

**Consultation Documents Update and Proposed Responses
Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan Issues and Options**
Report by Planning Policy Officer

<p>Summary: This report informs the Committee of the officers' proposed response to planning policy consultations recently received, and invites any comments or guidance the Committee may have.</p> <p>Recommendation: That the report be noted and the nature of proposed response be endorsed.</p>
--

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Appendix 1 shows selected planning policy consultation documents received by the Authority since the last Planning Committee meeting, together with the officer's proposed response.
- 1.2 The Committee's endorsement, comments or guidance are invited.

2 Financial Implications

- 2.1 There are no financial implications.

Background papers: None

Author: Natalie Beal
Date of report: 24 September 2014

Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Schedule of Planning Policy Consultations received

Planning Policy Consultations Received

ORGANISATION:	South Norfolk District Council
DOCUMENT:	Gypsies and Travelers Local Plan Issues and Options
LINK	http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/planning/6627.asp
RECEIVED:	19 August 2014
DUE DATE:	24 October 2014
STATUS:	Consultation
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Planning Committee endorsed.
NOTES:	<p><u>Background</u></p> <p>The Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan will set out how South Norfolk Council will meet the accommodation needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community and Travelling Showpeople community up to 2031.</p> <p>The Council has a legal duty to consider the needs of Gypsies and Travellers. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Local Planning Authorities should set out the strategic priorities for the area of the Local Plan, including the strategic policies to deliver the homes and jobs needed in the area and allocate sites to promote development. This includes allocating sites for the objectively assessed needs of Gypsy and Travellers.</p> <p>In March 2014 the Council commissioned a new GTAA (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment) covering the whole of the South Norfolk district. The purpose of the GTAA is to have robust up-to date evidence that complies fully with current guidance so as to inform the emerging Gypsies & Travellers Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Summary of document</u></p> <p>The document is at the early stages of production so there are no real proposals, rather issues with some options for consultees to discuss. The issues are plan period, strategic approach, site size, site tenure, mixed use sites, site selection criteria, implementation and monitoring. The document does not allocate any sites, but it does outline draft criteria for site selection and seeks comments on the proposed procedure for going forward.</p>
PROPOSED RESPONSE:	<p><u>Specific comments</u></p> <p>1.7. Request amendment relating to the GTAA assessment as follows ‘...covering the whole of the South Norfolk District, including the Broads Executive Area’. Or similar. This adds clarification.</p> <p>Move 2.15 to the introduction or include a statement in the introduction that</p>

this Local Plan does not include the area of South Norfolk for which the BA is the Local Planning Authority.

3.23 – G and T Local Plan Objectives. Request number 5 is expanded to specifically mention ‘landscape’ and ‘the Broads’.

Question 5, page 24. Whether sites are mixed use or not should reflect the location of that particular site as well as the scale of the site and ability to access the site by different vehicles. It seems the final use of a site and the criteria guiding development and use of that site needs to reflect the individual site characteristics and location.

4.21 – what is the definition of ‘reasonable proximity’?

4.23 – do those settlements to which the Council would prefer G and T sites to be located to have a settlement boundary? If this is not the case, it is not clear why that settlement is suitable for G and T sites if it has been assessed as not suitable in general terms for housing.

4.25 – 4.27 there is no mention of access to public transport or cycle distance.

4.27 – this section is confusing. Is the main issue facilities and services or schools? The only distance information provided is in relation to schools not the other key services as defined in the glossary. Would welcome this section to be clarified and be clearer.

Options 8 to 10 page 28 – distance is one element, but the quality of the route seems to be another. For example are there footways and cycleways? Is there surfacing? A site could be close to a particular key service, but the quality of the route, be it by car, could not be attractive.

Page 29, c). Does this also refer to walking and cycling access? What about cycle parking?

Page 29. E). Does this refer to visual impact and perception by residents? It is not clear if this is where the impact on important landscape is assessed. In particular there is no mention of impact on the Broads. Reference to this is requested.

Page 31, options 11 to 13. Until the sites are assessed it is not known if they will be allocated. Should 4.38 be ‘The Council *does not* propose to assess permanent and temporary sites...’? 4.38 is confusing as written and could usefully be clarified.

5.2 and 5.3. What will South Norfolk do if sites come forward in the Broads area? This might happen as people might not necessarily consider that an issue.

Regarding the call for sites and then assessment, is there a role for the BA to be involved and help South Norfolk assess sites near (to be defined) to the Broads Authority, in the interest of Duty to Cooperate? This could be for biodiversity and landscape benefit.

Site Assessment

Site allocation row: Change of distance units from Km to miles is confusing. Should the third criteria be 'further than 2km from settlement boundary'? Is there a need for a fourth criterion of 2 miles? In the comment box, what is the definition of 'close proximity'?

The most logical distance criteria seem to be in the rows at the top of page 35, notwithstanding the confusion of including 2 miles. Recommend that this is repeated in the distance related assessment criteria, although a fourth distance band (or third) be 'greater than 2km' to cover sites beyond that distance.

Re health care and convenience shop, it is unclear why 800m and 2km are both ++. Seems logical that within 800m is ++ and within 2km is +.

Re impacts on existing road network. How does the potential for improvements to the existing road network rate?

Re safe access. Could the access be made safe? How does that potential rate?

It is not clear why, if the site is not on brownfield land, it is a 0 and not a -.

Re contamination. It is not clear why if there is no history this is a ++. Is it better to have ++ if it is known that there is no contamination? Not know could be a?. Low could be a -.

Potential noise issues; could you include 'no - 0'?

Re international and national landscape or wildlife designations. Suggest these two important elements are separated.

There is not an assessment criterion relating to landscape impact in terms of the site being seen from an area thus impacting on the landscape. In particular the impact on the setting of the Broads is not mentioned.

There is no mention of heritage sites.

Rather than 'available' should it be 'deliverable' in line with NPPF footnote 11, page 12 of the NPPF?