

**GYPSY AND TRAVELLER  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**  
ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT 1:  
GENERAL APPROACH

REPORT ON ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT 1  
CONSULTATION

Prepared by CDN Planning for South Cambridgeshire District Council

## INTRODUCTION

Representations on the *“Issues and Options Report 1: General Approach”* were invited during a six-week period running from 13 October 2006 to 24 November 2006. During that period 1150 representations were received. This report is a summary of the main findings which will steer the next phase in the preparation of the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (GTDPD), which will be the *Issues and Options Report 2: Site Options*.

### General Overview:

Of the 1150 representations received, 583 (50.7%) were recorded as support, 288 (25%) as object and 279 (24.3%) as comments. Generally, representations were favourable of the proposals presented by SCDC. A summary of each option and recommendations on which to take forward to the next stage of the GTDPD follows below.

<b>GT1: Need for Sites</b>	
<i>Option GT1A</i> Support: 4 Object: 9 Comment: 7	<i>Option GT1B</i> Support: 15 Object: 7 Comment: 7

Although it was generally accepted that more needed to be done to tackle the occurrence of unauthorised sites in the district, there were many representations that expressed a desire to limit new Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the district. Of the objectors, many felt South Cambridgeshire already has its fair share of pitches and favoured option GT1B whereby the Council would only provide a portion of the 110 to 130 pitches identified by the needs assessment.

The Cambridge Sub-region Traveller Needs Survey confirms that in most cases Travellers do not identify a need to locate within a specific district, rather it is within the wider region. Since not all authorities have in the past responded positively to Travellers’ needs, existing provision is skewed towards a small number of responsible authorities. If those authorities are expected to meet all the need arising within its boundaries this will perpetuate the existing settlement patterns and hence continue to restrict Travellers’ opportunity to choose where they live.

GT1B will need to ensure that all Gypsies/Travellers in urgent housing need (i.e. those on unauthorised sites) are provided for. In due course the RSS will identify how many plots need to be identified in South Cambridgeshire for the period to 2021, looking at the district in the context of the wider area and provision elsewhere. It is possible that this could result in a lower figure than that identified in the Traveller needs survey for South Cambs if the RSS finds that a different

distribution of Traveller sites is appropriate. The requirements of the RSS will be addressed by an early review of the DPD, but there is a priority need to prepare a DPD now to meet urgent needs. There is potential for additional sites can be developed if they are in accordance with the Council's criteria based policy.

Recommendations:

It is recommended, that option GT1B is taken forward whereby SCDC will provide a proportion of the 110-130 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches identified in the needs survey for within the district, through allocations focusing on those in priority need.

<b>GT2: Need for Sites</b>
Support: 15 Object: 7 Comment: 7

There was general support for the approach of proportionately distributing new Gypsy/Traveller pitches throughout the district. When identifying sites for new pitches, Circular 01/2006 requires that account be taken of the potential strains that can be placed on local physical and social infrastructure. Regard must also be given to the scale of the nearest settlement. The concentration of sites is to be avoided. Consideration must also be given to Gypsy/Traveller preference areas, however this can not be the sole determining factor as this would be contrary to the other sustainability criteria outlined in Circular 01/2006.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT2 is taken forward whereby new Gypsy/Traveller pitches will be located proportionally throughout the district so as to minimise any undue pressures on local infrastructure and maintain the rural setting of adjacent communities/settlements.

**Action:** Ensure a clear definition of 'proportionately' is provided in the GTDPD.

<b>GT3: Identifying Sites</b>
Support: 11 Object: 7 Comments: 7

SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to adopt a flexible approach to finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Generally, representations were favourable to the proposed approach as comprehensive and consistent with the requirements of government guidance.

