

Travellers' Sites Development Plan Document

Main Issues Statement

Issue 3 – Questions (i to iv) (Document Number 1.3)

Issue 3– Does the plan identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years’ worth of sites against the locally set target and of specific developable sites or broad locations for growth after those 5 years?

Question (i) - The table at comment 11) on page 10 of A16 indicates a supply of 6.25 years. However, this is based solely on the requirement arising from travellers who meet the definition of traveller in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Having regard to section 124 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 should the needs of ‘cultural’ travellers, as referred to throughout the Accommodation Assessment, (or people residing in or resorting to the district with respect to the provision of sites on which caravans can be stationed) also be addressed?

Response

- 3.1 The purpose of the Travellers Sites DPD is to make provision for travellers in accordance with the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) August 2015. However the GTAA 2017 included consideration of both of need that meets the PPTS definition and cultural need. This approach would provide flexibility should the High Court Challenge to the definition of travellers in the PPTS have been successful. It also provided information in relation to Section 124 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 which broadens the duty on local authorities to consider the needs of the wider community who reside in caravans or houseboats. This includes people who are no longer classified as Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in relation to the definitions provided within Planning Policy for Travellers 2015.
- 3.2 Notwithstanding this a review of the Herefordshire Core Strategy is programmed to commence in 2019. An updated Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA) will be commissioned which will inform the review of the Core Strategy. This revised LHMA will include the assessment of those people residing in caravans (there are no houseboat dwellers within Herefordshire) whose needs are not addressed through the Traveller Sites DPD. The core strategy policies will be amended or new policies introduced as part of the review process as required to ensure that this meets the needs of those travellers that do not meet the definition set out in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

Question (ii) In the same table, could the Council please provide details of the 18 pitches that have been completed between 2011 and 2017? Why is the figure for total deliverable pitches as at April 2018 given as 10 rather than 9? Should the start of the 5 year supply period be taken from April 2017 or April 2018 and, if so, why?

Response

Planning Application Number and Location	Date of Permission	Number of pitches
DMN/110051/F The Millstone Lower Eggleton	June 2011	2
EN/2010/001261/22 (enforcement case) DMNW/100558/F Barnet Lane Wigmore (2 sites separated by a field)	August 2011 Allowed on appeal	2
N113541/F Colwall Road Bosbury	March 2012	1
111132/F Lyne Down Much Marcle	February 2012 Allowed on appeal	1
N112348/F Moon fields Ocle Pychard	May 2012	1
N122734 Nash End Lane Bosbury	December 2012	2
N121687/Wicton Lane Bromyard	December 2012	1
N123340/F Newtown Yarkhill	June 2013	1
S122893 Denewood Callow	May 2013	1
P141538 Pow Green Bosbury	October 2014	1
131942 Bush Pitch Ledbury	November 2013	2
121791 Oakfields Landinabo	June 2015	3
151110 Canon Pyon	March 2016	2

3.3 Please note that having reviewed the monitoring information, the total number of pitches granted planning permission between 2011 and 2017 is 20. The additional two pitches does not impact on the overall approach.

3.4 The start date should be April 2017 as this reflects the Council’s monitoring periods. The figure given did include a recent planning permission but on reflection this should not have been included. However this does not alter the overall approach to achieving a five year supply. (For information since the preparation of that document the application granted planning permission in 2018 is now the subject of judicial review and the case is to be heard in the High Court in July 2018.)

Question (iii) Given that the start of the plan period and the date of the Accommodation Assessment are not aligned what approach should be taken to meeting historic pitch needs which equates to 17 in total according to Table 5.3?

Response

3.5 The latest GTAA considers need for the first part of the local plan based on an extrapolation of data for the period 2011/12 to 2016/17. The GTAA 2017 (Submission Document A13) provided the date position on need for the remainder of the plan and addressed any need from the start of the plan period. The conclusions regarding turnover suggest that the total requirement for the plan period is met.

Question (iv) Should the potential to further expand existing sites as referred to at paragraphs 5.27 and 5.28 of the Accommodation Assessment be pursued further?

Response

3.6 This work has already taken place. In relation to the council owned sites opportunities for expansion and intensification are included in the submitted DPD. In relation to private sites, several publicised calls for sites were carried out but did not produce any sites that were able to be taken forward into the pre-submission plan. It is understood that there is a reluctance to submit sites through this process and that if there were opportunities for expansion or intensification of existing sites then these are more likely to be taken straight to the planning application stage. In these cases any applications would be considered against Policies TS1 and TS2 which aim to enable appropriate development.