS and a structure plan, whichever was adopted, approved or published most recently must take precedence. Any structure plans which are adopted or approved after commencement of Parts 1 and 2 and section 38 of the Act will, under sub-paragraph 2 (2) of Schedule 8 of the Act, be done so under the relevant provisions of Part 2 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. They will not have to be in general conformity with the RSS. However, the RPB should ensure that it makes any necessary representations to be considered at the structure plan EiP so that the structure plan is consistent with the RSS.

2.59 For the purposes of the above where the Secretary of State prescribes that an RPG should be treated as a RSS, its publication date will be the date the relevant RPG was published.

2.60 RPBs, in co-ordination with GOs, should look for opportunities to move forward into the new system as quickly as is practicable to do so. They should, therefore, encourage county, unitary and National Park authorities to review their plan preparation programmes and reconsider whether it would now be sensible to redirect the resources towards the appropriate elements of the RSS. Where a structure plan has reached statutory deposit stage by the time of commencement of Part 1 of the Act, it may continue to be prepared according to the relevant provisions of Part 2 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990. However, the structure plan authority in consultation with the RPB, may consider that it is not sensible to progress beyond the deposit stage, particularly where strategic planning expertise would be more effectively employed on sub-regional elements of the RSS. In such cases the structure plan authority should withdraw the draft structure plan.
3.1 In preparing the draft revision to a RSS, the RPB should demonstrate how it is intended that the spatial strategy will be implemented. Appropriate implementation mechanisms should be identified along with the organisations responsible for delivering policies. As this will be a factor in assessing the realism of the overall strategy, it is important that these agencies are directly involved in the development of the strategy and support its implementation.

3.2 An agreed implementation plan is necessary to set out for each policy and priority proposal which organisation(s) are responsible for delivery, along with the current status of the proposal (e.g. whether it is committed) and the timescales for the key actions to deliver the policy, including any output targets. This plan should be incorporated within the draft revision to the RSS or produced as a separate document. In the latter case the plan would be cross-referenced in the draft revision to the RSS and submitted with that revision to the Secretary of State. This will form the basis for informing both lower order strategies, plans and programmes and national delivery agencies such as the Highways Agency and the Strategic Rail Authority. This will provide greater certainty that the infrastructure required to support planned levels of development, will be provided at the appropriate time.

3.3 The plan can then be built upon by the RPB to promote the published spatial strategy across a wider range of agencies and bodies including at sub-regional and local levels. The RPB with other partners may be able to develop the plan to identify a clear set of integrated priorities across a wide policy spectrum at both regional and, where appropriate, sub-regional levels that all parties can collectively agree and support. Such priorities should be consistent with those in the published RSS.

3.4 In order to help focus on the key actions that are necessary to deliver the strategy, wherever practicable and sensible to do so, policies should be quantified and output targets and indicators set. Output targets should be set to specify a scale of change in a specified time period. The selection of indicators, which should be kept to a minimum, should follow after objectives, policies and targets have been defined. It is important that progress against the output targets is monitored as the key element of the annual monitoring report. For further explanation of the purposes of these targets and indicators see the monitoring guide referred to below.

3.5 Contextual indicators should also be monitored. These are indicators that measure changes in the wider socio-economic and environmental regional context against which the RSS is being implemented. These indicators may reveal changes which have been caused in part by the RSS.

3.6 RPBs also need, in time, to monitor the significant effects of implementation of the RSSs, although it may be several years before the RPBs can be certain about these effects. Directive 2001/42/EC requires formal SEA of certain plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment. Analysing the significant effects of RSS implementation is part of this. As part of the wider SA (see paragraphs 2.36 to 2.40) the

---

3 In the light of the structural changes to the rail industry set out in the White Paper ‘The Future of Rail’, CM 6233, July 2004, all references to the SRA should be taken to include any successor bodies as appropriate.
significant effects of the RSS on society and the economy, as well as on the environment, need to be assessed and monitored. Advice on this is provided in the monitoring sections of the consultation paper ‘Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks’, published by OPDM in September 2004.

3.7 In line with the above, Regulation 5 requires an annual monitoring report to be submitted by the RPB to the Secretary of State on the 28th of February of the following year to which it applies. Naturally, if the report is available before that date it should be submitted as soon as it is available. RPBs should ensure that as much as possible of the data provided in the report covers the year 1 April to 31 March, as required under this regulation. However, the report should not be limited to the inclusion of one year’s data as analysis of longer time periods may be needed to ensure that any discerned trend is established and not a temporary phenomenon.

3.8 Where the RSS contains a policy specifying the annual number of dwellings to be built, or any other period specified, for any part of the region, the annual monitoring report must state the number of net additional dwellings provided. It should also state the gross data needed to define this net figure. These gross data are the total of new dwellings created (new build and conversions) and losses (demolitions and changes of use). This information should be both for the year covered by the annual monitoring report and from the start date of the policy in question.

3.9 The Act makes clear that the main purpose of the annual monitoring report is to consider whether implementation of the RSS is being achieved in line with the purposes of the RSS. If it is not, then Regulation 5 requires the RPB to set out the reasons why it thinks the policy is not being implemented and what it intends to do about it. This will include whether the RPB intends to prepare a draft revision of the RSS to amend the policy. The report should be made publicly available, including on the RPB’s website.

3.10 The RPB should provide the Secretary of State with details of the proposed monitoring arrangements where they are not set out in the draft revision to the RSS. The Secretary of State will need to be satisfied that the RPB has established a monitoring and review mechanism, with member local authorities and other bodies as appropriate, that can respond sufficiently quickly to any adverse impact of the strategy. It is essential that there are clear arrangements to ensure close linkages between the production of the regional and local annual monitoring reports. The Regulations give the RPBs two more months, compared to LPAs, to submit their annual monitoring reports so that local monitoring information can feed into these regional reports. ODPM has published a set of core output indicators for RSSs and LDDs which are complementary and designed to achieve a cost-effective approach to data collection by the RPBs and local authorities for their respective reports.

3.11 Detailed guidance on how to monitor regional plans, which applies to RSSs, will be set out in the revised guide ‘Monitoring Regional Spatial Strategies: Good Practice Guidance on Targets and Indicators’ to be published by ODPM shortly. This will contain the core output indicators referred to above, which should be monitored by all RPBs.
Annex A  Policy and guidance on topics to be covered in a RSS

The following annex is a topic-based list of EU, central government or central government agency national policies, guidance, research and related material that should be taken into account when RPBs are preparing revisions to Regional Spatial Strategies. It does not claim to be comprehensive, nor does it include the various regional strategies, such as those for culture, economic development or housing, which the RPB will need to have regard to. On occasion, where documents overlap topic areas, they may be listed more than once. The list is not static in time, as it will be made out of date by the process of new research, newer documents superseding older ones, and draft versions becoming adopted. This annex, along with the rest of PPS11, is available on the ODPM’s website at http://www.odpm.gov.uk. The annex will be regularly updated and it will be important to check the most recent version available on the website.
RSS PROCESS TOPICS

Preparation of RSS revisions/EU policy on spatial planning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/ Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Planning Policy Statement 1: Creating Sustainable Communities</td>
<td>Feb 2004</td>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Sets out the Government’s vision for planning, and the key policies and principles which should underpin the planning system. These are built around three themes: sustainable development – the purpose of the planning system; the spatial planning approach; and community involvement in planning.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_027494.pdf">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_027494.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Spatial Development Perspective (INTERREG II C)</td>
<td>May 1999</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>A policy framework for the sectoral policies of the European Community and the Member States that have spatial impacts, as well as for regional and local authorities, aimed as it is at achieving a balanced and sustainable development of the European territory.</td>
<td><a href="http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/som_en.htm">http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/som_en.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monitoring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Regional Spatial Strategies: Good Practice Guidance on Targets and Indicators</td>
<td>Jul 2004</td>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>A guide to assist RPBs and others involved in the RSS process to develop a robust framework for performance review and monitoring of RSS.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606395.hcsp">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606395.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life Counts: Indicators for Sustainable Development for the UK – a Baseline Assessment</td>
<td>Dec 1999</td>
<td>Govt Statistical Service/DETR</td>
<td>The report provides a baseline assessment, looking in detail at 14 'headline' indicators and the messages they send, and providing a benchmark against which future progress can be measured.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/sustainable/quality99/pdf/index.htm">http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/sustainable/quality99/pdf/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Land Use Database</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>The NLUD Partnership (ODPM, English Partnerships, I&amp;DeA and Ordnance Survey)</td>
<td>The National Land Use Database of Previously Developed Land (NLUD-PDL) collects data for England on vacant and derelict sites, and other previously-developed land and buildings that may be available for redevelopment.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nlud.org.uk/">http://www.nlud.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library of Local Performance Indicators</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Audit Commission/ I&amp;DeA</td>
<td>The library provides a range of PIs to help local authorities and local partners to measure how they are meeting local targets. See specific biodiversity topic link for advice on biodiversity indicators.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.local-pi-library.gov.uk/library.asp">http://www.local-pi-library.gov.uk/library.asp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participation in Planning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Involvement in Planning: The Government’s Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Feb 2004</td>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Sets out the Government’s general objectives for community involvement in planning to provide the context for the changes being made to the way that the planning system operates at national, regional and local levels.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_027497.pdf">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_027497.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory Planning for Sustainable Communities: International Experience in Mediation, Negotiation and Engagement in Making Plans</strong></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>The report calls for the notion of ‘public participation’ to be put aside. It is time instead to practice ‘participatory planning’. Includes a series of recommendations addressed to: the ODPM; regional planning bodies; unitary, county and district councils; the RTPI and related professional bodies; and Planners.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_023784.hcsp">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_023784.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Access for Disabled People: A Good Practice Guide</strong></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Describes how all those involved in the development process can play their part in delivering physical environments that can be used by everyone.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_609460.hcsp">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_609460.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sustainability Appraisal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive on the Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>The SEA Directive requires the environmental effects of a range of plans and programmes, including those for planning and land use, to be assessed and taken into account. The public and bodies with environmental responsibilities must be consulted. The Directive's requirements will be fully incorporated into sustainability appraisals under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</td>
<td><a href="http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/eia/full-legal-text/96pc511.htm">http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/eia/full-legal-text/96pc511.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RSS POLICY TOPICS

Air Quality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland; And Addendum</td>
<td>Jan 2000</td>
<td>DETR</td>
<td>This strategy describes the Government’s policies to improve and protect ambient air quality in the UK in the medium-term. The proposals aim to protect people’s health and the environment without imposing unacceptable economic or social costs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/airquality/strategy/">http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/airquality/strategy/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biodiversity and Nature Conservation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A New Focus for England’s Woodlands: Strategic Priorities and Programmes</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>Government’s strategy for the creation and sustainable management of forests for economic, environmental and social benefits. See in particular page 16 which includes specific priorities related to planning issues.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.forestry.gov.uk/englandforestrystrategy">http://www.forestry.gov.uk/englandforestrystrategy</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change and Nature Conservation in Britain and Ireland</td>
<td>Nov 2001</td>
<td>Harrison, Berry and Dawson/UKCIP</td>
<td>One of a series of sectoral and regional studies undertaken within the Defra-funded UK Climate Impacts Programme. See in particular chapter 9 which advises on policy needs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ukcip.org">http://www.ukcip.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biodiversity and Nature Conservation: *(continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Forestry Frameworks: Information for stakeholders assisting the preparation of regional frameworks for implementing the England Forestry Strategy</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Defra/Forestry Commission</td>
<td>Government guidance on the preparation of Regional Forestry Frameworks and their relevance to other regional strategies and frameworks, including Regional Planning Guidance. See in particular paragraphs 2.2 to 2.5 which refer to planning interests.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/infd-51let7">http://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/infd-51let7</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Climate Change:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional climate impacts overviews</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>UKCIP</td>
<td>Regional scoping studies assessing the impacts of climate change, vulnerabilities, and possible responses, including for planning, are available covering all England regions and the Devolved Administrations.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ukcip.org.uk">http://www.ukcip.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change and local communities – How prepared are you?</td>
<td>Jul 2003</td>
<td>UKCIP, I&amp;DeA, LGA</td>
<td>Climate change adaptation guide for local authorities in the UK, includes examples for planning.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ukcip.org.uk">http://www.ukcip.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Knowledge for a Changing Climate</td>
<td>Feb 2003</td>
<td>UKCIP, EPSRC</td>
<td>Overview of a research programme on the impacts of climate change on the built environment, transport and infrastructure, and associated risk management. The latest information from this programme will be helpful.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ukcip.org.uk">http://www.ukcip.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance Note 25: Development and Flood Risk</td>
<td>Jul 2001</td>
<td>DTLR</td>
<td>Government planning policy guidance for development and flood risk. See in particular ‘Regional Planning and Development Plans – River Catchment Planning’ (paragraph 43) and ‘Regional Planning Guidance’ (paragraphs 44-45), which advise on what RPG should take into account regarding flood risk areas, managing floods, and run-off.</td>
<td>gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606931.hcsp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Coast:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Culture:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomorrow's Tourism: A Growth Industry for the New Millennium</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Department for Culture, Media and Sport</td>
<td>Government's tourism strategy, which identifies the responsibilities of all parts of national and local government as well as the industry and suggests a new partnership to raise standards.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.culture.gov.uk/global/publications/archive_1999/tomorrow_tourism.htm">http://www.culture.gov.uk/global/publications/archive_1999/tomorrow_tourism.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic Development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Until PPS4 is published the following interim guidance applies as stated in PPG11

In preparing relevant RSS revisions, Regional Planning Bodies should ensure that they complement and assist the implementation of the RDAs’ economic strategies and as a minimum:

- identify the regional or sub-regional priority areas for economic development and regeneration. This will include, where appropriate, making provision for the location, expansion and promotion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven industry;
- ensure that regionally, or sub-regionally, significant housing, transport and other infrastructure proposals support the above priorities and, where necessary, provide advice on phasing and programming; and
- advise on the need for simplified planning zones, particularly where this will assist business development, and on the general locations and criteria for strategic site selection, including major inward investment sites, so that sufficient sites are made available to meet business needs while ensuring that major ‘Greenfield’ sites are not released unnecessarily as part of a process of competition between nearby authorities. The RPB should review with other stakeholders, including the RDA, whether all existing strategic employment sites are still needed. For the reasons set out in chapter 1 of this PPS, RSS cannot itself identify specific sites for inward investment.
**Energy:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Green Belt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts</td>
<td>Jan 1995</td>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Government planning policy guidance for green belts. See in particular paragraphs 1.4; 2.2 Regional guidance and development plans; and 2.12 and 2.14, which deal with safeguarded land and new green belts.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606905.hcsp">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606905.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Health:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Health Improvement Modernisation Programmes (HimPS)</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>NHS etc.</td>
<td>Set out the strategic programmes for health care and health improvement development by the local NHS (health authority, hospital trusts and primary care groups and trusts), local authorities and the local community.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Housing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement by Planning Minister Keith Hill – Planning for Housing</td>
<td>Jul 2004</td>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>The statement concerns planning’s role in the timely delivery of housing supply and improving its contribution to meeting the full range of housing needs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/content">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/content</a> servertemplate/odpm_index.hcst?n=35468&amp;i=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing</td>
<td>Mar 2000</td>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Government planning policy guidance for housing. See in particular ‘Widening Housing Opportunity And Choice– Providing sufficient housing’ (paragraph 2-7); ‘Plan, Monitor, and Manage’ (paragraph 8); ‘Assessing local housing needs’ (paragraph 12); Re-using urban land and buildings (paragraph 23); Assessing urban housing capacity (paragraphs 25-26); Identifying areas and sites (paragraph 28).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606933.hcsp">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606933.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing: Consultation Paper on a Proposed change to Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 (PPG3): Housing</td>
<td>Jul 2003</td>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Government draft consultation paper on planning policy for Affordable Housing. See in particular ‘Assessing housing needs’ (paragraph 2); ‘Planning for Affordable Housing’ (paragraph 5 and 7).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_023005.hcsp">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_023005.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing: *(continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circular 01/94 – Gypsy Sites and Planning</strong></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Sets out guidance for local planning authorities to identify and provide suitable sites for Gypsy caravans.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606797.hcsp">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606797.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Communities Plan</strong></td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Government programme which sets out a long-term programme of action for delivering sustainable communities in both urban and rural areas. It aims to tackle housing supply issues in the South East, low demand in other parts of the country, and the quality of our public spaces.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/contentservertemplate/odpm_index.hcst?n=3657&amp;i=1">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/contentservertemplate/odpm_index.hcst?n=3657&amp;i=1</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minerals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Planning Guidance Note 1: General Considerations and the Development Plan System</td>
<td>Jun 1996</td>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Government general minerals policy guidance. See in particular paragraph 40, which advises that MPAs should make an appropriate contribution to meeting regional needs for minerals in their development plans.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606843.hcsp">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606843.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Planning Guidance Note 3: Coal Mining and Colliery Spoil Disposal</td>
<td>Mar 1999</td>
<td>DETR</td>
<td>Government mineral guidance on coal mining and colliery spoil disposal. Requirements for coal are defined by the market within national energy policy. Policy for coal extraction is however relevant in all regions that have significant coalfields.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606875.hcsp">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606875.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minerals: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circular 02/85: Onshore Oil and Gas</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Government circular providing guidance on the exercise of planning control over on-shore oil and gas exploration, appraisal and production.</td>
<td>Not available online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Planning Guidance Note: Onshore Oil, Gas, and Coalbed Methane</td>
<td>Oct 1999</td>
<td>DETR</td>
<td>Consultation paper providing advice to MPAs and industry on how to ensure that development of oil and gas resources can take place in accordance with the protection of the environment. Work is being undertaken currently with a view to public consultation on a draft annex to MPS1 on oil and gas in the Autumn of 2004.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_605887.hcsp">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_605887.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Policy Statement 2: Controlling and Mitigating the Environmental</td>
<td>Feb 2003</td>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Government consultation paper on minerals guidance for controlling and mitigating the environmental effects of minerals extraction, consisting of core guidance and draft annexes on dust and noise.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/content/servertemplate/odpm_index.hcst?n=2546&amp;i=2">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/content/servertemplate/odpm_index.hcst?n=2546&amp;i=2</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minerals: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Retail and Leisure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance Note 6: Town Centres and Retail Developments</td>
<td>Jun 96</td>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Government planning policy guidance for town centre and retail development. See in particular 'The Plan-led Approach' (paragraph 1.4); 'Regional Shopping Centres' (paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5); 'Assessing major shopping proposals' (paragraph 4.12); and Annex B (paragraph 2).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/contentservertemplate/odpm_index.hcst?n=3392&amp;l=3">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/contentservertemplate/odpm_index.hcst?n=3392&amp;l=3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on Draft Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres</td>
<td>Dec 03</td>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Government draft consultation paper on planning policy statement for planning of town centres. See in particular ‘The Government’s Aims’ (paragraph 1.5); ‘Networks and Hierarchies of Centres’ (paragraph 2.7); ‘A Pro-Active, Plan-Led System- The Role of Regional Plans’ (paragraph 2.10-2.12).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_026232.hcsp">http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_026232.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Rural Development and the Countryside:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DoE Circular 12/96 Environment Act 1995, Part III: National Parks</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>This document gives Government guidance on National Parks in light of the establishment of National Park Authorities under the Environment Act. The sections of relevance for preparing RSSs are: Section 7 which outlines National Park purposes; Section 19 which explains the duty on all relevant authorities to have regard to National Park purposes; Sections 46, 47 and 48 which explain the planning responsibilities of the National Park Authorities; Section 49 which explains government planning policy on major developments in National Parks.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Soil:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code of Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Soil</strong></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>MAFF</td>
<td>A set of practices to help farmers and growers avoid causing long term damage to the soils that they farm. Also of relevance to other users of soil. See in particular chapter 6 on restoring disturbed soils, also chapters 4 and 5 on physical degradation and contamination respectively.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/environ/cogap/soilcode.pdf">http://www.defra.gov.uk/environ/cogap/soilcode.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Draft Soil Strategy for England – a consultation paper</strong></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>MAFF and DETR</td>
<td>This draft strategy sets out the Government’s overall approach for the sustainable use and protection of soil. See in particular sections 1.3 and 2.2 on sustainable development and loss of soil through development respectively.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/consult/dss/index.htm">http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/consult/dss/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transport:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport White Paper: The Future of Transport</td>
<td>Jul 2004</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>White Paper on transport policy. Sets out factors that will shape transport in the UK over the next thirty years. Also sets out how the Government will respond to the increasing demand for travel, while minimising the negative impact on people and the environment.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dft.gov.uk/strategy/futureoftransport/">http://www.dft.gov.uk/strategy/futureoftransport/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport</td>
<td>Mar 2001</td>
<td>DETR</td>
<td>Government planning policy guidance on transport. See in particular ‘Integration Between Planning and Transport’ (Paragraph 7-8); Aviation (Paragraph 5).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/content/server/template/odpm_index.hcst?n=3413&amp;l=3">www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/content/server/template/odpm_index.hcst?n=3413&amp;l=3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide to Producing Regional Transport Strategies</td>
<td>Apr 2003</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>Aims to assist in the development of strengthened RTS documents and more effective processes for their production over the next two years; intended as a practical tool for RPBs, GOs, and other organisations engaged in the RTS process, offering advice, clarification and examples of good practice in relation to main issues and considerations in producing a RTS.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_transstrat/documents/page/dft_transstrat_507939.hcsp">http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_transstrat/documents/page/dft_transstrat_507939.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Transport: (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport Analysis Guidance (WebTag)</td>
<td>Jul 2004</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>Webtag provides online guidance on the appraisal of transport projects and wider advice on scoping and carrying out transport studies. Also provides advice on modelling and appraisal appropriate for major highway and public transport schemes.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.webtag.org.uk/">http://www.webtag.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROADS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RAIL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


### Transport: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Rail Authority's Annual Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>Outlines the current state of the railways and the SRA's strategic goals and projects for the coming year/s.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sra.gov.uk/publications/index.tt2">http://www.sra.gov.uk/publications/index.tt2</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Rail Authority's Regional Planning Assesments</td>
<td>Oct 2003</td>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>Regional Planning Assessments provide the level of planning below the Strategic Plan; objectives of RPAs include, among others, formulating a basis for planning rail services over the medium to long term at a more detailed level and inform SRA input to RPG or future Regional Spatial Strategies.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sra.gov.uk/publications/other/2003_10_16/regional_planning_assessments_161003.pdf">http://www.sra.gov.uk/publications/other/2003_10_16/regional_planning_assessments_161003.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Policy</td>
<td>Mar 2004</td>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>Advises on the form, function, operating characteristics and role of Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges to inform planning policies.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sra.gov.uk/publications/strategy/freight_interchange/interchange_policy">http://www.sra.gov.uk/publications/strategy/freight_interchange/interchange_policy</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FREIGHT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PORTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Ports: A UK Policy</td>
<td>Nov 2000</td>
<td>DETR</td>
<td>Sets out the broad policy aims of the Government and the devolved administrations for the UK's ports. These reflect an integrated approach to transport and recognise the relationship between transport and other important policies.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_shipping/documents/page/dft_shipping_505279.hcsp">http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_shipping/documents/page/dft_shipping_505279.hcsp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transport: *(continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVIATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYCLING AND WALKING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Cycling Strategy</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>Creates a focus for organisations/individuals who are in a position to influence a change in physical conditions, the attitudes of individuals and the outlook of organisations on cycling. It identifies a range of actions which can help to increase cycling levels.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nationalcyclingstrategy.org.uk">http://www.nationalcyclingstrategy.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Walking: Advice to Local Authorities</td>
<td>May 2000</td>
<td>DETR</td>
<td>A working guide for people who will put policy into action; recommends that the key improvements needed are greater focus on and higher priority for the needs of pedestrians, including re-allocating road space; Integrating walking into transport and land use planning; and improving conditions to make it easier, safer and more convenient for people to walk.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_sustravel/documents/page/dft_sustravel_504172.pdf">http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_sustravel/documents/page/dft_sustravel_504172.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waste:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered:</th>
<th>Web Link:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Until PPS10 is published, the following interim guidance applies:

Regional Planning Bodies in preparing revisions to Regional Spatial Strategies should consider the implications for waste management. They should include, as an integral part of the RSS, a clear and deliverable strategy for managing waste. This should enable sustainable waste management in line with the Government’s national waste strategy and be capable of being carried forward into local development documents prepared by waste planning authorities. In particular, policies should enable the timely provision of sufficient facilities for waste management of an appropriate size and mix and in the right locations. In drawing up these policies, the RPB should take into account the specific needs of hazardous wastes. The RSS should include indicators for regular monitoring so as to measure progress in delivering the waste strategy.
Water:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Relevance of Document/Material Covered</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Defra</td>
<td>Requires all inland and coastal waters to reach “good status” by 2015. It will do this by establishing a river basin district structure within which demanding environmental objectives will be set, including ecological targets for surface waters. See in particular ‘Duty to have regard to river basin management plans and supplementary plans’ (Regulation 17).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legislation.hmso.gov.uk/si/si2003/20033242.htm">http://www.legislation.hmso.gov.uk/si/si2003/20033242.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources for the Future – A strategy for England and Wales (Supplemented by detailed regional strategies plus one for Wales)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>The strategies identify existing and forecast pressures on water resources, consider the needs for water of both the environment and society, and examine the uncertainties about future demand and availability. They are therefore an important source of information to inform land use planning strategies to ensure sustainable development.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk">www.environment-agency.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUIREMENTS FOR PREPARING REGIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGIES

1. Better integration between transport and spatial planning is critical to the development and delivery of an effective Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). Transport policies need to reflect and support the aims of the spatial strategy, and land use planning in turn needs to take account of the existing transport network and plans for its development. This integrated approach should help to deliver more sustainable travel patterns and to identify locations for housing, commercial development and essential services in areas of high public transport accessibility.

2. Of key importance to achieving this integration is the preparation of a Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) as an integral and clearly identifiable part of a RSS.

CONTENT OF A REGIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY

3. The RTS should set out how national transport policies and programmes will be delivered in the regions, outline the transport and related land use policies and measures required to support the spatial strategy, and provide a long term framework for transport in the region. It should also steer the development of local transport plans and policies in Local Development Documents (LDDs). These considerations underlie the main aims of the RTS set out in the Figure below.

4. These aims are addressed at paragraphs 19 to 37 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Aims of the Regional Transport Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The RTS should provide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- regional objectives and priorities for transport investment and management across all modes to support the spatial strategy and delivery of sustainable national transport policies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a strategic steer on the future development of airports and ports in the region consistent with national policy and the development of inland waterways;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- guidance on priorities for managing and improving the trunk road network, and local roads of regional or sub-regional importance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- advice on the promotion of sustainable freight distribution where there is an appropriate regional or sub-regional dimension;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a strategic framework for public transport that identifies measures to improve accessibility to jobs and key services at the regional and sub-regional level, expands travel choice, improves access for those without a car, and guides the location of new development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- advice on parking policies appropriate to different parts of the region; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- guidance on the strategic context for local demand management measures within the region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PREPARATION OF A DRAFT REGIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY

5. The preparation of a draft RTS should be an integral part of the preparation of a draft RSS, given the close linkages between transport and spatial planning. Transport issues should not be considered in isolation from spatial planning considerations. RSSs will only be credible, authoritative and deliverable if transport considerations are fully factored into their development from the outset, and if spatial development is considered in the light of its impact on all modes of transport. RPBs need to ensure the appropriate arrangements are in place to allow an effective dialogue between regional transport and spatial planning stakeholders. Annex D underlines the importance of partnership working in the RSS process and of RPBs engaging with a wide range of stakeholders in both the private and public sectors.

6. As with the rest of the RSS, the RDA will be a key stakeholder, and it will be important that the RTS and the RDA’s Regional Economic Strategy (RES) and action plans pursue complementary outcomes. The strategies need to recognise the links between land use, economic activity and travel demand and the impact of congestion on the economy. The RSS, including the RTS, should therefore indicate how land use and transport policies would support economic development and should also inform and assist the RDA in the development and implementation of its RES.

7. The preparation of an effective RTS, as an integral part of a RSS, also requires strong analytical underpinning. RPBs will need to justify the policies and priorities proposed in the draft RTS to both the Panel at the EiP and the Secretary of State. This requires a clear understanding of the key transport issues affecting the region in relation to the wider spatial strategy and supporting evidence to demonstrate how the policies and priorities have been identified. Technical studies and models have a vital role here. RPBs should work with GOs and other regional stakeholders to ensure that there is robust analysis available of the transport network and related land use issues, and assessments of economic development opportunities and environmental constraints in the region, to inform the preparation of the RTS. The analysis, and transport and land use modelling, undertaken for the completed Multi-Modal Studies programme, studies carried out by the Highways Agency, the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) and Passenger Transport Authorities, and studies commissioned and funded jointly by the RPBs, RDAs and other stakeholders represent a substantial source of information to inform the development of the RTS. As explained in chapter 3, all references to the SRA should be taken to include any successor bodies as appropriate.

8. Preparation of the RTS, in particular the setting of objectives and translation of those objectives into policies and priorities, should be an iterative process. It may become apparent, for example, during the identification of policies and priorities that a proposed objective cannot be achieved in the RSS timeframe. This may cause the objective to be
revisited to reflect what can be realistically achieved. Similarly, assessment of priorities may identify constraints on the transport measures that can be taken forward in support of the preferred spatial strategy. In such circumstances, it may be necessary to reconsider the overall balance of the spatial strategy.

9. Detailed advice on the preparation of the RTS is contained in the DfT/ODPM guide, *Guide to Producing Regional Transport Strategies*. This is being updated and a revised guide will be published shortly.

**AN OBJECTIVES-LED APPROACH**

10. Critical to developing the RTS and the formulation of policies and priorities is establishing a coherent set of strategic objectives. These should address the identified transport and land use problems and opportunities for the region, and be clearly related to the wider objectives of the RSS. They will need to be consistent with and support the Government’s national objectives and PSA targets for transport at the same time as being specific to the region. Chapter 2 explains that RPBs are being encouraged to adopt a more sub-regional approach to development of the broad spatial strategy and the objectives should reflect the issues and problems specific to functional sub-regions.

11. In setting objectives, it will be important not to define them so narrowly as to imply particular policies and solutions. They should be framed instead in broad, strategic terms which will enable a range of integrated transport and land use planning options to be considered in addressing the identified problems.