Several representations expressed a reluctance to allow new pitches in rural areas of the district and areas on the fringe of settlements, Circular 01/2006 requires the Council to consider all areas of the district, including areas within and outside settlement frameworks, rural or semi-rural locations and areas within the Green Belt. Sustainability criteria include economic, social and environmental factors that must be considered when assessing potential sites. It is important that all relevant plans and designations are taken into account in site option identification.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT3 is taken forward whereby the Council will use a three-tier approach of location, access & infrastructure, and deliverability, design & impact, which combine environmental, economic and social indicators to identify the most suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.

**Action:** Ensure subsequent documents make reference to Mineral Safeguarding Areas, Mineral Consultation Areas, Waste Safeguarding Areas, Sustainable Transport Protection Zones, Listed Buildings and International Designations (such as SACs).

<b>GT4: Relationship to Settlements</b>		
<i>Option GT4A</i> Support: 7 Object: 6 Comment: 1	<i>Option GT4B</i> Support: 4 Object: 3 Comment: 1	<i>Option GT4C</i> Support: 11 Object: 8 Comment: 5

Many of the objections raised related to the proposal in Options GT4A and C to locate Gypsy/Traveller pitches in areas outside village frameworks and potentially in rural locations and in the Green Belt. Others objected to the proposal to allocate pitches within village frameworks, as in Options GT4B and C, as this could lead to potential conflict between the Gypsy/Traveller community and the settled community.

Circular 01/2006 requires that the Council examine all potential areas for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which can include land adjoining built-up areas, land within settlements, as well as rural or semi-rural locations subject to meeting the requirements of the Circular and the needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community.

Option GT4B restricting pitches outside settlement frameworks and GT4A restricting pitches within settlement framework, if taken forward, would result in a restrictive policy, contrary to Circular 01/2006.

Recommendations:

It is therefore recommended that option GT4C is taken forward whereby sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches may be located both outside and/or within settlement

frameworks if the site can meet the requirements of Circular 01/2006 with regard site location and those of Gypsies/Travellers.

<b>GT5: Flood Risk</b>
------------------------

Support: 17 Object: 1 Comment: 2
--

General support for this option as it is consistent with the approach taken for conventional residential development.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT5 is taken forward whereby the Council would not permit Gypsy/Traveller pitches on sites that are liable to flooding or where the development would likely give rise to flooding elsewhere, unless it is demonstrated that these effects can be overcome by appropriate alleviation and mitigation measure secured by planning conditions or Section 106 Agreements.

<b>GT6: Highway Access</b>
----------------------------

Support: 14 Object: 1 Comment: 7
--

General support for this option as it is consistent with the approach taken for conventional residential development. Where no safe pedestrian route is available to a local area centre, then new or improved pedestrian routes to a local area centre or a public transport node with service to a local area centre should be considered as appropriate. The Highway Agency and Cambridgeshire County Council will be consulted during the site identification stage to assess the suitability of site access and the impact additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches might have on road network.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT6 is taken forward whereby the Council would not permit Gypsy/Traveller pitches where the site access is deemed unsafe or inadequate, or where no safe pedestrian route to a local area centre or to a public transport node with service to a local area centre is or can be made available.

<b>GT7: Site Safety</b>
-------------------------

Support: 15 Object: 0 Comment: 7
--

Overall support for the proposed approach as it is consistent with that taken for conventional housing and it meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT7 is taken forward whereby sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would not ideally be located in the vicinity of any dangerous roads, railway lines, water bodies or power lines. However these locations will be considered in the same way as for conventional housing if they are suggested.

<b>GT8: Basic Infrastructure</b>
Support: 13 Object: 3 Comment: 6

General support for this option since the basic infrastructure needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community (water, sewage disposal, electricity) is the same as conventional housing. The proposed approach meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 that Gypsies/Travellers are given equal access to housing and services as the settled community.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT8 is taken forward whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches would only be allocated or granted planning permission in areas where the provision of necessary infrastructure such as water, sewage disposal, and electricity are readily available and financially feasible.

