

Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036 Examination

MATTER 16 – Gypsy and Traveller Allocations

Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee
Hearing Statement

October 2016



Matter 16 – Gypsy and Traveller Allocations (LP56)

Issue 16a – Gypsy and Travellers – Policy LP56

Q1. Is the identified need for 72 pitches justified?

The Central Lincolnshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2013 (**E004**) identifies an annual need of 3.6 new permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches from 2013 to 2033 (72 total over this period) to meet needs arising from overcrowding and from newly forming families on authorised sites. For a summary, see para 10.10 of **E004**.

The Assessment was a thorough and robust piece of work, including stakeholder consultation and face-to-face surveys with Gypsy and Travellers.

Q2. Have an appropriate selection of potential sites been assessed? Is it clear why some sites have been selected and/or rejected?

The Evidence Report **PS.EVR55** explains which potential sites were assessed, why and against what criteria, together with evidence as to why the potential sites were eventually selected or not for inclusion in the Local Plan.

The Appendix 3, page 385 of the IIA Appendices document (**E001C**), sets out an appraisal of options at a strategic level for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites, whilst Appendix 5 (P534) of the same document appraises the candidate sites.

The Committee believes that taken as a whole, the above evidence makes it clear why some sites have been selected and other rejected.

Q3. Does the plan make suitable provision to meet this need?

Yes, via a combination of site allocations (LP56), a contribution from SUEs (LP28) and from 'windfall' development considered via the criteria based part of LP56.

Q4. Are the allocations justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Are there any significant factors that indicate that any sites should not have been allocated?

Yes, the allocations justified, effective and consistent with national policy, as confirmed by **PS.EVR55** and **E001C**.

No, there are not any significant factors that indicate that any sites should not have been allocated (other than for the sites which are not allocated), as confirmed by **PS.EVR55** and **E001C**.

Q5. Is there any risk that site conditions and constraints might prevent development or adversely affect viability and delivery?

A Local Plan can never guarantee that an allocated site will be delivered

Equally, through the detailed investigation of a site at a planning application stage, an unforeseen issue (site condition or other constraint) might arise which means the allocated site cannot be delivered.

However, the Committee believes it has undertaken reasonable steps to investigate the allocated Gypsy and Traveller sites, in order to determine the likelihood of delivery.

So, yes, there is some risk of non-delivery (as there is with all allocated sites), but the Committee believes the risk to be low.

Q6. Are the site boundaries correctly defined?

Yes, they are clearly defined on the Policies Map (Insets 1, 10 and 21), including the CL reference number in each case.

The Committee is not aware they are incorrectly defined.

Q7. What factors were determinative in allocating sites?

See Q2 response.

Q8. Have the three allocated sites been assessed against a) – e) in Policy LP56 (and the site's proximity to services). If not, should this not be a determining factor in the suitability of a site allocation?

Yes, the matters raised in a-e are covered, to the degree appropriate for allocating a site in a Local Plan, by the detailed appraisals and considerations as set out in **PS.EVR55** and **E001C**.

As made clear in policy LP56, the criteria will be used in assessing planning application proposals for the allocated sites, but the Committee has no reason to believe the sites allocated would not, through an appropriate design solution, be able to comfortably meet the criteria.

Q9. Do the site allocations, along with provision within the SUEs, provide sufficient pitches to provide five-years' worth of supply?

Yes.

The five year need at any point during the period 2013-23 is 16 pitches (as can be determined by table 10.1 of **E004**).

The allocated sites are all considered to be deliverable in the plan period, and therefore should deliver between 14-17 pitches.

Additional provision to meet need (including any 'backlog' if that is deemed necessary) can come forward through:

- the delivery of the SUEs, which are required via Policy LP28 to make provision for Gypsy and Traveller pitches, and which should be making on-site progress in the next five years; and/or.
- windfall, via the positive framework set by the criteria in LP56; and/or
- potential conversion to permanent pitches of recently permitted tolerated and temporary pitches (Note: according to published AMRs, NKDC has delivered 2 tolerated pitches since 2013 and WLDC has delivered 2 temporary pitches since 2013)