**POLICIES TO MEET OBJECTIVES**

12. The RTS should set out policies to meet the objectives for the RSS and explain the rationale and analytical basis for each policy. RPBs should have particular regard to national policies and plans set out in national transport policy statements. These statements will include:

- *Sustainable Distribution – a Strategy* (1999);
- the Strategic Rail Authority’s annual Strategic Plan and its daughter documents, including the Network Utilisation Strategy\(^6\);
- PPG13: *Transport* (2001)\(^7\);
- the discussion paper, *Managing our Roads* (2003)\(^8\);

---

\(^4\) [http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_control/documents/contentservertemplate/dft_index.hcst?n=7887&l=2](http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_control/documents/contentservertemplate/dft_index.hcst?n=7887&l=2)

\(^5\) [http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_control/documents/contentservertemplate/dft_index.hcst?n=7882&l=1](http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_control/documents/contentservertemplate/dft_index.hcst?n=7882&l=1)


\(^7\) [http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/contentservertemplate/odpm_index.hcst?n=3413&l=3](http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/contentservertemplate/odpm_index.hcst?n=3413&l=3)


13. The RTS should be consistent with national policies (unless as explained in chapter 2 the Secretary of State accepts the case made at an EiP for a departure from national policy) and set out the regional and sub-regional considerations for delivery of these key policies. The overall RTS will itself help inform future development of national policy. Future reviews of RTS will also need to take account of policy developments.

14. Cross-regional policies on transport, land use planning, the environment and economic development may be required to address issues and problems that cut across regional boundaries. Specific policies should only be included in the RTS if there is a genuine and distinctive regional or sub-regional dimension. They should not repeat national policy guidance, nor should they address issues that are local by nature and are best addressed through Local Transport Plans (LTPs).

**STEERING LOCAL TRANSPORT PLANS AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DOCUMENTS**

15. The RTS should provide a regional and sub-regional transport context for the preparation of LTPs by local transport authorities and of Local Development Documents (LDDs) at local planning authority and, where relevant, county council level. The central role for the RTS in relation to LDDs is to provide a steer on the land use planning policies included in LDDs to help develop sustainable travel patterns and guide new built development to locations accessible by the existing and planned future public transport network. The advice contained in the RTS on, for example, off-street parking standards would be expected to have a significant influence on the policies towards new developments in LDDs.

16. The role of the RTS in relation to LTPs should be to provide a policy framework for the identification of transport priorities at the sub-regional level. Full LTPs are prepared at five yearly intervals and RPBs should ensure that reviews of RTS are carried out in good time to inform each new round of LTPs. The next round covering the period 2006/7 to 2010/11 will be submitted to the Department for Transport in July 2005, and statutory guidance on the scope and content of these plans will be issued by DfT in autumn 2004. This guidance will emphasise that all LTPs should be consistent with the policies and priorities set out in the RTS.

---

9 http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_aviation/documents/divisionhomepage/029650.hcsp
10 http://www.dft.gov.uk/railways/whitepaper
11 http://www.dft.gov.uk/strategy/futureoftransport
17. The RTS should add value to this national guidance by:
   – setting out a policy framework for specific sub-regions, as necessary, identifying where an integrated and coherent approach across LTP boundaries is essential to delivery of policy priorities;
   – providing a steer on policies, initiatives and measures of regional or sub-regional significance to be addressed in LTPs; and
   – providing a regional and sub-regional dimension to local LTP initiatives where, cumulatively, they have a significant regional impact.

18. Following the Social Exclusion Unit’s report ‘Making the Connections’, local transport authorities will be expected to pay greater attention to accessibility within their next LTPs. The Department for Transport will be issuing guidance on how local transport authorities should undertake a more systematic approach to improving access to jobs and key services, particularly for people from disadvantaged groups and areas, in the summer of 2004, alongside guidance on the next round of LTPs. RPBs should work with authorities to ensure there is a consistent approach towards accessibility planning at the sub-regional level. The development of accessibility assessment and mapping techniques should assist the RPBs in identifying levels of accessibility at broad locations across the region and within sub-regions. This should in turn inform the development of a strategic framework for public transport described in paragraphs 31 to 34.

IDENTIFYING INVESTMENT AND MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES

19. The RTS should set out regional priorities for transport investment and management across all modes. These priorities should be:
   – derived from analysis of issues for the region’s transport system, be consistent with the RTS’ objectives and policies and support the wider objectives of the RSS;
   – consistent with national transport priorities set out in national policy documents;
   – defined in broad terms only and focus on general outcomes, unless there is already a clear commitment to deliver a particular scheme confirmed by DfT or the relevant national transport delivery agency;
   – informed by advice from relevant delivery agencies on prospective costs, benefits and relative value for money of proposals; and be capable of being delivered within the RSS timeframe, taking into account the likely level of resources available for transport over this period.

20. Priorities should stem from and be linked to specific RTS’ objectives and policies. Consistency between the RTS’ priorities and the RSS’ wider objectives and policies is vital if transport and spatial planning are to be sufficiently integrated. The RPB will need to demonstrate the extent to which priorities are critical to the overall delivery of the wider spatial strategy and other relevant regional strategies that will assist delivery of shared objectives.
21. The focus, in identifying potential priorities, should not be exclusively on new infrastructure enhancements. It should in the first instance be on making best use of the existing transport network, for example through improved network management and small-scale incremental enhancements. It should also recognise the contribution of committed national schemes or initiatives of regional or sub-regional significance to meeting RTS’ objectives and policies. Where priorities for further infrastructure improvements are identified as essential, the RPB will need to show how they will support the wider spatial strategy and that alternatives have been examined.

22. It is important, however, that the draft RTS avoids creating generalised blight or the diversion of focus by including wish lists of projects that are unlikely to be affordable, or are not viable, whether undertaken by the public or private sectors. Priorities should not be described in terms of specific scheme proposals other than where there is a clearly agreed commitment from the relevant delivery agency to take forward a particular scheme. Scheme proposals should only be specified in the RTS where they have been appraised as part of a range of options, and such proposals may be subject to considerable change in the light of subsequent developments and clearer understanding of costs and benefits. Proposals should also only be included if there is a realistic prospect of delivery within the RSS timeframe. When determining regional priorities the RPB should seek advice from the relevant delivery agency on estimated costs, timeframe and likely value for money of scheme proposals. The RPB should in relation to rail also have regard to the SRA’s regional planning assessments.

23. Affordability will be a crucial issue in setting priorities, and the RPB should take account of the Government’s investment plans for transport. Advice from the GO, HA, SRA, transport operators and infrastructure providers on likely expenditure programmes and resource constraints should be sought so that the draft RSS is realistic in the transport priorities it identifies. The RTS should also set out a ranking of priorities in terms of their relative importance to delivering the spatial strategy and supporting economic development and providing value for money. In determining relative priorities, RPBs should carry out sensitivity testing to assess their respective impacts on the RTS and the order of priorities assuming lower and higher levels of expenditure.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF AIRPORTS AND PORTS

24. The Government has published the air transport White Paper, ‘The Future of Air Transport’ which sets out a long-term framework for the development of air services in the UK. Future reviews of the RSS will need to be consistent with the conclusions of the White Paper. In the case of the RTS, RPBs will need to address in conjunction with the HA and SRA the surface access issues, including freight access and requirements for development of airports in their region. The RPBs should, in this respect, work closely with the Airport Transport Forums, which are responsible for drawing up airport surface access strategies (ASAS) with targets for increasing the proportion of journeys to airports made by public transport.
25. The RTS should, in the context of national policy on port development\textsuperscript{12}, assess the role and future of ports within the region and the impact on the surface transport network of port-related passenger and freight movements. While it is for the ports industry to determine when to propose potential port developments or expansions, RPBs should work with the industry to identify relevant land use and surface infrastructure needs and priorities and ensure that any proposals are consistent with the RSS. This will include identifying measures required at the inter-regional, regional and sub-regional level to support the role and development of ports.

PRIORITIES FOR MANAGING AND IMPROVING THE ROAD NETWORK

26. The RTS should have regard to the issues raised in the document, \textit{Managing our Roads}, in setting out the key developments affecting the strategic trunk road network in the region over the RSS timeframe. Key improvements already planned to the management of the strategic network should also be highlighted in the RTS, particularly where such improvements have wider implications for the spatial strategy.

27. The RTS should also include all the capacity enhancements which have been agreed in principle by the Secretary of State for Transport and entered the Highways Agency’s Targeted Programme of Improvements (TPI) following the completion of the Multi-Modal Studies programme and roads-based studies. These enhancements will be subject to completion of any remaining statutory procedures, including where appropriate a public inquiry and formal environmental impact statement, and should therefore be described in broad terms only in the RTS. Schemes emerging from studies that have been rejected by the Secretary of State for Transport should not be incorporated in the RTS.

28. Any additional scheme proposal set out in the draft RTS deemed necessary to the delivery of the RSS will need to be justified at the EiP in the context of national policy and available resources. If the case is made, the Secretary of State for Transport will consider the scheme proposal in greater detail. However, if he decides that the proposal should not be prioritised, the RSS will need revision so that it is not dependent on the scheme.

29. In addition to setting out developments on the strategic trunk road network, the RTS has an important role in providing a steer to local highway authorities on the management and development of local roads where they are of regional or sub-regional significance, taking into consideration both passenger and freight traffic. This should form part of the policy framework for the development of LTPs described in paragraphs 15 to 17.

\textsuperscript{12} Modern Ports: a UK Policy’ at: http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_shipping/documents/page/dft_shipping_505279.hcsp
FREIGHT

30. The RTS should provide advice for both LTPs and LDDs on the promotion of sustainable freight distribution where there is an appropriate regional or sub-regional dimension. RPBs should have regard to the principles set out in the Government’s paper, ‘Sustainable Distribution: A Strategy’\(^\text{13}\); and any relevant Regional Freight Strategy, and should seek to maximise use of the existing infrastructure. Particular consideration should be given to the spatial issues, such as identifying the broad location of new multi-modal freight interchanges which include regional rail freight interchanges as set out in the SRA’s Rail Freight Interchanges Strategy and distribution centres of regional or sub-regional significance to encourage modal shift of freight from road to rail. At a sub-regional level RPBs should look to develop a consistent approach towards lorry parking and rest areas. RPBs will need to work closely with freight operators, local planning authorities and other relevant organisations such as the Highways Agency, SRA and British Waterways when drawing up these plans.

A STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT

31. The RTS should set out a strategic framework for public transport, from rail to bus services, to ensure public transport issues are sufficiently integrated with spatial planning considerations at a regional or sub-regional level. Such integration is vital if the RSS as a whole is to encourage more sustainable modes of travel, ensure public transport supports regional economic growth and productivity, and enable those without a car to have greater access to jobs and key services.

32. Such a strategic framework should aim to:

– ensure accessibility is reflected in the location of new developments in LDDs. The framework should help to determine the broad location of new development to be set out in the RSS and its sub-regional strategies, by informing the development of specific land use policies for LDDs to improve access by public transport, such as encouraging development near public transport interchanges. Guidance on the relationship between transport and land use planning issues in LDDs is contained in PPS12 on Local Development Frameworks.

– identify key public transport priorities of regional or sub-regional significance that are affordable and deliverable. The strategic framework should identify:

  – areas/corridors in the region where better use of the existing public transport can be made and where further improvements are required to support the spatial strategy;

  – a hierarchy of public transport interchanges across modes of regional or sub-regional significance; and

\(^{13}\) http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_freight/documents/page/dft_freight_503891.hcsp
– a network of public transport corridors across modes of regional or sub-regional significance which link these interchanges.
– encourage through the LTP process an integrated approach to public transport between modes and across local authority boundaries. The framework should provide guidance on:
  – the identification of local interchanges and public transport services to complement the regional/sub-regional interchanges and corridors identified;
  – the integration of public transport services across the region; and
  – the broad location of park and ride sites of strategic importance and their integration with the rest of the public transport network.

33. The underlying aim of the strategic framework is to ensure a more holistic approach to the treatment of public transport in the RTS. The framework should not seek to set specific service levels for particular public transport corridors. This is the responsibility of the relevant transport operator and public authority, consulting where appropriate with regional and local stakeholders.

34. The RPB should develop this strategic framework in conjunction with the SRA, local transport authorities, local planning authorities and public transport operators. It should be consistent with the SRA’s ‘Strategy Plan’ and its other strategy documents such as the ‘Network Utilisation Strategy’. It should also take account of the SRA’s ‘Regional Planning Assessments’, which will set out a long-term framework for regional rail planning. It should in addition consider the various functions of the rail network, in carrying passenger and freight traffic and serving long distance, regional or local markets.

PARKING POLICIES

35. The availability of car parking is a major influence on travel choices, and the RSS has an important role to play in ensuring local parking policies collectively support the wider spatial strategy. RPBs should have regard to the guidance in PPG13 in setting parking standards appropriate to their region or parts of the region.

MANAGING TRAFFIC DEMAND

36. RPBs should consider the full range of measures available to tackle congestion described in the document ‘Managing Our Roads’ in putting forward demand management proposals in the RTS.
37. Most of these measures will be for implementation by local authorities and the RTS has a key role in steering LTPs on where demand management measures might be appropriate. RPBs should identify in the RTS locations where demand management would help solve specific congestion problems and set out criteria and policy principles for appropriate schemes. These will need to consider the extent of competition between centres and the accompanying economic and social impacts, and should include complementary sustainable transport measures such as travel planning and provision for walking and cycling, and necessary improvements to public transport.

SETTNG OUT THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

38. The successful implementation of the RTS will depend upon the co-operation and agreement of a wide range of organisations, including the national delivery agencies (HA and the SRA), private sector operators and the RPBs, along with local planning and transport authorities. An agreed implementation plan setting out for each policy and priority proposal which organisation(s) are responsible for delivery, along with their current status and timeframe, should be incorporated within the RSS or produced as a separate document and cross-referenced in the RSS.

39. The RPBs should develop regional targets and indicators for monitoring and evaluating the RTS. These should show how the RTS' objectives, policies and priorities are contributing to the delivery of the Government's transport targets and also take account of the local targets incorporated into LTPs. Advice on developing a framework for implementation and setting regional transport targets and indicators is included in the 'Guide to Producing Regional Transport Strategies'. Advice on the monitoring and review of targets is referred to in chapter 3 above.
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EXAMINATIONS OF DRAFT REVISIONS TO REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGIES: POLICY AND GUIDANCE ON THE PROCEDURES

Introduction

1. An important feature of the new arrangements for finalising Regional Spatial Strategies is the holding of an Examination-in-Public (EiP) into the draft revision of the RSS once it has been submitted by the regional planning body to the Secretary of State. The term “regional planning body” (RPB) is used throughout this guide to refer to the regional organisation which is in the lead in the production of the draft revision. Since 1 April 2003, the RPB in all regions outside London is the Regional Chamber or Regional Assembly, as they prefer to be called.

2. It will only be in the exceptional circumstances of a minor revision, and subject to the criteria set out in section 7(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (the ‘Act’), that the Secretary of State may decide that an EiP is unnecessary. Before taking a decision not to carry out an EiP, the Secretary of State will consult the RPB and other regional stakeholders as appropriate.

3. The lead responsibility for organising the EiP falls to the relevant Government Office or Offices (referred to as the “GO” hereafter), in liaison with the RPB. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (referred to as the “Office” hereafter) will pay for the hire of accommodation, the payment of fees and expenses of the Chair, the payment of the Panel Secretary and Panel Assistant and such other costs which are reasonably incurred by the GO and agreed with the Office within the budget ceiling set by the Office for its payment of EiP costs.

4. This guide sets out the non-statutory procedures which will be followed, and practical advice for participants at the EiP. The main stages in the EiP process, with an indicative timetable, are set out in Appendix (i).

Purpose of an Examination-in-Public

5. The main purpose of an EiP of a draft revision is to provide an opportunity for the discussion and testing, in public and before a Panel appointed by the Secretary of State, of selected matters (see paragraphs 14 to 16 below). These will arise from the Panel’s consideration of the representations made and what it considers it needs to hear debate on in order to test the soundness of that revision. Paragraph 2.49 of chapter 2 sets out the main criteria for assessing soundness. The Panel’s report following the examination will provide the main basis on which the Secretary of State can decide whether any changes
need to be made to the draft revision before it is issued as a revised RSS. Therefore, an EiP into a draft revision is not an examination of the whole of the submitted proposals, nor is it a hearing of all representations. It is a public debate on selected issues where an examination could usefully provide further information to test the soundness of the revision. Together with the resulting report of the Panel into those issues, it significantly increases the transparency of the process by which a draft revision is turned into the final version of a revised RSS.