<b>GT9: Ground Stability</b>
Support: 12 Object: 0 Comment: 4

Overall support for this option as it is consistent with the approach taken for conventional residential development. Where mitigation can overcome concerns over ground stability, the Council will consider proposals on a case-by-case basis, which would then be secured through planning conditions/S106 agreements if deemed to be appropriate. The cost and implementation of such proposals will be the responsibility of the applicant/developer.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT9 is taken forward whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches would not be permitted on land found to be unstable, unless it can be demonstrated that the land is physically capable of accommodating development and that the risk of damage to the proposed development or adjoining land or

buildings can be overcome by appropriate alleviation and mitigation measures secured by planning conditions or Section 106 Agreements.

<b>GT10: Drainage</b>
-----------------------

Support: 12 Object: 2 Comment: 2
--

General support for this option as it is consistent with that taken for conventional housing. The Council will first avoid allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches in areas of poor drainage. Where mitigation is possible, the Council will fully consider proposals made by an applicant/developer on a case-by-case basis. The Council supports all forms of sustainable development and will therefore encourage the implementation of sustainable drainage systems.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT10 is taken forward whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches would not be permitted in areas of poor drainage unless it can be demonstrated that these issues can be addressed through an appropriate drainage system secured through planning conditions or Section 106 Agreements.

<b>GT11: Hazardous Installations and Contaminated Land</b>
--

Support: 12 Object: 0 Comment: 2
--

Overall support for this approach as it is consistent with that taken for conventional housing. In the interests of health and safety, Gypsy/Traveller pitches should not be located away from hazardous installations and contaminated land.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT11 is taken forward whereby the Council will not permit Gypsy/Traveller pitches if located in the vicinity of a hazardous installation or in areas of contaminated land or water unless it can be demonstrated that these issues can be addressed through appropriate mitigation measures secured by planning conditions or Section 106 Agreements.

<b>GT12: Protection of Mineral Workings</b>
---

Support: 8 Object: 0 Comment: 4
---------------------------------------

Overall support for this approach as it is consistent with that taken for conventional housing and meets the requirements of the emerging RSS. Recommendation that the following draft policies from the Cambridgeshire County Council's Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals (DPD) Preferred Options report be added as protected areas: Mineral Safeguarding Areas (SSP DPD Preferred Option SSP7): Mineral Consultation Areas (SSP DPD Preferred Option SSP9).

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT12 is taken forward whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches would not be permitted if located in the vicinity of mineral safeguarding areas so as to provide for any future demand.

<b>GT13/14: Sustainability of the Location</b>		
<i>Option 13A</i> Support: 13 Object: 6 Comment: 7	<i>Option GT13B</i> Support: 1 Object: 11 Comment: 4	<i>Rejected Option GT14</i> Support: 8 Object: 3 Comment: 2

Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to "create and support sustainable, respectful and inclusive communities where Gypsies and Travellers have fair access to suitable accommodation, education, health and welfare provision." Rejected Option GT14 for remote locations would be inconsistent with the objectives set out in PPS7, which promotes "focusing most development in, or next to, existing towns and villages". It is therefore recommended that GT14 remain a rejected option.

More support for option GT13A exists over option GT13B because of a perception that Gypsy/Traveller pitches within settlements could lead to additional conflict between both communities. Option GT13A provides the best access to services whilst allowing a degree of separation between both communities. The Gypsy/Traveller community have expressed a preference for living in small groups close to local communities, but not within them. This arrangement could avoid conflict/confrontation and allow for smoother integration of both communities.

Several representations recommended a combination of both option A and B as it would allow for the most flexible approach to finding suitable sites, which is advocated by Circular 01/2006.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that both options GT13A and GT13B be taken forward whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches would ideally be located within communities with access to a range of services or outside but near to local centres, towns or villages with access to a range of services.



**Action:** Ensure the wording of GTDPD policy relating to sustainability of location include both GT13A and GT13B, whereby "Gypsy and Traveller pitches would ideally be located in sustainable locations within or adjoining settlements with access to a range of services." This allows the Council the maximum level of flexibility in its search for suitable sites, reflecting this requirement in Circular 01/2006.

