



GOVERNMENT OFFICE
FOR THE SOUTH EAST

Matter 8Diii / East Kent and Ashford: Sub-region Outside of Ashford

Government Office for the South East of England (7447)

Draft RSS for The South East of England -The South East Plan
Examination in Public - November 2006 to March 2007
Written Statement on behalf of HM Government - December 2006

8Diii.1 Does the draft RSS adequately recognise the potential for housing growth in Dover District given its economic prospects and regeneration needs?

1. The Core Economic Strategy for the sub-region sets out clearly that the employment growth potential for Dover is good. The former coal fields are cited as areas for economic regeneration and these fall within the Dover District. EKA 4 Policy for the Coastal Towns includes the urban areas of Dover and the regeneration of Dover Town. The new business parks at White Cliffs will also support the employment growth within Dover.
2. Prospects at Dover Docks (Policy EKA5), and new employment land to be identified to support housing numbers at Dover (Policy EKA 7) are strands to be pulled together to form a strong economic support for increased housing numbers in Dover. In our representation to the Panel we expressed concern that in spite of there may have been some suppression of building houses in Dover. We would ask the Panel to investigate these numbers further to find if there is the possibility of increasing these housing numbers further.

8Diii.2 Do the level and distribution of housing provision proposed in East Kent outside Ashford take appropriate account of regeneration objectives, in the role of regional hubs and forecast local needs and environmental sensitivities(PolicyEKA1)?

1. Paragraph 2.1 to 2.3 set out the case for a sub-regional housing total of 48,000 to 2026. There is little evidence to explain the derivation of this figure. However, paragraph 2.4 goes on to state that, should all the local needs for all urban areas and the regeneration of Dover to be addressed at the same time, then the dwelling total would be higher than the 48,000.
2. The Sub-regional significance of Canterbury as a regional hub is not dealt with in the sub-regional strategy. It is merely regarded as constrained. This does not support the South East Plan's views in earlier chapters.
3. As already put forward we suggest that some further work be undertaken to address the concerns regarding the reduced level of housing allocations at Thanet.

8Diii.3 Is the level of 30% affordable housing justified and capable of being implemented?

1. This point has already been covered under Matter 4 but we would ask the Panel to question the evidence supporting this lower figure for the East Kent and Ashford sub-region.