Appointment of the Panel

6. The Planning Inspectorate will normally appoint the Chair and other members to the 'shadow' Panel at least ten months prior to the EiP. It will be a 'shadow' Panel until the Secretary of State has confirmed that an examination will be held although, as stated above, it will be most unusual for there not to be an examination. The Chair will be an independent person with a wide range of relevant experience. All contact between him/her and the RPB and the GO will be through the Panel Secretary or the Panel Assistant once they are appointed.

7. It may be sufficient for the Panel to consist of the Chair and one or more Planning Inspectors. However, a technical assessor may also be needed to provide specialist expertise if there are areas where the Chair or Inspector may not have relevant knowledge and experience. For example, this may be necessary in order to assess very specialist information put forward such as the technical aspects of waste.

Appointment of the Panel Secretary and the Panel Assistant

8. The Planning Inspectorate or GO, as appropriate, will appoint, following public advertisement, a 'shadow' Panel Secretary and a Panel Assistant as soon as practicable after an indicative date for an EiP is known and normally before the draft revision is submitted to the Secretary of State. This will normally be at least nine months prior to the EiP. The Chair is normally consulted on both appointments.

9. The Panel Secretary’s duties include the provision and commissioning of briefing for the Panel, dealing with all correspondence on behalf of the Chair, and assisting the Panel in the preparation of its report. As soon as he/she is appointed, the RPB and the GO each nominate a lead officer or officers for him/her to liaise with. Selection of matters for discussion and participants at the EiP is for the Panel, taking into account advice from the RPB and the GO via the Panel Secretary. It is the responsibility of the Panel Secretary to examine representations in order to advise the Chair and the other members of the Panel on the matters to be selected. The Panel Secretary, the GO and the RPB will see all the representations. The use of the term “representations” in this guide refers to both representations in support of and objecting to the draft revision. A specification of the Panel Secretary’s duties is in Appendix (ii).
10. The Panel Assistant will manage all the arrangements for the EiP and assist the Panel on administrative matters. A specification of the Panel Assistant’s duties is in Appendix (iii). The GO may provide the Secretary and the Panel Assistant with clerical support to help them on such matters as mail outs. The GO and, on occasion, the RPB will provide IT support and advice as necessary to assist the Panel Secretary and Panel Assistant set up a database to log responses to the draft revision. Responsibility for entering data into the database and summarising and analysing responses rests with the Panel Secretary and Panel Assistant supported by other professional help to assist in this task as appropriate.

11. The Panel Secretary, the Panel Assistant and any other staff work under the direction of the Panel Chair. For the duration of their appointment they are treated as officers of the EiP. The Panel Secretary and the Panel Assistant are recruited for the examination and will have suitable administrative experience. They will not be current or recent members of the RPB, GO, or Office nor local authority planning department staff in the area covered by the draft revision. Nor will they in any other way have been connected with the preparation of the draft revision or have a vested interest in its outcome.

Notice of ‘shadow’ Panel appointments and timing of the Examination-in-Public

12. When submitting a draft revision to the Secretary of State, among the matters which the RPB is also required to publish with the draft revision, under Regulation 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Regional Planning) (England) Regulations 2004 (“the Regulations”) are:
   – the period within which representations on the draft revision must be made;
   – the address to which and, where appropriate, the person to whom written representations and representations by electronic communication must be sent;
   – an explanation of the procedure under Part 1 of the Bill for considering representations on a draft revision and publishing a revision of the RSS; and
   – the likely place, start date and Panel members for the EiP should the Secretary of State decide that an examination should be held.

13. Under Regulation 14, details of any changes to the examination arrangements have to be published and notification given to the ‘submission consultees’, as defined in the Regulations, and to anyone who has made a representation on the draft revision and not withdrawn it.
Selection of matters for the Examination in Public

14. It is the responsibility of the Panel to select matters that it considers ought to be examined and which it will then report upon to the Secretary of State. In doing so, the Panel will be advised by the Panel Secretary. The Secretary will look at all representations and provide the Panel with a written analysis of them together with a reasoned justification for the selection of those matters which he or she recommends for consideration at the examination. This will also explain why any topics of significant controversy are proposed to be omitted. In preparing this analysis and recommendations, the Secretary will look to the RPB and the GO for advice through the nominated officer arrangements (see paragraph 9 above). Similarly, the GO and the RPB will be consulted on the preliminary list of matters. The Panel Secretary will need administrative support during this stage when representations are entered and summarised into a database (see paragraph 10 above).

15. Close examination of representations will reveal what matters need to be covered, but they will normally include those which arise from:

(i) representations which have been made about the adequacy of particular policies and their justification;

(ii) issues involving significant controversy;

(iii) conflicts between the draft revision and national policies;

(iv) tensions between the draft revision and other relevant regional strategies or RSSs for adjoining regions; and

(v) internal inconsistencies in the draft revision or between those parts of the RSS which are the subject of the draft revision and the rest of the RSS.

16. The list of matters will be drafted as precisely as possible. The ground to be covered in the discussion will be made clear. In order to steer the discussion in the right direction the selected matters will often be drafted in the form of questions. The public will have an opportunity to comment upon the list of selected matters (see paragraph 23 below).

Selection of Participants

17. As the EiP is directed to the discussion of selected matters, and not to the hearing of all representations, individual objectors do not have an automatic right to appear under section 8(3) of the Act. Participants have to be invited. As with the list of matters, the Panel will draw up the list of participants taking into account advice from the RPB and the GO via the Panel Secretary. The public will have the opportunity to comment upon the list of those invited to participate (see paragraph 23 below).
18. In general, the choice of participants will flow from the matters selected for examination. The main criterion for selecting participants will be the significance of the contribution they can be expected to make to the discussion, having regard to their knowledge and expertise and/or the views they have already expressed. The Panel will ensure it does not invite so many participants as to preclude meaningful debate. To assist in this it is important that co-ordinated representations by voluntary groupings of interests are made where there is a common objective and a lead representative identified rather than all interests putting themselves forward as potential participants. Once the representations have been made the Panel may be able to encourage such groupings in order to assist the selection of participants.

19. As the EiP is not a forum for hearing all representations, there is no need to invite all those who objected to the proposals. Nor will it normally be necessary or appropriate to invite everyone who objected or made representations in respect of the selected matters. The Panel will ensure that it invites sufficient participants to ensure an effective examination of the strategic issues. This may involve inviting participants who have not made representations in order to contribute to an understanding of the strategic issues. The aim will be to select participants who between them represent a broad range of viewpoints and have a relevant contribution to make thereby enabling an equitable balance of differing viewpoints to be achieved in discussion of the soundness of the revision. These would include, as appropriate, the following: the RPB and possibly adjoining regional planning bodies, the GO, Government departments and agencies (including Regional Development Agencies), business and commercial organisations, environmental organisations, community groups, women’s groups, private interest groups or individuals. The RPB and the GO will always need to be represented (probably for each matter) and normally the RDA would be invited as well. There will be occasions when a representative or representatives of groups of local authorities will need to be invited in view of the matters to be discussed, especially in the circumstances set out in paragraph 20 below. Where there are matters which cut across regional boundaries the Panel will obtain the views of neighbouring RPBs and in such cases often invite them to the EiP.

20. On major issues of contention between an RPB and authorities with strategic planning expertise relevant to a matter to be examined at the EiP, the Panel will ensure that the issues are examined and the appropriate authority or authorities are invited compatible with having a manageable debate. These authorities are defined in section 4(4) of the Act as a county council, metropolitan district council, National Park Authority or a district council for an area for which there is no county council.

21. The GO and, where appropriate, the Office and possibly other Government Departments, may be invited to explain relevant national policy and other factual information such as the basis of the national household projections. Government officials will not, however, be called upon to explain the merits of government policies.
Participants’ expenses

22. The Department will meet travel and subsistence claims from any private individuals invited and appearing on their own behalf (not as a representative of an organisation or a participant’s adviser), and from representatives of voluntary organisations who can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the relevant GO that they are unpaid volunteers. In the latter cases, letters from the voluntary organisations concerned will be required to verify this.

Publication of list of matters and participants

23. When the preliminary list of matters and participants has been finalised, the Panel Secretary will arrange for it to be available for public inspection and give notice, allowing an opportunity for those who wish to send written comments on the list, a period of 28 days in which to do so. The notice will include the names of the Chair and the other Panel members as well as the date and place of the EiP. It will be published 12 weeks in advance of the EiP. Where possible, the announcement will provide an indicative timetable for the consideration of the selected matters.

24. Following a 28 day consultation period, the Panel Secretary will then consult the nominated officers from the RPB and GO, having copied to both all the representations received on receipt. The Panel Secretary will then advise the Panel and arrange for the publication of an amended list of matters and participants. This will be the final list of matters although the Panel may invite additional participants before or during the examination.

25. The list will also be sent by the Panel Secretary to the selected participants together with an invitation to them to take part. This will give them an opportunity to confirm that they wish to attend. The Panel will normally expect participants to provide a further statement specifically directed at the selected matters. This will be essential where the invited participant has not yet made representations on the draft revision. Interested parties who were not invited to the EiP may also wish to submit statements in connection with the selected matters. All statements should be as brief and to the point as reasonably practicable. The Panel will set a word limit of 2,000 words per issue or such other limit as it considers necessary.

26. All statements and any supporting documents should be submitted no later than 4 weeks in advance of the EiP. If submitted later, the Panel, save where the statements and supporting documents are in response to a request from it, will not normally be able to take them into account. Participants should provide sufficient copies, as prescribed by the Panel, of submitted statements and supporting documents for circulation to other participants before the EiP begins. Circulation of documents will also be assisted by the Panel Secretariat circulating e-mail addresses of participants or preferably by itself placing any electronic copies of documents received on the internet. The Panel, for obvious reasons, cannot consider confidential material. The Panel will expect participants to have read the documents relevant to a particular session and the examination will proceed on the assumption that they have done so.
ACCOMMODATION

27. An early search will be made for suitable accommodation as soon as it is clear when an EiP is likely to be held. The general rule will be to fix a location or locations convenient to participants in terms of good access to public transport and services. Different locations will be necessary where the Panel decides to hold sessions in different parts of the region where the relevant sub-regional issues occur. The venue or venues should have good disabled access and if possible a ‘loop’ system in place for the hard of hearing.

28. The accommodation will be adequate to facilitate a “round table” discussion together with public seating (see paragraph 44 below on the conduct of the examination). It will comprise a hall or room where the main discussion between the Panel and the participants can take place and where members of the public and the press will be able to observe. Adequately equipped ancillary rooms will be necessary in the form of a large room for the secretariat (since the Panel Assistant will need other staff support during the examination) with possibly a separate room for the Panel Secretary, a room for the Panel to work in and retire to during adjournments, and one or more rooms for participants’ discussions. Suitable copying and IT facilities will be in the secretariat room. IT facilities will also be made available to the Panel. Security storage will be made available for Panel papers.

29. An important consideration will be the need for ready and convenient access for disabled people. If possible, public telephones for the use of participants will also be available. A table and seating may also be necessary for the Press.

30. Provision will also be made for a document room which will be accessible to the public. It will contain a copy of the draft revision, the pre-submission consultation statement (as defined in the Regulations), supporting documents and the Sustainability Appraisal, copies of representations and any subsequent clarifications and briefing to the Panel. It may also include copies of PPS11, other relevant Planning Policy Statements, and other relevant national policy documents and guidance notes.

31. Photocopying facilities will be readily available, and a reasonable charge may be made to defray the cost of copying. Wherever possible documents should be available electronically as well as in hard copy form.

Public Address System and Recording Equipment

32. A good public address or amplification system is essential for the efficient operation of the EiP proceedings. It will be linked to recording equipment so that a full recording of the proceedings can be made available to the Panel and subsequently made available for public purchase.
33. Participants will be asked to announce themselves each time they speak so that they can be identified on the recording.

**Notes for Participants**

34. 'Notes for Participants' comprising information which participants will need to know, or will find helpful, about the conduct of and arrangements for the EiP will be prepared by the Panel Assistant in consultation with the Chair. They will specify the dates for submission of documents and final statements (paragraph 26 above refers) and refer to the conduct of the examination (see paragraph 44 below). They may cover a wide range of other matters, such as the location of the EiP, public transport access and any car parking and other facilities, the provision for recording the proceedings, and the programme for the EiP. The Notes will also deal with the eligibility of participants for expenses (see paragraph 22 above). If possible, the Notes will be sent out before the first preliminary meeting (see below) so that the Chair can refer to them. Any new participants will be given a copy of the Notes with their invitations.

**Preparations for an Examination-in-Public**

(a) **Preliminary Meetings:**

35. The Chair may wish to call two preliminary meetings. The first meeting will be 12 weeks before the start of the EiP to coincide with publication of the preliminary list of matters. The second, if required, will be at least 5 weeks before the examination. Any preliminary meetings will be open to the press as well as the public. The Panel Secretary will normally write to participants (on behalf of the Panel) setting out the particular issues to be discussed at each meeting. The same venue will often be used for the preliminary meetings and the EiP. The Panel Secretary will normally inform the participants about the preliminary meetings at least 2 weeks before they are due to be held. A note of each meeting, and of any action to be taken as a result, will be made publicly available. It will be prepared by the Panel Secretary and approved by the Chair.

36. The first meeting will enable the Chair, in the light of the preliminary list of matters, to invite appropriate participants to consider whether there are any issues which they can resolve at side meetings before the EiP, and if possible before the second preliminary meeting. Panel members may chair these preparatory meetings. This assists the Panel to understand the issues, helps focus discussion at the EiP and may benefit the finalisation of the list of matters and participants. Examples of issues which might be usefully dealt with at such meetings include the basis of the RPB’s figure work and any alternatives proposed, discussion of the RPB’s statement of public participation and pre-submission consultation statement, and assisting the selection of representatives as potential participants. The first meeting can also help participants gain a common understanding of information sources,
including any work still being produced by the RPB and its timing. The Chair, by reference to the Notes for Participants, will also be able to outline the next steps before the start of the EiP and any key arrangements for the examination which it may be helpful to refer to at that stage.

37. The main purposes of a second meeting, if needed, will be to let participants and the press know in more detail how the examination is to be handled, to answer questions on this and to ensure that everyone is aware of any new work undertaken by the RPB or other participants since the first preliminary meeting and the results of any preparatory meetings.

(b) Briefing the Panel:

38. The Panel will require thorough background briefing. Some of this may be provided directly by the Panel Secretary. However, the Panel is likely to commission written briefing from others through the Panel Secretary. In particular this is likely to be from the GO and the RPB. Where it is sensible and reasonably practicable to do so, it is good practice for the briefing to be agreed between them, although there may be issues where separate briefs are necessary. Both bodies may decide to provide background briefing on matters of fact before being asked by the Panel Secretary, given the initial unfamiliarity of the Panel with the region and its spatial planning issues.

39. Any such briefing will be made publicly available in the document room (see paragraph 30 above) and it may be appropriate to circulate some or all of the briefing to interested participants before the start of the EiP. The Panel Secretary may also be asked by the Chair or other Panel members to provide briefing on suggested issues needing further probing. The Panel may also require agreed position statements on factual matters that have been agreed between participants in advance of the EiP where this has not happened following the first preliminary meeting (paragraph 36 refers). This avoids unnecessary time being taken up in agreeing these matters at the examination.