<b>GT15: Access to Local Amenities</b>	
<i>Option GT15A</i> Support: 9 Object: 13 Comment: 5	<i>Option GT15B</i> Support: 2 Object: 12 Comment: 1
<i>Option GT15C</i> Support: 8 Object: 9 Comment: 2	<i>Option GT15D</i> Support: 5 Object: 9 Comment: 6

Mixed views on these options – many advocate that new Gypsy/Traveller pitches should be concentrated where a larger number of services are likely to be provided (Cambridge or Northstowe or a Rural Centre), while others believe a more flexible approach should be taken such as option GT15C. If taken forward, option GT15A could result in the concentration of Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which would be contrary to Circular 01/2006.

Option GT15B is also overly restrictive in terms of the settlement hierarchy identified in the Core Strategy and would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 requiring consideration of rural and semi-rural locations. Supporters of GT15B questioned the availability of a range of services in rural and minor rural centres.

Option GT15C allows for the greatest flexibility in the search for suitable sites and best meets the needs of Circular 01/2006 by allowing sites to be considered both within and outside settlement frameworks in a variety of locations, including rural and semi-rural locations, where it can be reasonably assumed access to a range of services/amenities is available. The approach is also consistent with the sequential and hierarchical structure adopted in the Structure Plan and Core Strategy, starting with the Cambridge fringe then Northstowe, rural centres, minor rural centres, group and finally infill villages. It can be assumed that there is not likely to be a range and number of amenities available in infill villages and therefore option GT15D is rejected.

Several objectors questioned the inclusion of Northstowe in the proposed options. This Issues and Options Report 1: General Approach is the first stage in the production of the GTDPD, which will set out policies to address the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller population in South Cambridgeshire until 2016. It will

also allocate sites up to 2010, the period covered by the “Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Survey”. It will then be reviewed to take account of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) review, which will identify the number of pitches required in the district to 2021.

It can be reasonably assumed that significant progress on Northstowe would have been completed during the plan period. The Core Strategy assumes 4,800 homes will be completed by 2016. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider all areas of the district for potential Gypsy/Traveller pitches, including major development and redevelopment schemes. The introduction of Gypsy/Traveller pitches at the development stage of a major new development would allow for sites to be 'designed' into the development so as to minimise any potential impacts on the settled community and provide the Gypsy/Traveller community with an attractive site with convenient access to local services/facilities.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT15C is taken forward whereby to encourage sustainable forms of development within the District, sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would ideally be located within 1000m (via a safe walking or cycle route) of a centre in Cambridge or Northstowe or a Rural Centre or a Minor Rural Centre or a better-served Group Village as defined in the Core Strategy.

**Action:** Ensure that the wording of the GTDPD policy relating to access to local amenities makes reference to walking and/or cycling routes.

<b>GT16: Access to Public Transport: Distance</b>	
Option GT16A Support: 9 Object: 4 Comment: 3	Option GT16B Support: 7 Object: 5 Comment: 3

SCDC is committed to promoting sustainable forms of transport. By allowing sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches within safe access to frequent public transport will ideally encourage Gypsy/Travellers to make use of this service and reduce their reliance on private vehicles.

Given the degree of flexibility advocated in Circular 01/2006, it would be unreasonable to restrict new sites to within 400m of a transport node providing frequent service to the nearest local centre or town. A distance of 1000m would allow for greater flexibility in finding suitable sites, whilst still consistent with the guidance set by the Building Research Establishment (BRE) for sustainable residential development and reflecting the principles of PPG13.

Given the level of support for both options, this can be reflected in the Council's scoring sheet for the three-tier approach to site assessment/selection. When

assessing access to public transport, a base score can be given to sites within 1000m of a transport node (i.e. +1) and a higher score can be given to sites that fall within 400m (i.e. +2).