(c) Panel Tours:

40. The Panel are likely to make tours of the area before and possibly during and/or after the EiP to give themselves a general feel for areas within the region where key issues have been raised and to allow them to see any broad locations which are likely to feature in discussion. As well as being accompanied by members of the Panel Secretariat, the Panel may also decide that the GO and RPB will also accompany them to point out matters of fact. A note will be kept of these and made publicly available on request.

Examination-in-Public Timetable

41. The need for an efficient and expeditious EiP has to be balanced against the need for a thorough discussion of the selected matters. The aim will be to ensure that participants feel satisfied that they have had a fair hearing and that the Panel has given serious consideration to their statements and points of view.
42. The Panel and its supporting staff will have a considerable amount of work to do before and after each day’s session. Since an EiP is likely to last at least three weeks, the Panel Assistant is likely to limit the programme to 4 days a week, arranging discussions in half-day units where possible.

43. To speed the production of the Panel Report, it is likely that the Panel will spend time each evening discussing their interim conclusions on the day’s proceedings. The programme will be scheduled to finish early enough to allow time for this evening work.

Conduct of an Examination-in-Public

44. The EiP will be conducted in an informal manner to create the right atmosphere for discussion. A round table arrangement is normally followed. Debate of the issues rather than the reading out of prepared position statements will be encouraged, particularly since written statements will have been circulated well before the EiP (see paragraph 26 above). The Panel will encourage discussion on the key points of contention in relation to each issue and sub-issue identified in the list of matters. In exploring these points the Panel often need to go beyond submitted material and lead the debate. The Panel will, therefore, pursue 'inquisitive chairing' rather than allow a general airing of views which would not be a productive use of examination time. Some participants may wish to present their views on the selected matters through an agent or adviser. However, it is essential that this does not undermine the informal nature of the EiP. Formal legal advocacy and cross-examination is inappropriate to a "round table" type discussion. The Notes for Participants will make this clear. In conducting the discussion, the Panel will ensure there has been sufficient discussion of the selected topics and sufficient information obtained so that properly informed recommendations can be made about them.

45. Following an introduction by the Panel, the RPB or lead objector will be asked to start the discussion on a selected matter. Exceptionally, if in relation to a selected matter there are issues of contention between the member authorities of an RPB, it may be necessary to have representatives of the relevant groups of authorities present their differing views to the Panel rather than seeking a single view from the RPB itself. The Panel may encourage groups of participants to meet away from the main table during breaks in proceedings to meet informally and resolve differences.

46. Every effort should be made by participants not to introduce new material during the EiP. The Panel may refuse to accept it, if in its view, it would impose an unacceptable burden on the proceedings given the lack of time which the Panel and other participants have to consider it. However, there may be occasions where the Panel needs additional information to be provided to enable it to complete its consideration of a matter.

47. In carrying out the EiP and in reporting to the Secretary of State, the Panel will have regard to the policy set out in this PPS on the procedures for preparing and the content and format of a draft revision.
Adjournment or Postponement of an Examination-in-Public

48. Exceptionally the Panel may decide that the EiP should be adjourned or even postponed. For example, this may be necessary where important new information comes to hand during the examination requiring consideration by the Panel and participants prior to discussing the related matter at the examination. This could include new factual information or a new national planning policy statement.

49. The Panel will need to take a view on whether the new information can be readily taken into account by itself and the relevant parties without an adjournment, whether an adjournment of a few weeks would significantly facilitate the EiP or whether the new information is so extensive in its implications for the draft guidance that it could not properly be taken into account without a new draft being prepared and consulted upon. The Panel may even decide that the information should be set aside and considered in a future revision of the RSS. In forming its view the Panel will provide participants with an opportunity to comment. The Panel Chair has the authority to re-open the EiP once the new information has been taken into account.

Preparing the Panel’s Report

50. The Panel members have overall responsibility for the preparation of the report on the issues discussed at the examination, although they may wish to be assisted by the Panel Secretary in its drafting. It is for the Chair to decide to what extent he/she requires the assistance of the Panel Secretary in preparing the report. The Chair’s formal letter of appointment will make clear that the Panel report is expected to be completed and signed within a short period of the close of the EiP. The aim should normally be to complete the report two months after the end of the EiP, although this may take up to three months depending on the length and complexity of the EiP. The report will be succinct and centred on recommendations, where possible in the form of textual amendments to the draft revision. The necessary justification will be given linked to key representations made either before or during the examination. The Panel report does not need to provide a detailed account of the representations made, not least because a full taped recording of proceedings is available (see paragraph 32). The report will contain an executive summary in the form of a list of all the recommendations.

51. The report will be sent to the GO who will receive it on behalf of the Secretary of State. The Regulations require the report to be published as soon as practicable thereafter and this will normally be within two weeks of receipt and in advance of the proposed changes.
Handling of the Panel’s Report

52. The Panel report will form an important basis for the Secretary of State in considering what changes, if any, to make to the draft revision. Other considerations will include all the representations made on the draft revision, not just those considered in the context of the EiP and reported on by the Panel. The Secretary of State’s proposed changes to the draft revision will then be published both in paper copy and electronically with a reasoned statement of the decisions, allowing at least eight weeks for comment. The reasoned statement will not only explain the main changes made but also decisions not to make changes recommended by the Panel. Explanations will be required for both changes to the policies and to the supporting text. However, minor textual amendments consequential to such changes that are required may not necessarily also require explanation. There may be changes which the Secretary of State needs to make which do not relate to matters which the Panel selected for the EiP, though these are likely to be relatively minor.

53. Under Regulation 16, the proposed changes, the reasoned statement and the Panel report must be made available at the same places as the submitted draft. Copies of the proposed changes and the reasoned statement and any SA of those changes will be sent to the submission consultees, as defined in the Regulations, and to anyone who made representations on the draft revisions and not withdrawn those representations. The GO should send copies of these documents and the Panel report to all those who participated at the examination. Hard copies of these documents and the Panel report will also be available on request, subject to any reasonable charge which may be levied for copying and dispatch.

54. When publishing the proposed changes, the Secretary of State may indicate policies where advice from the RPB and other participants would be particularly welcome. Exceptionally, the GO or Department may then wish to hold meetings or otherwise contact the RPB and certain other participants as appropriate, in two sets of circumstances. Firstly, where the Panel had insufficient evidence on certain matters which were left unresolved in its report. Secondly, where the changes proposed by the Secretary of State are such that further information is required to assess whether they could be effectively applied. Publicly available minutes of such meetings or notes of the outcomes of other contacts will be kept. Where there has been such selective contact, and depending on its nature and outcome, a further consultation period may be necessary in order to give others an opportunity to comment. The above-mentioned notes and minutes will be made available as part of this process.
55. Following the consultation on the proposed changes, the Secretary of State will approve and issue the revised RSS, although the Secretary of State retains the right to withdraw the revision at any time prior to issue, in the event of which there must be a statement of reasons. Under Regulation 17, the RPB must make a copy of the revised RSS together with reasons for any further changes incorporated in the revised version available at the same places as the submitted revision. The Secretary of State is also required to produce a publication statement, which will advise people of the fact that the RSS revision has been published and of their rights to make applications to the High Court under section 113 of the Act. These documents will be published on the Department’s or the relevant GO’s website together with details of where and when a hard copy of the revised RSS is available for inspection. Although not required under the Regulations, a copy will normally be sent to all those who participated at the EiP. Hard copies will also be made available to anyone else who requests a copy, subject to payment of a reasonable charge.
Appendix (i) Indicative Timetable

- Appointment of Chair and Inspector/Inspectors (the Assessor/Assessors if needed can be appointed at a later date) – at least 10 months before the likely EiP.
- Appointment of Panel Secretary and Panel Assistant – at least 9 months before the likely EiP.
- Consultation on draft revision – normally 12 weeks in duration except where the regional planning body has previously carried out consultation on an earlier draft and the draft submitted to the Secretary of State does not significantly differ from that.
- Panel, in consultation with GO and regional planning body, publishes draft list of matters and participants some 12 weeks in advance of the examination and allowing 28 days for comments on the list.
- First preliminary meeting to coincide with the start of consultation on draft list of matters and participants some 12 weeks in advance of the examination.
- Revised list published at least 6 weeks before the examination.
- Second preliminary meeting and final preparations for examination at least 5 weeks before the examination.
- EiP – 3 to 6 weeks in duration.
- Panel report – 2 to 3 months.
- Secretary of State publishes draft changes with a statement of reasons – 2 to 3 months.
- A minimum 8 week period for comments on draft changes.
- Exceptionally, where there have been meetings with the RPB or other participants, a further 6-8 week consultation period may be necessary with minutes of any meetings made available.
- Revised RSS issued – up to 2 months after the end of the consultation period.

Note: some of the early stages may be carried out in parallel.
Appendix (ii) Panel Secretary

Duties include:
– acting as the point of contact between the regional planning body/GO and the Panel;
– dealing with correspondence on behalf of the Panel Chair;
– examining all representations in consultation with nominated officers in regional planning body and GO to advise the Panel on issues for discussion at the EiP;
– examining comments on published list of matters and participants to advise the Panel;
– commissioning briefing for the Panel;
– preparing notes of the preliminary meetings, and of any action to be taken as a result;
– writing to participants about the topics to be discussed under the selected issues and, if possible, giving a preliminary indication of the likely order of speakers;
– ensuring that participants are sent the “Notes for Participants”;
– helping to arrange the Panel tour and accompanying the Panel;
– assisting in the preparation of the Panel’s report (for example, by preparing an outline structure) while not being a party to its decisions and recommendations, and
– certifying any claims for expenses from participants.

Note: The Panel Secretary works under the direction of the Chair, and for the duration of his/her appointment should be seen as an officer of the EiP. He or she should have suitable administrative experience but should not be a current member of the GO, Department or local authority planning department in the area covered by the draft revision. Nor should he/she in any other way have been connected with the preparation of the draft revision or have a vested interest in its outcome.
Appendix (iii) Panel Assistant

Duties include:
- managing the day-to-day arrangements of the EiP, before and during the proceedings;
- assisting the Panel Secretary as appropriate in examining representations and comments on the published list of matters and participants;
- arranging any Panel tours;
- drawing up a provisional programme and timetable for the proceedings;
- preparing the “Notes for Participants”;
- circulating any additional statements prepared by participants;
- recording all documents and plans submitted during the course of the proceedings, and
- informing participants of timetable changes.

Note: The Panel Assistant works under the direction of the Chair, and for the duration of his/her appointment should be seen as an officer of the EiP. He/she should have suitable administrative experience but should not be a current member of the GO, Department or local authority planning department in the area covered by the draft revision. Nor should he/she in any other way have been connected with the preparation of the draft revision or have a vested interest in its outcome.
Annex D  Partnership Working and Community Involvement in the Regional Spatial Strategy Process

1. This annex is in two parts. The first part deals with partnership working with particular stakeholders and the second with more extensive community involvement.

**PARTNERSHIP WORKING**

2. Partnership working will take place on an ongoing basis, not just during the process of conducting a revision of the draft RSS. The partnership role is enshrined in the Planning Act for certain bodies. Firstly, it is the duty on the RPB to seek advice from and for it to be provided by the bodies listed in section 4(4) of the Act, i.e., county council, metropolitan district council, National Park Authority or a district council for an area for which there is no county council. Secondly, section 4(5) of the Act also enables the RPB to enter into appropriate arrangements agreed with these bodies and district councils to assist it in keeping under review, revising and monitoring the implementation of the RSS.

3. As owners of local development documents, local transport plans and National Park management plans, and through their responsibilities for the delivery of local services, these are the key bodies that can translate the vision of the RSS into reality. Through their monitoring and survey activities, they will also be the providers of data and information fundamental to the RSS monitoring and revision process. As chapter 2 makes clear however, it is important that the RPB also works in partnership with the owners of other key regional strategies, in particular Regional Development Agencies.

4. There are a wide range of other stakeholders who the RPB should work in partnership with. The stakeholders will include other statutory agencies and bodies (including the statutory environmental bodies), business and commercial organisations (including representative bodies such as the CBI and the Chambers of Commerce), transport providers and operators, utility companies and the house builders, local regeneration partnerships and voluntary and women’s organisations. Neighbouring RPBs should be consulted and bodies which cross regional boundaries will need to be involved. Education and health authorities and health trusts will also need to be consulted to ensure that the education and health implications of the draft strategy are properly examined. As chapter 2 makes clear, RPBs should consider establishing focus groups of these stakeholders as appropriate, reporting to a small central RSS steering group chaired by the RPB. This steering group should have at least 30% membership from non-local authority bodies, including the RDA and organisations responsible for planning and funding key infrastructure and services critical to RSS delivery.
Regional strategies need to complement and reinforce each other if they are to be successfully delivered. There are likely to be benefits in the RPB working with regional partners to consider how events and consultations relating to different regional strategies can be shared and packaged. Combining regional strategy participation exercises in this way will help the community make the links between the strategies and streamline their responses.

**Stakeholder Reference Groups in the West Midlands and Yorkshire and the Humber**

In addition to four Partnership Technical Groups set up to direct the analytical work needed to underpin the West Midlands RPG review in 2001 and 2002, five Partnership Reference Groups were set up. These groups provided the key mechanism enabling a wide range of regional partners to contribute directly to the policy development process. Chairs of these groups were drawn from outside the RPB. Stakeholder satisfaction with these arrangements was high.

In Yorkshire and the Humber a ‘Regional Planning and Infrastructure Commission’ drawing in a large cross-section of regional stakeholders has been established to guide the transformation of the existing regional plan into a new style RSS.

5. Regional strategies need to complement and reinforce each other if they are to be successfully delivered. There are likely to be benefits in the RPB working with regional partners to consider how events and consultations relating to different regional strategies can be shared and packaged. Combining regional strategy participation exercises in this way will help the community make the links between the strategies and streamline their responses.

**Joining up Strategies in Yorkshire and the Humber**

The Yorkshire and the Humber Assembly, in partnership with other stakeholders, has prepared ‘Advancing Together’. This sets the framework for preparing and monitoring consistent and complementary regional strategies, including a high level vision, objectives and indicators. Consistency between regional planning guidance, the regional economic strategy and the regional housing strategy has been improved by the use of joint sustainability appraisals in the context of the regional sustainability framework. The timing of the comprehensive revision of the regional spatial strategy and regional housing strategy review has been planned to fit with the next review of the regional economic strategy in 2005. A working group has been established, including representatives from the Assembly, Yorkshire Forward, the Regional Intelligence Network and the Government Office to continue to develop good practice in joining up the preparation, monitoring and implementation of regional strategies.
Sub-regional work

6. As chapter 2 makes clear, the RPB will want to consider how any sub-regional studies commissioned to support the revision of the regional spatial strategy can best be undertaken. This may involve either the RPB taking the lead in a partnership with local authorities or one of those authorities themselves taking the lead role under an arrangement with the RPB. This is subject to the requirement in the Act that in the case of sub-regional policies, the section 4 (4) authority or authorities should be the first to make detailed proposals, unless it is agreed that the RPB itself or a district council should do so instead (see chapter 2).

Developing the draft Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy

This exercise was led by three RPBs (East of England, East Midlands and the South East) and supported by the three RDAs. The task of pulling the draft together was led by officers of Northamptonshire County Council, working under an informal agreement with the East Midlands Regional Assembly and funded by resources from the Planning Delivery Grant. Other strategic authorities in the East of England and the South East also contributed to statements covering their regions.

Advice on general conformity issues

7. Expressing an opinion on the general conformity of local development plan documents with the RSS represents a substantial statutory duty for the RPB. RPBs should consider whether checking for general conformity may best be undertaken by authorities with strategic planning expertise.

Service Level Agreements in the North East

The North East Regional Assembly has entered into service level agreements with Durham and Northumberland county councils to undertake general conformity checking of local development documents produced by local planning authorities within their areas. The reports written by the officers of the county councils form the basis for final opinions on conformity issued by the regional planning body.
Providing technical advice

8. RPBs should consider how best to engage the expertise of local authorities and other regional partners in the technical work underpinning revisions of the RSS and any groups steering that work. Before undertaking research the RPB should consider the scope for undertaking this on a joint basis with other regional partners and other work that may be in progress elsewhere. The Government Office should be able to advise on this.

Developing a new housing methodology

In Summer 2003, the Regional Assembly for Yorkshire and the Humber set up a project group to look at housing issues in the preparation of the RSS. The Government Office worked closely with partners and, on behalf of the group, took the lead in drawing up a brief for consultants to develop a new and innovative methodology for determining the scale and distribution of housing. The Government Office also helped facilitate discussion with ODPM, RPBs and regional housing boards in other regions about this work.

Regional Technical Advisory Bodies (RTABs)

The North East RTAB has played a key role in the formulation of waste policies for inclusion within the draft RSS for the North East. The advice they provided was developed in an inclusive manner, after consultations with local authorities, local businesses, interest groups and members of the public.

Implementation, monitoring and review

9. Implementation of the policies in the RSS will in large part be dependent on these being translated into local development documents and on how local authorities exercise their service responsibilities. Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs) will draw heavily on information provided by local authorities. The close involvement of these authorities in AMR preparation is essential. In the North East for example, the two counties and ten unitary authorities in the region are jointly responsible for preparing the annual monitoring report under a service level agreement with the RPB.
Working with the Government Offices

10. Chapter 2 makes clear that the RPB should agree the project plan with the Government Office. It is good practice for the RPB to work closely with the Government Office in preparing the draft revision, although care needs to be taken to ensure that ownership of the emerging RSS rests clearly with the RPB throughout. The Government Office can advise on issues to be addressed in the revision and the application of national policy.

11. Once the draft revision has been published and before publication of the Secretary of State’s proposed changes, it is undesirable for discussions to be held between the RPB and the Government Office on the draft except for the purposes of agreeing joint briefing and to check matters of fact.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

12. PPS 1 sets out the principles that the Government believes should underpin community involvement in the planning process. The document ‘Community Involvement in Planning: The Government’s Objectives’\(^\text{14}\) expands on these. This section of the annex sets out how these policy principles should and could be applied in preparing RSS revisions.

13. As well as highlighting elements of community involvement required by legislation, this annex provides a core of recommended measures to facilitate community involvement that RPBs are expected to follow. This is subject to RPBs using their good sense on how much of this is applicable where only minor revisions of RSSs are being undertaken. This section of the annex also highlights issues to consider and examples of good practice. But this is only a starting point and RPBs are encouraged to look beyond this annex and develop innovative techniques for community involvement.

---

\(^{14}\) ODPM (February 2004).
The Government’s key principles for community involvement outlined in PPS1 are:

– Community involvement that is appropriate to the level of planning. Arrangements need to be built on a clear understanding of the needs of the community and to be fit for purpose;

– Front loading- there should be opportunities for early community involvement in the revision process;

– Using methods which are relevant to the experience of communities;

– Clearly articulated opportunities for continuing involvement. Community involvement is not a one-off event;

– Transparency and accessibility; and

– Planning for involvement. Community involvement should be planned into the process for revising the RSS from the start.

14. Community in this instance means all those who have an interest in and a contribution to make to the content of the revised RSS. This includes individuals as well as local authorities and bodies representing various interest groups. Involvement means more than the provision of information and the invitation to respond to consultation documents, although both of these have a role to play. It should mean the opportunity to participate in shaping the RSS revision, especially before it is submitted to the Secretary of State. The benefits of this include giving the community an element of ownership thereby increasing the chances of successful implementation.

Identifying who to involve and how to involve them

15. The RPB should establish from the very beginning whom it might need to let know that a RSS revision is about to take place. It should think about the best way of approaching these people so that they can make an informed decision about if or how they want to be involved. Local authorities may have established networks that work well in communicating issues to a broad cross-section of people. Local Strategic Partnerships, particularly through their work in drawing up Community Strategies, are likely to have established mechanisms for connecting with hard-to-reach groups. The RPB may want to discuss with these bodies how their existing networks can best be utilised for the RSS revision process and to ensure that they have a comprehensive database of contacts.

Drawing up a statement of public participation

16. The RPB has a statutory duty to prepare and publish a statement of public participation setting out how it is going to involve all those with an interest throughout the RSS revision process. The RPB should, in consultation with the Government Office and with reference to other bodies with recent experience of major exercises in community involvement, draw up a statement of public participation.
17. The statement of public participation should explain how and when the RPB intends to involve the public and should also identify who the RPB’s main partners will be and how it intends to work with them in undertaking the RSS revision. The statement should be treated as an integral part of the project plan and be project-managed in the same way as the rest of the RSS revision process. This will include revising the statement where circumstances have changed and the original proposals are no longer appropriate. The RPB may wish to set out in the statement the anticipated resource cost in terms of staff time and money of implementing the programme of community involvement and partnership working set out in the statement and identify responsibilities for managing the process. The RPB may also wish to consider whether there is any scope for it or other stakeholders to provide financial support to community and voluntary groups to assist their ability to participate in the process.

**Communicating the issues**

18. Once the RPB has identified a preliminary list of issues to be covered by the draft revision and drafted a project plan, including the statement of public participation, then the community should be provided with an opportunity to comment.

19. The RPB should consider the best way to involve a broad cross-section of the community. This could take the form of a single one-day public conference but a series of sub-regional events may be better. These events will mean that people are less likely to be put off by the prospect of travelling significant distances or a larger, more impersonal gathering. Whatever the format chosen, the RPB should set out the issues identified for the revision, how the revision will be carried forward and how the community will be involved. Potential sustainability issues should also be identified. It will be important to engage the community in the sustainability appraisal that is integral to the plan preparation process.

20. These events should provide an opportunity to give feedback on views already expressed and allow participants to express their views. These should be taken account of in revising the project plan, including the statement of public participation, which should then be published.

21. The RPB should send invitations to the regional conference or sub-regional events to all those organisations and individuals that it believes may have an interest in the RSS revision. This will be a significant exercise. The Regional Assembly for Yorkshire & Humber for example consulted some 2,500 organisations and individuals on the issues to be addressed in the revision of RPG12.

22. This first communication exercise is likely to be more effective if the RPB builds on the previous lessons learnt by local authorities, local strategic partnerships and others about who to communicate with and how to communicate with them. In particular the RPB should consider how specifically to inform and involve groups within the community who
have not in the past participated in the process of revising the regional plan, but who may have an interest in its content. Failure to do so runs the risk of increasing existing inequalities between those best equipped to make their voice heard and those traditionally excluded from the process.

23. The RPB should consider, for example, whether key documents should be made available in hard copy and on the website in languages other than English. They should consider the particular needs of hard-to-reach groups, minority ethnic groups and people with disabilities. The needs of these groups should be considered both in relation to the material that is produced and in terms of the accessibility of venues for events. A short guide on the RSS process has been drafted by ODPM so that RPBs can adapt this to meet the specific requirements of their region in the light of the objectives above.

24. It may be unrealistic for the RPB to approach a large number of small community groups, voluntary sector organisations or businesses, or for these bodies to make an informed choice about whether to become involved or not. Where regional umbrella groups exist, the best approach may be for the RPB to use them as a hub to disseminate information to individual organisations and for them to encourage involvement or become involved on the individual organisations’ behalf. This should not be used however as an excuse not to contact individuals and specific organisations where the RPB has identified a particular interest and the RPB should have regard to how representative an umbrella group may actually be.

25. The communication package inviting people and organisations to the public conference or smaller sub-regional events should include as a minimum the preliminary list of issues to be considered and a summary of the draft project plan including the draft statement of public participation. The documents that they receive either by post or electronically should enable the community to:
   – get a clear sense of what a RSS is;
   – understand how the RSS revision might relate to them;
   – understand what the process of revising a RSS looks like;
   – see where throughout this process there will be opportunities for involvement;
   – provide a telephone contact point for finding out more; and
   – request that they do not receive further information or suggest others who may be interested.

26. RPBs are encouraged to provide recipients of the communication package with a list of questions to respond to rather than simply inviting comments on the draft documents. This also provides an opportunity to find out what else is happening in the region that may be of use as the RSS revision progresses. The RPB in Yorkshire and the Humber, for example, specifically asked recipients of the issues paper whether their organisation was

---

15 See for example, Cortese and Nardini – ‘Getting it Right – Including Disabled People in Communication and Consultation’ (LARIA 2002).
already working on a project or study that might be of importance to RSS. A summary of responses should be made available at the public conference or sub-regional events and the issues for the revision reconsidered in the light of these and what is said at these meetings.

### Making use of opinion polls

The South East regional planning body commissioned MORI to undertake research into the views of a representative sample of people across the South East of England as the process of undertaking a comprehensive review of regional planning guidance got underway. 1,800 people were asked by telephone around 30 questions on issues such as housing, employment and transport to ascertain what the most pressing issues were seen to be locally and favoured solutions for the region as a whole.

Further opinion polling will be undertaken to test people's views on potential scenarios and options and following publication of a pre-consultation draft.

### Community involvement in developing options and policies

27. It is important that the RPB continues to involve the community as issues and options papers are produced, sustainability appraisal work undertaken and policies established in the light of this technical work and community responses. The community must be involved at these early stages if their involvement is to be effective.

28. As soon as decisions have been taken on which is the favoured option, then the RPB will be able to prepare draft policies. The RPB should promote involvement in these policies as they emerge, taking account of interrelationships between different policy topics, where it is feasible and sensible to do so. It would be a mistake to wait to consult on a completed full draft by which time it will more difficult to undo the decisions which have been taken in arriving at such a complex and interrelated document as a RSS revision.

29. RPBs are required under the Regulations to consult the following bodies before submitting the draft RSS to the Secretary of State:

- a local planning authority, any part of whose area is in or adjoins the RPB’s region;
- a county council any part of whose area is in or adjoins the RPB’s region;
- a parish council any part of whose area is in or adjoins the RPB’s region;
- the RPB for each adjoining region;
- the Countryside Agency;
- English Heritage;
- English Nature;
– the Environment Agency;
– the Strategic Rail Authority;
– a regional development agency any part of whose area is in or adjoins the RPB’s region;
– the relevant electricity, gas, telecoms, sewerage and water undertakers; and
– any strategic health authority exercising functions in any part of the region.

Where the RPB is any doubt, and unless the body indicates that it does not wish to be consulted, the RPB should consult the body.

30. RPBs are also required under the Regulations to consult the following bodies before submitting the draft RSS revision to the extent they consider it appropriate to do so:
– voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the region;
– bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the region;
– bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the region;
– bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the region; and
– bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the region.

31. The use of umbrella groups as outlined above is critical to reaching as wide a cross-section of the community as possible. Greater use of networks could help reach harder-to-reach groups, including those of different racial or ethnic origin. Information on the draft revision and what it might mean for those groups and the options available could be sent to central points, such as the Black Environment Network or Urban Forum. These could then disseminate information to members and other relevant organisations. The following list outlines some further examples of ways in which harder-to-reach groups might be engaged:
– use of ‘community enablers’ to liaise with e.g., isolated rural communities, to listen to concerns, explain legislation etc.;
– offering strategies, plans and associated documents in a variety of languages and formats (e.g., large print, CD, tape);
– undertaking surveys asking broad questions to get a useful starting point for gauging the general public’s views;
– dissemination of information by appropriate ethnic minority press and radio stations;
– posting of pamphlets/leaflets written in simple, non-technical language may be helpful to engage those not affiliated with any particular interest group; and
– holding ‘Planning Surgeries’ or presentations/roadshows/workshops in local communities.
32. As an additional safeguard in ensuring that the draft revision is not discriminatory, RPBs may find it helpful to consult the Commission for Racial Equality, the Disability Rights Commission and the Equal Opportunities Commission. Other national bodies or regional bodies representing specific interests, for example, the Women’s National Commission, Age Concern and faith based groups, should also be considered. These are all listed in Table 1 below.

33. The lists above are not meant to be comprehensive; a fuller listing of potential participants is provided in Table 1 at the end of this section. Nor do they suggest what form that consultation and the more proactive participation of those bodies where appropriate should take. Research shows some correlation between the use of more innovative consultation and participation methods and stakeholder satisfaction with the RPG process. Features of a successful process of communication and involvement are set out below.

   (i) Making effective use of websites

34. The Regional Assembly’s website should be regularly updated. In the East Midlands for example, as the draft RPG developed following consultation seminars and meetings with other stakeholders, each iteration was published on the RPB’s website. For the transformation of RPG9 into a RSS in the South East, the RPB will create a specific youth website and are using MORI to set up and manage an ‘extranet’. The extranet will enable stakeholders to monitor survey results and provide comments to generate further debate. The Government Office’s website should as a minimum provide an overview of the RSS revision process in their region and a link to the relevant part of the Assembly’s website. Where users of other organisations’ websites are likely to have an interest in the RSS, the RPB may wish to consider setting up links between its website and these other organisations’ websites.

   (ii) Creating Formal Groups that include the wider community

35. Ensuring that representatives of the wider community are included within formal groups guiding the RSS revision is an important part of ensuring that the community is at the heart of the process, not simply on the outside looking in. The requirement that at least 30% of the membership of the regional planning body is drawn from outside local authorities is in itself an important safeguard of this, but the RPB may find it useful to establish additional structures.

   (iii) Engaging people in a way that works for them

36. Where possible, events should be held on a sub-regional basis so that people are not discouraged from attending by the prospect of having to travel significant distances. Counties and other local authorities may be well placed to organise and run these alongside the RPB. Any sub-regional work already undertaken is likely to provide a solid foundation of involvement and networks that should be built upon.

---

37. There is a body of good practice from around the regions. In the East Midlands for example, seven consultation seminars were held, each attended by sixty to seventy representatives of interested groups to discuss draft recommendations emerging from technical work on subjects such as employment land, freight and retail. Different formats should be considered if more traditional ones are not attracting those traditionally excluded from the planning process. For example, bringing a relevant planning issue to citizens’ juries for young people, people with disabilities or minority ethnic groups. Essex County Council for example, used MORI to undertake personal interviews based around a guided questionnaire. This was used to get feedback from harder to reach groups on its structure plan options. The Leicestershire Local Strategic Partnership for Community Strategy consultation targeted six ‘hard-to-reach’ groups- ethnic minorities; young adults; people with disabilities; people on low incomes in social housing in isolated rural areas; young adults with families; and small businesses. Discussion groups were held and facilitated by independent consultants.

38. The potential importance and impact of RSSs is likely to be less obvious to many members of the community than the impact of local development documents. RPBs should explain from the beginning how decisions reached in the RSS revision affect particular groups and individuals and structure events to make them relevant to those who come. For the South East comprehensive revision for example, focus groups will examine in depth specific issues that polling indicates are of particular importance and workshops will be held for particular sectional interests.

(iv) Mediating Differences

39. Engagement with a wide cross-section of the community at this stage in the process is likely to identify any tensions that are emerging in relation to the development of options or policies. The RPB may wish to consider how a process of ‘mediation’ can be established alongside or as part of ongoing workshops or seminars. Research suggests17 that opportunities for airing and seeking to resolve differences should be built in to the plan making process at as early a stage as possible, with the goal of reducing conflict later on. The RPB may wish to consider the need to employ a third party as mediator where policy decisions are particularly controversial, but there is no set format. The key will be to ensure that all parties are given the opportunity to debate their differences and feel that their point of view has been properly taken into account.