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT16A is taken forward whereby to encourage sustainable forms of development within the District, sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would ideally be located within 400m and no more than 1000m (via a safe walking route) of a transport node providing a frequent service to the nearest local centre or town.

<b>GT17: Access to Public Transport: Frequency</b>	
<i>Option GT17A</i> Support: 5 Object: 4 Comment: 4	<i>Option GT17B</i> Support: 9 Object: 3 Comment: 4

Given the requirement of Circular 01/2006 to consider rural and semi-rural locations, where the frequency of bus services is expected to be less, GT17B requiring a half-hourly service could result in an overly restrictive policy if taken forward. GT17A allows for greater flexibility in considering a wider range of sites.

Given the level of support for both options, this can be reflected in the Council's scoring sheet for the three-tier approach to site assessment/selection. When assessing access to public transport, a base score can be given to sites with access to an hourly service (i.e. +1) and a higher score can be given to sites with access to a half-hourly service or better (i.e. +2).

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT17A is taken forward whereby to encourage sustainable forms of development within the District, sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would ideally be located to a transport node providing half hourly service or better to the nearest local centre or town.

<b>GT18: Re-use of Brownfield Sites</b>
Support: 12 Object: 1 Comment: 7

General support for option GT18 as it is consistent with the approach used for conventional residential development. Brownfield sites will therefore only be suitable options for development if they are in sustainable locations. Consideration must be given to the possibility of any new wildlife habitats that might have been created on sites.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT18 is taken forward whereby the Council will encourage, where suitable, the use of brownfield sites for siting of Gypsy/Traveller pitches.

**Actions:** Clarify that brownfield sites will only be suitable options for development if they are in sustainable locations.

<b>GT19/20: Major New Developments</b>	
<i>Proposed Approach (GT19)</i> Support: 15 Object: 8 Comment: 2	<i>Rejected Approach (GT20)</i> Support: 6 Object: 1 Comment: 4

General support for the proposed approach, which is consistent with the provision of meeting identified housing needs as part of major new development schemes. Some objectors questioned the need to provide preferential treatment to Gypsy/Travellers whilst supporters acknowledged the advantage of 'designing-in' Gypsy/Traveller pitches in to new major developments, as it could avoid conflict with an existing settled population.

The submission Development Control Policies DPD identifies that the needs of particular groups must be met, including Travellers. For example, both it and the adopted Core Strategy require provision for affordable housing in all new major development projects. It is therefore important to ensure that there is provision to meet the needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community, a group housing legislation recognises as an ethnic group entitled to the same access to housing as the settled population and would be contrary to the Council's Race Equality Scheme.

The introduction of Gypsy/Traveller pitches at the development stage of a major new development would allow for sites to be 'designed' into the development so as to minimise any potential impacts on the settled community and provide the Gypsy/Traveller community with an attractive site with convenient access to local services/facilities. Informal consultation exercises were undertaken in 2006 with the Gypsy/Traveller community and other key stakeholders, including Parish Councillors. The outcome of these consultation exercises was interest for an option where Gypsy/Traveller sites would be identified at the outset of major new developments, which could avoid the conflict that often arises where a site is introduced into an area where a settled community already exists.

SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to consider all areas of the district that could reasonably accommodate a site for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Therefore, the policy must allow for flexibility to consider potential sites as part of a major new

development, which would only be allowed where they perform well against sustainability and suitability criteria outlined in the Council's proposed three-tier approach.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward whereby the provision of Gypsy/Traveller pitches will be considered at all major new developments. Option GT20 is to remain rejected, as it would be contrary to Circular 01/2006.

**Action:** Ensure the relevant GTDPD policy provides further clarification as to what would constitute a 'major' new development.