(v) Providing Feedback

40. Consultation and involvement cannot simply happen and then be ignored. The community will disengage unless it is clear that what they say makes a difference. It is good practice for the RPB to publish on its website and make available a summary of responses and comments at the key stages in the process of developing a draft RSS revision and show how

they have been acted on or the reasons why they have been rejected. There should be a clear audit trail to demonstrate why for example one particular option out of a number of different options has been put forward in the RSS. The views of the community will be an important factor in this. A regular newsletter may be a good means of setting out progress and why particular decisions have been taken at a summary level.

**Submitting the draft RSS revision to the Secretary of State**

41. The necessity of providing feedback is enshrined in Regulations. When the RPB sends the draft RSS to the Secretary of State it is also required to send to the Secretary of State a ‘pre-submission consultation statement’. This latter document must set out which of those bodies in paragraphs 29 and 30 above the RPB has consulted, how they and any other bodies consulted were consulted, a summary of the main issues raised in these consultations and how these main issues have been addressed in the draft revision. It must also set out how the public participation statement has been followed in practice.

**Community participation and the submitted draft RSS revision**

42. The submission of the draft RSS revision to the Secretary of State triggers the formal consultation process. Minimum requirements at this stage are covered in the Regulations. All those bodies the RPB has previously consulted under its statutory obligations and all other bodies and people who in the opinion of the RPB may wish to make representations, must be sent the information necessary to enable them to make informed representations. Chapter 2 sets out what information the RPB must provide. The period allowed for representations must be not less than twelve weeks from the date of publication of the draft RSS revision, except where the Secretary of State is of the opinion that the revision constitutes a minor amendment, when the period for representations must be not less than six weeks. The extent to which the RPB should look to engage the community beyond these requirements to invite representations on the draft will depend on the success with which the community has been involved and kept informed up to this point as recommended above.

43. The RPB should consider how best to publicise the draft RSS and explain clearly the next stages in the process, beyond the formal statutory requirements placed on it referred to above and in chapter 2. Press releases to the regional media, specialist press and where appropriate, national media, may result in good coverage for aspects of the draft revision as a news item. Essex County Council for example managed to generate significant publicity for their Structure Plan review with a media launch that featured a four-generation Essex family. Where this sort of free publicity is not successfully obtained, paid advertisements in newspapers may be appropriate, particularly where a limited number of publications cover the whole region. These should not be confined to the formal notices section. Leaflets,
providing an outline of the draft plan, the revision process and where to find out more information, could be distributed. Leaflets about the draft London Plan, for example, were distributed from stalls in shopping centres and mainline railway stations. Inserts into the publications of local authorities and other bodies may generate additional publicity. A further option is to encourage the establishment of links to the RPB website on other websites used by the wider regional community.

44. The following list outlines examples of different ways a draft RSS revision could be publicised by the RPB:

- use of media such as local radio and television stations;
- issuing press releases;
- using the Internet, such as the use of a dedicated website; use of the Regional Assembly’s/RPB’s site; use of all LPA or county websites for the Region; or links within such sites to the Assembly’s page etc.;
- advertising in free and paid-for local, regional and national newspapers;
- advertising in local government publications and National Associations of local councils;
- leaflets – either posted, at pick up points (e.g., in libraries), within Council Tax bills, within local council publications, or within other publications;
- holding ‘Planning Surgeries’ or presentations/roadshows/workshops in local communities;
- operating telephone hotlines for answering enquiries;
- radio interviews to reach a wider audience;
- email sign-ups for regular automatic updates;
- use of existing networks in the region to disseminate information, e.g., Local Strategic Partnerships;
- nominating a champion, possibly a well-known figure;
- deposit/advertising in local libraries;
- publication in the London Gazette;
- media launches, such as that used by Essex County Council example given above, to gain significant press coverage without paid advertising;
- mailing out consultation packs to a database of stakeholders;
- topic-based newsletters emailed regularly to key partners and the media, to help maintain a public profile;
- staffed information points in libraries, shopping centres; and
- develop a ‘brand’ identity for the RSS to make it more accessible.
45. Publicising a single telephone point of contact for all RSS queries may be a good way of helping those who are interested but confused about where to begin and where to find relevant documents. Providing information about the RSS process to local information points run by local authorities throughout the region should help to ensure that people who use these facilities are pointed in the right direction.

46. The Regulations require the draft RSS revision, sustainability appraisal report, statement on who the RPB has consulted and supporting technical documents to be made available for public inspection at the principal offices of the RPB, county councils and local planning authorities and such other places as the RPB considers appropriate, during normal office hours. Copies of these documents must be made available on request and on payment of a reasonable charge.

47. The RPB may wish to consider whether there are opportunities for making documents available outside normal office hours, particularly where they are not readily available electronically. Similarly, it may be desirable to provide libraries of documents at additional locations, if principal office sites are inaccessible to some members of the community.

48. A key to securing involvement will be to make the draft RSS revision as user-friendly as possible. The length and complexity of draft RPGs have been a source of concern to some members of the community.18

Community involvement at the Examination-in-Public (see also Annex C)

49. The examination-in-public (EiP) provides invited members of the community with an opportunity to make their case to an independent panel. Given that the numbers of participants in the EiP are inevitably limited, groups with similar interests and concerns should consider indicating a preferred representative to make their shared case. Details of the EiP process are set out in annex C. In order to facilitate effective participation by all those invited to attend, the following good practice will be followed in relation to community involvement:

- participants will be sent information (‘notes for participants’) by the Panel Assistant providing details of timetables, the examination process, details of the venue and arrangements on expenses;
- where possible a member of the Panel will chair pre-examination meetings in order to agree data, help focus discussion at the EiP and assist the finalisation of the list of matters and participants;
- the EiP will be held in a venue or venues that participants can easily access by public transport from across the region, and wherever possible have good disabled access and a ‘loop’ system in place for the hard of hearing. Where the draft RSS revision has a significant sub-regional dimension then it may be sensible to hold EiP sessions in different venues across the region. A library of relevant documents will be provided; and

---

18 TCPA: Stakeholder Involvement in the Regional Planning Guidance Process (October 2003).
the EiP will be as unintimidating as possible. The EiP will be conducted in an informal and relaxed manner as opposed to a more formal public inquiry style. Both the way the inquiry is chaired and the venues selected may make an important difference to the extent to which those less accustomed to public debate feel able to contribute.

Community involvement after the Examination-in-Public

50. Publication of the Secretary of State’s proposed changes and reasoned statement, following the Panel’s report, provides a further window for involvement. The Regulations provide for a consultation period of at least eight weeks from the date of publication and all those who have previously been consulted on the draft RSS revision or made representations must be invited to comment. In usual circumstances this will necessarily be restricted to written representations on the proposed changes, though the Secretary of State may indicate policies where advice from the RPB or stakeholders would be particularly welcome. Favoured access to the Secretary of State or officials by some groups or individuals would run the risk of legal challenge.

51. However, there are two types of occasions after the publication of the Panel Report where the Secretary of State may need to meet the RPB or other shareholders. Where more evidence is required on matters left unresolved in the Panel report or further information is needed on whether the Secretary of State’s proposed changes could be effectively applied, further meetings with selected stakeholders may be appropriate. Care will be taken to ensure that publicly available minutes of such meetings or notes of the outcomes of other contacts will be kept. If new issues of significance arise at this late stage, the Secretary of State would normally be expected to re-open the EiP.

Community participation in monitoring and review

52. The publication of the final RSS should not be seen by the RPB as the end-point of community involvement. Maintaining dialogue with the community through the stages of implementation and review may make it easier to re-engage people in subsequent revisions and help foster a common sense of ownership of the document. A number of organisations will have a share of responsibility for the delivery of targets. For others, progress against indicators and targets will be a matter of interest and concern, but beyond their power to influence.

53. In addition to full annual monitoring reports, RPBs should produce summary documents setting out progress against key indicators in a readily digestible format. These should be made available on the RPB website. The RPB should consider holding an annual public meeting to set out progress and take the views of the community on the appropriateness and presentation of existing indicators and targets. Feedback from this can then inform the next RSS revision.
## A Summary of Community Involvement in the RSS Revision Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>How they might be involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Individuals                                                          | - keep informed of what is happening  
- provide opportunities for responding to consultation  
- provide opportunities to attend events, seminars etc. |
| Networks, Forums and Umbrella Groups from the not-for-profit sector | - keep informed of what is happening  
- provide opportunities for responding to consultation  
- provide opportunities to attend events, seminars etc.  
- use as a means for distributing information to members and expressing views on their behalf |
| Private Sector                                                       | - keep informed of what is happening  
- provide opportunities for responding to consultation  
- provide opportunities to attend events, seminars etc.  
- engage in technical work that will impact on decisions on economic and employment issues |
| Local Strategic Partnerships                                         | - keep informed of what is happening  
- provide opportunities for responding to consultation  
- provide opportunities to attend events, seminars etc.  
- work together on lessons learned from production of community strategy and accessing hard to reach groups |
| Local Planning Authorities and County Councils                       | - keep informed of what is happening  
- provide opportunities for responding to consultation  
- provide opportunities to attend and hold joint events, seminars etc.  
- partnership working on technical work underpinning the RSS, sub-regional work, monitoring and implementation |
| Regional Bodies                                                      | - keep informed of what is happening  
- provide opportunities for responding to consultation  
- provide opportunities to attend and hold joint events, seminars etc.  
- partnership working on complementary strategies and revision timetables and joint research |
| Government Office                                                    | - joint working to agree a project plan for the RSS revision and its ongoing implementation, review and monitoring  
- continuing involvement to keep the Government Office informed and draw on the Government Office's knowledge of national policy and procedure |
Potential participants in the RSS revision process:

54. Although much more extensive than the list provided in the Regulations, the following list is intended as guidance on the range of bodies that are likely to need to be involved. It cannot be comprehensive since there are different bodies in each region. An asterisk indicates that the RPB is required under the Regulations to consult, both prior to the submission of the draft RSS revision and on its submission. Note that Government Departments are not listed since their views will be co-ordinated by the GOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Organisation:</th>
<th>Areas for Consultation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devolved Administrations:</td>
<td>Policies in regions bordering on Wales that may have an impact on Wales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assembly for Wales</td>
<td>Policies in regions bordering on Scotland that may have an impact on Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Executive</td>
<td>Proposals likely to have an impact on Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Regional Government</td>
<td>Where these cover an area that is in or adjoins the area of the revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AONB Management Bodies</td>
<td>Matters that may have an impact on fire safety issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Councils*</td>
<td>For all adjoining regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Authorities</td>
<td>Proposals with a potential health impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning Authorities*</td>
<td>Where these cover an area that is in or adjoins the area of the revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes National Park authorities and the Broads Authority)</td>
<td>Partnerships covering an area that is in or adjoins the area of the revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>Where these cover an area that is in or adjoins the area of the revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or Parish Councils*</td>
<td>Matters that may have an impact on crime and community and public safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Authorities</td>
<td>Covering areas adjoining the area of the revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Bodies*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Executive Agencies and Non-Departmental Public Bodies and Public Corporations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Body</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AONB Conservation Boards</td>
<td>Proposals likely to have an impact on Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Geological Survey</td>
<td>Policies that may be influenced by geoscientific information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Waterways, canal owners and navigation authorities</td>
<td>On all issues relating to inland waterways and land adjacent to inland waterways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Link (local offices)</td>
<td>Proposals likely to affect business start-ups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Authority</td>
<td>Matters affecting coalfield areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Aviation Authority</td>
<td>Policies for areas in the vicinity of airports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment</td>
<td>Architecture and design issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for Racial Equality</td>
<td>Proposals likely to have significance for black and minority ethnic communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Agency*</td>
<td>Proposals likely to have an impact on rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Estate</td>
<td>Proposals which affect any of the Crown Estates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Rights Commission</td>
<td>All proposals that may have implications for those with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty Homes Agency</td>
<td>Proposals likely to affect housing demand and supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage* (the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England)</td>
<td>Proposals likely to affect historic buildings or the historic environment including archaeology, historic buildings areas and landscapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Nature*</td>
<td>Proposals likely to affect the conservation of wildlife or geology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Partnerships (EP)</td>
<td>Areas where EP has major assets or undeveloped land holdings, including those acquired from Urban Development Corporations or a potential role in site assembly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency*</td>
<td>All proposals with environmental consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities Commission</td>
<td>All proposals likely to have equal opportunities implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>Wherever forestry is a feature of a strategic planning area, either as an industry, an environmental feature, or as a recreation resource. In appropriate areas, RPBs should also consult Community Forest teams and the National Forest Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Executive</td>
<td>Health and safety implications of proposed policies, specifically with regard to any implications of proposed policies for major accident prevention, etc. within the meaning of Directive 96/82/EC and the Control of Major Accidents Hazards Regulations 1999.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM Prison Service</td>
<td>Policies that may impact on penal establishments or prisoners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>Co-ordination of land use and transport planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Corporation</td>
<td>Matters relating to the measurement of, need for, or supply of, affordable social low cost housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Skills Councils</td>
<td>Economic development, business and employment issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Government Commerce</td>
<td>Policies that may impact on the civil estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Transport Executives</td>
<td>Matters relating to transport in regions that have a Metropolitan area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Inspectorate</td>
<td>Will have a professional interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Cultural Consortiums</td>
<td>Matters relating to cultural development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Agencies* (RDAs)</td>
<td>Matters relating to economic and general development issues. RDAs covering or adjoining the region of the RSS review are statutory consultees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Housing Boards</td>
<td>Matters relating to housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England and Regional Sports Boards</td>
<td>Matters relating to sport and physical recreation generally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Rail Authority*</td>
<td>Matters that may impact on the development of the rail network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tourist Boards (covering the area of the revision)  
Proposals that may have an impact on visitor levels.

Women’s National Commission  
All proposals likely to have particular significance for women.

Private Sector Organisations

BAA plc and other airport operators  
Policies and proposals in relation to aviation matters, those in the vicinity of airports, or which would affect airport infrastructure or operations.

British Ports Authority  
Policies likely to affect the development or use of ports.

Chambers of Commerce, CBI (regional offices) and Institute of Directors  
Economic development, business, and employment land issues.

Construction companies  
Proposals likely to impact on domestic and commercial building.

Electricity companies*  
Proposals likely to have significant implications for electricity supply.

Federation of Small Businesses  
Proposals likely to impact on economic development, business, and employment land issues.

Freight Transport Association  
Proposals likely to impact on freight transport.

Gas companies*  
Proposals likely to have significant implications for gas supply.

House Builders Federation  
Issues relating to the provision of new housing.

Mineral and aggregates extraction companies and associations  
Issues relating to the extraction of minerals and aggregates.

Network Rail  
Issues relating to rail transport or that may impact on rail transport use.

Rail Freight Group  
Proposals that may impact on how freight is transported or the volume transported.

Rail Passengers Council and Committees  
Proposals that may impact on rail passenger transport.