<b>GT21/22/23: Green Belt</b>		
<i>Proposed Approach (GT21)</i> Support: 10 Object: 17 Comment: 3	<i>Alternative Option (GT22)</i> Support: 13 Object: 6 Comment: 4	<i>Rejected Option (GT23)</i> Support: 7 Object: 4 Comment: 1

There is significant support for the protection of the Green Belt against all forms of development. However, some representations acknowledged the importance of considering the Green Belt for suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in very extreme circumstances.

The Council remains committed to the principle that development in the Green Belt is not appropriate. However, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches within the Green Belt in very exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. Options GT22 and GT23 if taken forward would be contrary to this guidance.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward where in very exceptional circumstances, sites options could be proposed in the Green Belt and allocated for Gypsy/Traveller pitches if they conform to suitability and sustainability criteria, in particular where they are located close to Cambridge, Northstowe or a Rural Centre.

**Action:** Ensure the wording of GTDPD policy relating to the Green Belt makes reference to additional text from Circular 01/2006: "after all alternatives have been fully exhausted."

**Action:** Ensure that the final policy amplifies what would constitute 'very exceptional circumstances'.

<b>GT24: Nationally Recognised Designations</b>
Support: 13 Object: 3 Comment: 7

Overall support for the proposed approach since it is consistent to that used for conventional residential development. Several representations seeking to remove the word 'generally' from the option, however this could result in an overly restrictive policy contrary to the guidance in Circular 01/2006.

The aim of option GT24 is to propose an approach whereby areas of the district which are protected by a nationally or internationally recognised designations will normally not be suitable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which reflects the principles set out in PPS7. This approach is consistent with that used by SCDC for conventional housing outlined in the Development Control Policies DPD.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT24 is taken forward where Gypsy/Traveller pitches would normally not be permitted where they would have an adverse affect or lead to the loss of important areas and features of Internationally or Nationally Recognised Designations.

**Action:** Ensure policy heading refers to Internationally and Nationally Recognised Designations.

**Action:** Ensure that relevant GTDPD policies make reference to Circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation and sites of international importance classified under EC Directives (Special Protection Areas: SPAs and Special Areas of Conservation: SACs) or those listed under conventions (e.g. Ramsar sites).

**Action:** Consider addition of the text "unless it is demonstrated that there is no adverse impact...." to the GTDPD policy.

<b>GT25: Conservation Areas</b>
Support: 10 Object: 9 Comment: 4

Support for option GT25 as it is consistent with national planning policy where other forms of development are permitted within conservation areas, where they can show they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or its setting. Ideally Gypsy/Traveller sites should not be allowed in conservation areas, however the same tests that would apply to other

developments in conservation areas should apply. Some objectors question how a Gypsy/Traveller site can enhance the character of a Conservation Area.

Circular 01/2006 and PPG15 do not rule out development in areas within or adjoining conservation areas provided the development does not have an adverse impact on the objectives of the designation.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT26 is taken forward whereby Conservation Areas are to be avoided if at all possible. However, the Council could consider site options for Gypsy/Traveller pitches within or adjoining a Conservation Area if they were in a suitable and sustainable location, and where they can show that the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or its setting.

<b>GT26: Locally Recognised Designations</b>
Support: 13 Object: 1 Comment: 6

Overall support for the proposed approach as it is consistent with that taken for conventional residential development.

Circular 01/2006 advises that, "Local landscape and local nature conservation designations should not be used in themselves to refuse planning permission for Gypsy and Traveller sites." It is therefore not reasonable to rule out development in a locally recognised designation area if there is no harmful impact.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT26 is taken forward whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches would normally not be permitted where they would have an adverse affect or lead to the loss of important areas and features of Locally Recognised Designations.

**Action:** Consider the use of more positive approach "Gypsy and Traveller pitches will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated that there would be no harmful impact on, or loss of, important areas and features of Locally Recognised Designations."

**Action:** Ensure the relevant GTDPD policy makes specific reference to public footpaths and bridleways.

**Action:** To reflect recommendation in representation 19333 relating to consistency with the emerging Minerals and Waste LDF: Waste Safeguarding Areas, Sustainable Transport Protection Zones.

<b>GT27: Impact on the Nearest Settlement</b>
Support: 18 Object: 0 Comment: 3

Overall support for the proposed approach since Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to ensure in identifying new pitches that account is taken of the potential strains that can be placed on local physical and social infrastructure including schools and health services. Regard also needs to be given to the scale of the nearest settled community and the impact new pitches might have on that community.

The Council would consider the nearest settlement as the settled area closest to the proposed site - this could range from a town to a grouping of houses. The proposed approach would not allow any Gypsy/Traveller pitches in areas that would dominate the nearest settlement or place undue stresses on local physical and social infrastructure. The approach reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approached proposed by SCDC for conventional housing outlined in the emerging Development Control Policies DPD.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT27 is taken forward where sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would respect the scale of the nearest settlement. Planning permission for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would not be granted where it results in undue pressures on local physical and social infrastructure.

**Action:** Ensure the relevant policy of the GTDPD clarify what constitutes 'nearest settlement'

<b>GT28: Local Character and Appearance</b>
Support: 14 Object: 4 Comment: 2

The proposed approach in option GT28 is consistent with that used for conventional housing proposed in the Development Control Policies DPD and meets the requirements of the Core Strategy and Circular 01/2006. Although the Council will seek to minimise any adverse impact on the local character and appearance of a locality, the proposed approach will not rule out rural and semi-rural locations for Gypsy/Traveller sites as stipulated by Circular 01/2006. Some concern raised by representations that due to the flat landscape of South Cambridgeshire, landscaping will not address all issues and any landscaping needs to be sensitive to the area.



Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT28 is taken forward where sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would only be permitted where it would not result in any unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the locality. Pitches would be sensitively screened and enclosed where appropriate.

**Action:** Ensure reference is made in the relevant GTDPD policy to the use of landscaping which makes use of indigenous species and is consistent with the local character and setting.

<b>GT29: Impact on Local Amenity</b>
Support: 14 Object: 3 Comment: 5

Several objectors raised concerns over the use of “respect for” as it is not clear and could lead to an ambiguous policy. Although the terminology is consistent with the wording in Circular 01/2006, it is recommended that the GTDP policy relating to impact on local amenity exclude this terminology. It is recommended that the text of the relevant policy include text such as "avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses." This would be consistent with the approach used for conventional housing and still reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006.

Some representations suggested the combination of option GT29 and option GT27 as both are closely related to the impact Gypsy/Traveller pitches will have on local services/infrastructure. It is reasonable to assume that local amenity includes local social and physical infrastructure.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT29 is taken forward where sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would only be permitted where they avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses and where the local services/infrastructure has the ability to meet their needs.

**Action:** Ensure relevant GTDPD policy removes reference to "respect for neighbouring uses" in favour of "avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses".

**Action:** Consider the combination of options GT27 and GT28 as they closely relate to impact on nearest settlement.

<b>GT30/31/32: Size of Sites</b>		
<i>Proposed Option (GT30)</i>	<i>Alternative Option (GT31)</i>	<i>Rejected Option (GT32)</i>

Support: 15 Object: 10 Comment: 6	Support: 4 Object: 11 Comment: 3	Support: 8 Object: 1 Comment: 2
---	--	---------------------------------------

Representations express concerns over not setting a maximum number of pitches permitted for each site. Some suggest no more than 15 pitches, others suggest a lower limit, and others believe all applications should be considered. A few representations have suggested that the size of a site if limited to 15 should combine permanently occupied pitches with transit pitches, thereby allowing flexibility for the size of extended families and the natural coming and goings of Travellers.

A suggestion that a small number of larger sites may be preferable than a large number of small sites, since this would limit the number of access points on to the local highway network and enable mitigation/sustainable transport measures to be implemented more effectively.

Setting such limits would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 which does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site, but suggests that cases should be considered in context, and in relation to the local infrastructure and population size and density. It is therefore reasonable to conclude option GT32 would be unsound as it would result in an overly restrictive policy and should remain rejected.