Renewable Energy Sector/Bodies  
Issues relating to renewable energy development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Organisations</td>
<td>Proposals that may impact on the retail sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
<td>Proposals that may impact on how freight is transported or the volume transported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecoms providers*</td>
<td>Matters concerning telephony services and provision of such services to new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train, bus and other public transport operators</td>
<td>Issues relating to transport or that may impact on public transport use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management companies</td>
<td>Issues relating to waste collection, management and disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sewerage companies*</td>
<td>All matters concerning water and sewerage services and the provision of such services to new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary and Not for Profit Organisations</td>
<td>Allocations likely to have particular significance for the elderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Concern</td>
<td>Policies concerned with regeneration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Urban Regeneration Association</td>
<td>Proposals likely to have particular significance for young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Youth Council</td>
<td>Proposals likely to impact on sports and recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Council for Physical Recreation</td>
<td>Proposals which may affect any of the Church Commissioners’ estates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Commissioners</td>
<td>Proposals which may affect links to local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Trust Societies</td>
<td>Proposals that may impact on specific communities and communities of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community groups (Where umbrella bodies represent a number of community groups, these should usually be the first point of contact)</td>
<td>Proposals that may impact on archaeological sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for British Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Countryside groups and charities
(e.g., Campaign to Protect Rural England, Countryside Alliance, Country Landowners Association, National Farmers Union) Proposals likely to affect the countryside.

County Surveyors Society Will have a professional interest in matters affecting counties.

Disability groups and charities Proposals where there may be access implications, for example in the provision of new housing.

Environmental groups and charities (e.g., Friends of the Earth, National Trust, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Wildlife Trusts, Woodland Trust) Proposals that are likely to impact on these groups’ areas of environmental concern.

Faith groups (these should usually be approached through bodies representing individual groups in the region) Proposals that may impact particularly on a faith group or groups.

Gender Groups Proposals that may impact on a gender group or groups.

Green Belt Associations Proposals that may impact on Green Belts.

Groundwork Proposals concerned with regeneration, sustainable communities and the environment.

Heritage Groups (e.g., Heritage Lottery Fund and Institute of Historic Building Conservation) Proposals likely to affect derelict listed buildings and other historic buildings.

Higher and Further Education Bodies Proposals concerned with education provision and those likely to affect current higher education providers.

Land Owners and Representative bodies Proposals affecting major land holdings.

Minority ethnic and other groups representing particular racial or national identities (e.g., Gypsy and Traveller Organisations) Proposals that may impact particularly on an ethnic, racial or national group or groups.
National Playing Fields Association
Issues relating to open space and recreation.

Public Rights of Way User Groups
(e.g., British Mountaineering Council, Ramblers Association, British Horse Society, Cyclists Touring Club, etc.)
Where proposals may impact on these groups’ access to the countryside.

Planning Officers Society
Will have a general professional interest.

Regeneration partnerships
(e.g. New Deal for Communities)
Proposals that may affect the regeneration of areas covered by the partnership.

Registered Social Landlords
Proposals affecting housing.

Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
Will have a general professional interest.

Royal Town Planning Institute
Will have a general professional interest.

Town and Country Planning Association
Will have a general professional interest.

Trades Unions (regional branches of TUC, Unison etc.)
Where proposals may affect workers represented by the union.

Transport groups (representing the interests of public transport users, motorists, motorcyclists, cyclists, walkers etc.)
Proposals that may affect transport infrastructure or choice of modes; environmental impacts of transport.
Glossary

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
A site with a statutory national landscape designation to provide special protection for the area’s natural beauty. Designated by the Countryside Agency, the primary objective is to conserve the natural beauty of the landscape.

Community Initiative on Transnational Co-operation on Spatial Planning
Community Initiatives are special financing instruments for structural policy and were set up in 1989. They can be implemented throughout the European Union and are co-financed by the Structural Funds and by the member states with the aim of solving specific problems in the EU territory.

Development Plan Documents
The development plan documents which local planning authorities must prepare include the core strategy, site specific allocations of land and, where needed, area action plans. There will also be a proposals map which illustrates the spatial extent of policies that must be prepared and maintained to accompany all development plan documents. All development plan documents must be subject to rigorous procedures of community involvement, consultation and independent examination, and adopted after receipt of the inspector’s binding report.

EU Directive 2001/42/EC (see also Strategic Environmental Assessment)
Directive which aims to provide a high level of protection to the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes, with a view to promoting sustainable development. The Directive requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment to be carried out for a range of plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment.

EU Structural Funds (see also Structural Funds Programme)
The European Union provides Structural Funds for supporting social and economic restructuring across the Union. They account for over a third of the European Union budget. The UK’s allocation from the Structural Funds for the period 2000-2006 is over £10 billion. Structural funds are delivered through agreed operational spending programmes and strategies. These comprise the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the European Social Fund (ESF) and the European Agricultural Guarantee and Guidance Fund (EAGGF).

European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP)
Policy document based on the EU aim of achieving balanced and sustainable development, in particular by strengthening economic and social cohesion. It is legally non-binding and has a policy framework aimed at better co-operation between community sectoral policies with significant impacts, and between member states, their regions and cities. National spatial development policies of the member states and sectoral policies of the EU require clear spatial development guidelines which transcend national boundaries, which are provided by the ESDP.
Front-loading
Involving stakeholders, developers and landowners in the policy production process with an aim to develop consensus on significant issues early in the RSS process. The RPB in its Statement of Public Participation should set out how it intends to provide opportunities for participation in identifying issues and debating options from the earliest stages. Community involvement should happen at a point at which people recognise that they have the potential to make a difference and contribute to policy development.

Highways Agency
An Executive Agency of the Department for Transport (DfT), which is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network in England on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport.

Key Diagram
The key diagram illustrates the spatial strategy set out in the RSS and may show links and relationships with other strategies and neighbouring regions.

Local Development Documents
These include development plan documents (see above), which will form part of the statutory development plan, and supplementary planning documents which do not form part of the statutory development plan.

Local Development Frameworks
The local development framework is a non-statutory term used to describe a folder of documents which includes all the local planning authority’s local development documents (comprised of development plan documents, which will form part of the statutory development plan, and supplementary planning documents). The local development framework will also comprise the statement of community involvement, the local development scheme and the annual monitoring report.

Local Transport Plan
A five-year integrated transport strategy prepared by local authorities in partnership with the community. The plan sets out the resources envisaged for delivery of the targets identified in the strategy. Local transport plans should be consistent with the policies and priorities set out in the Regional Transport Strategy as an integral part of the RSS.

London Plan
The London Plan is the name given to the Mayor’s spatial development strategy.

Multi-modal studies
A detailed study of options to address a specific transport problem. A multi-modal study assesses a range of options across a number of modes of transport against the Government transport objectives of environment, safety, economy, integration and accessibility.
National Parks
Designated by the Countryside Agency, subject to confirmation by the Secretary of State, under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949. The statutory purpose of National Parks is to conserve and enhance their natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage, and to promote opportunities for public understanding and enjoyment of their special qualities.

Panel
This is a panel of persons appointed by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State to conduct the examination-in-public into a draft revision to the RSS.

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act
The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduces a statutory system for regional planning; a new system for local planning; reforms to the development control and compulsory purchase and compensation systems; and removes crown immunity from planning controls.

Planning Delivery Grant (PDG)
PDG is providing £605 million over six years (2003-2008), to resource and incentivise RPBs and local authorities to improve the planning system and deliver sustainable communities. Allocations are based on assessment of performance across a range of planning functions. In 2004/05 the RPBs received approximately £7 million in total from PDG in addition to their other funding from Government.

Planning Inspectorate
Responsible for the processing of planning and enforcement appeals, holding inquiries into local development plans, listed building consent appeals, advertisement appeals, and reporting on planning applications called in for decision by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, or, in Wales, by the National Assembly for Wales. Various compulsory purchase orders, rights of way cases and cases arising from the Environmental Protection and Water Acts and the Transport and Works Act and other highways legislation are also dealt with. The work is set out in an agreement with the Department for Transport, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and the National Assembly for Wales.

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG)
Issued by central Government setting out its national land use policies for England on different areas of planning. These are being replaced by Planning Policy Statements.

Planning Policy Statement (PPS)
Issued by central Government to replace the existing Planning Policy Guidance notes, in order to provide greater clarity and to remove from national policy advice on practical implementation, which is better expressed as guidance rather than policy.
Public Service Agreement
All government departments have agreed to a set of objectives and targets linked with the allocation of public expenditure. These are called Public Service Agreements (PSAs) and aim to deliver modern, responsive public services. The implication is that departmental budgets will be linked to how well each department performs in relation to its Public Service Agreement.

Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000
Legislation which seeks to prevent discrimination directly or indirectly in any functions carried out by public authorities.

Regional Assembly
Each of the English regions outside of London has a Regional Chamber (which the regions generally call 'Regional Assemblies'). They are responsible for developing and co-ordinating a strategic vision for improving the quality of life in a region. The Assembly is responsible for setting priorities and preparing certain regional strategies, including Regional Spatial Strategies.

Regional Development Agencies
The nine Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) set up in the English Regions are non-departmental public bodies. Their primary role is as a strategic driver of regional economic development in their region. The RDAs aim is to co-ordinate regional economic development and regeneration, enable the regions to improve their relative competitiveness, and reduce the imbalances that exist within and between regions.

Regional Economic Strategy
These statutory strategies take an integrated and sustainable approach to economic development and regeneration by tackling business competitiveness, productivity and the underlying problems of unemployment, skills shortages, social exclusion and physical decay. They provide:
– a regional framework for economic development, skills and regeneration to ensure better strategic focus for, and co-ordination of, activity in the region whether by the agency or by other regional, sub-regional or local organisations;
– a framework for the delivery of national and European programmes and influence the development of Government policy; and
– the basis for the RDAs’ detailed action plans.

Regional Housing Strategy
The Regional Housing Strategy prioritises the housing needs of the region (by locations and/or types of expenditure) to allow decisions to be taken on how housing resources should be allocated within the region. It takes an overall view on regional housing need, housing investment priorities and affordable housing targets. This provides a regional context for local authorities in drawing up their own housing investment strategies and to identify regional priorities for housing investment to be funded through registered social landlords.
Regional Housing Boards
Regional Housing Boards are established in each region to strengthen the linkages between housing, the planning framework, and economic development, and to co-ordinate arrangements for determining regional priorities for housing investment.

Regional Sustainable Development Framework (RSDF)
The Government envisages that regional sustainable development frameworks will be high level documents that set out a vision for sustainable development in each region, and the region’s contribution to sustainable development at the national level. In doing so, frameworks should take a wide overview of regional activity and the regional impact of Government policy.

Single Programming Documents (also see European Structural Funds)
Documents that set out what a region in the country wants the allocated European Structural Funds to achieve over the eligible period of 2000-2006. The aims of the document must tie in with the overall aims of the funds to promote the economic and social cohesion of the European Union. The eligible areas are those that have less than 75% of EU average GDP and areas facing structural difficulties under the four strands – industrial, rural, urban and fisheries.

Spatial Development
Changes in the distribution of activities in space and the linkages between them in terms of the use and development of land.

Spatial Planning
Spatial planning goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function. That will include policies which can impact on land use, for example by influencing the demands on, or needs for, development, but which are not capable of being delivered solely or mainly through the granting or refusal of planning permission and which may be implemented by other means.

Strategic Development Control Policies
These policies are implemented directly through the grant and refusal of planning permission and are part of the RSS.

Strategic Environmental Assessment
An environmental assessment which complies with the EU Directive 2001/42/EC. The environmental assessment involves the preparation of an environmental report, the carrying out of consultations, the taking into account of the environmental report and the results of the consultations in decision making, the provision of information when the plan or programme is adopted, and showing that the results of the environment assessment have been taken into account.
Strategic Rail Authority (SRA)
A non-departmental public body, established under the Transport Act 2000 and operating under instructions and guidance from the Secretary of State for Transport. The SRA provides an overall strategic direction and leadership for Britain’s railway, lets and manages passenger franchises, develops and sponsors major infrastructure projects, administers freight grants, sets and publishes strategies, and is responsible for some aspects of consumer protection. In the light of the structural changes to the rail industry set out in the White Paper ‘The Future of Rail’, CM 6233, July 2004, all references to the SRA should be taken to include any successor bodies as appropriate.

Structural Funds Programme (see also EU Structural Funds)
An EU wide system of providing EU countries (member states) and regions with targeted financial support. It is aimed to close economic and social gaps between member states and regions, to strengthen the EU as a whole.

Structure Plan
An old-style development plan which sets out strategic planning policies and forms the basis for detailed policies in local plans. These plans will continue to operate for a time after the commencement of the new development plan system, by virtue of specific transitional provisions.

Sustainable Communities Plan
A programme issued by the Government to set the framework for delivering sustainable communities over the next 15-20 years. The main areas of focus are sustainable communities, housing supply, new growth areas, decent homes, and countryside and local environment.

Sustainable Development
A widely used definition drawn up by the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987: “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. The Government has set out four aims for sustainable development in its strategy ‘A Better Quality of Life, a Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK’. The four aims, to be achieved at the same time, are:
– social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;
– effective protection of the environment;
– the prudent use of natural resources; and
– maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

Sustainability Appraisal
An appraisal of the economic, social and environmental effects of a plan from the outset of the preparation process, so that decisions can be made that accord with sustainable development. It is an integral part of producing a draft revision of a RSS and should be started as soon as a RSS revision is first considered.
Targeted Programme of Improvements (TPI)
The TPI is the Secretary of State’s current programme of major road improvement schemes aimed at combating some of the most pressing infrastructure problems. The TPI was originally announced in ‘A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England’, which reported on the Government’s strategic review of the roads programme against criteria of accessibility, safety, economy, environment and integration.

Ten Year Plan
This transport plan set out a long-term view on the level of investment needed to help achieve the Government’s vision for transport, to complement the statutory changes and to deliver the objective set out in the White Paper ‘A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone’ (DETR, July 1998). The plan took account of both the public and private sector investment likely to be needed to deliver the Government’s key policy objectives. The plan has in part been superseded by the transport White Paper, ‘The Future of Transport’ (DfT, July 2004).

Trunk Road
Trunk roads are roads, which are developed and maintained by the Highways Agency and are the national system of routes for through traffic. Virtually all motorways are trunk roads.

Unitary Development Plan (UDP)
An old-style development plan prepared by a Metropolitan District and some Unitary Local Authorities which contains policies equivalent to those in both a Structure Plan and Local Plan. These plans will continue to operate for a time after the commencement of the new development plan system, by virtue of specific transitional provisions.
List of Abbreviations/Acronyms

Acronyms and other abbreviations used in PPS11 are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Act</th>
<th>Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DETR</td>
<td>Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (responsible for planning between 1997 and 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>Department for Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of the Environment (responsible for planning before 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>Development Plan Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTLR</td>
<td>Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (responsible for planning in 2001 and 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EiP</td>
<td>Examination in Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Government Office for the region (exist in all the English regions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDD</td>
<td>Local Development Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF</td>
<td>Local Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPA</td>
<td>Local Planning Authority i.e., National Park Authorities, the Broads Authority, Unitary Authorities and District Councils. Also embraces County Councils where relevant to their role in producing Minerals and Waste LDDs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Local Transport Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (responsible for planning from 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDG</td>
<td>Planning Delivery Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Planning Policy Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Public Service Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>Regional Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHB</td>
<td>Regional Housing Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHS</td>
<td>Regional Housing Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPB</td>
<td>Regional Planning Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPG</td>
<td>Regional Planning Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDF</td>
<td>Regional Sustainable Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>Regional Spatial Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTS</td>
<td>Regional Transport Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Strategic Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(4) authority</td>
<td>Section 4(4) body under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act – County Councils, National Park Authorities and Unitary Authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>Strategic Rail Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPI</td>
<td>DfT’s Targeted Programme of Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP</td>
<td>Unitary Development Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning shapes the places where people live and work and the country we live in. It plays a key role in supporting the Government’s wider social, environmental and economic objectives and for sustainable communities.