Although option GT31 is the most consistent with Circular 01/2006 guidance, it is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward due to the significant level of public objection to having no guidelines set on what would be an optimum site size.

The Council believes an appropriate size of sites should be no more than 15 pitches. At consultation exercises in 2006 there was particular interest for small Gypsy-owned sites of between 5 and 10 pitches. As Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site, SCDC must allow for flexibility in its GTDPD policy relating to size of sites and not be overly prescriptive. It is believed that option GT30 offers an acceptable compromise that is consistent with Circular 01/2006.

A recommendation was made to make use of a similar structure identified in the Core Strategy where conventional housing provision is set according to the sequence of development locations and the classification of the settlement, as indicated below. This could be appropriate for identifying an appropriate number of Gypsy/Traveller pitches for each settlement category. The number of pitches on a site should have regard to the average family size, services and facilities available locally and the overall level of need identified in the district Although some of this has been addressed in option GT15, it is reasonable to go further and apply this to the GTDPD policy relating to size of sites.

- *Cambridge*: Residential development and redevelopment without limit. Proposed Gypsy/Traveller accommodation limited to 30 pitches (generally no more than 15 pitches per site).
- *Northstowe*: New town of up to 10,000 dwellings. Proposed Gypsy/Traveller accommodation limited to 30 pitches (generally no more than 15 pitches per site).
- *Rural Centres*: Residential development and redevelopment without limit. Proposed Gypsy/Traveller accommodation limited to 30 pitches (generally no more than 15 pitches per site).
- *Minor Rural Centres*: Residential development and redevelopment up to an indicative maximum scheme size of 30 dwellings. Proposed Gypsy/Traveller accommodation limited to 15 pitches.
- *Group Villages*: Residential development and redevelopment up to an indicative maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings. Proposed Gypsy/Traveller accommodation limited to 8 pitches.

Any proposal for new pitches within a locality will be evaluated against any potential impacts on local physical and social infrastructure. The scale of the nearest settlement will also be a consideration, which will avoid the concentration of sites. This has been addressed in options GT27, GT28 and GT29. This will determine the number of pitches suitable for that locality

#### Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward whereby new sites allocated for Gypsy/Traveller pitches will ideally be for no more than 15 pitches, however all planning applications would be considered on their own merits regardless of site size.

**Action:** Consider the use of a similar approach to that identified in the Core Strategy for conventional housing whereby an appropriate number of pitches (as suggested) is identified for each category of settlement using the sequence for development.

<b>GT33: Provision for Business Uses</b>
Support: 13
Object: 4
Comment: 3

General support for the use of Gypsy/Traveller sites for businesses uses, provided all safety and amenity considerations are complied with, along with environmental regulations. Circular 01/2006 promotes sites as suitable for mixed residential and business uses.

The Council would identify a significant impact as one where an adverse effect would result from the proposed development on neighbouring properties and/or land uses. However, it is not the function of the planning system to interfere with or inhibit competition between users of or investors in land. The Council is committed to treating everyone fairly and justly and this is core to its Race Equality Scheme, which can be found on <http://www.scams.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/Equality/>

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT33 is taken forward where business uses on Gypsy/Traveller sites would only be permitted if appropriate for their location and where they would not result in a significant impact on neighbouring properties or land uses. These uses would be subject to EA regulations and requirements for disposal of waste.

**Action:** Ensure further clarification is provided in the relevant GTDPD policy as to what would constitute a 'significant impact'.

<b>GT34: Provision for Stables</b>
Support: 13 Object: 1 Comment: 0

General support for option GT34 provide stables are of an appropriate scale, have no impact on surroundings and cannot be later converted to dwellings.

Option GT34 reflects the requirement of Circular 01/2006 that SCDC must where possible identify in the GTDPD Gypsy/Traveller sites that are suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents. The conversion of stables to residential is subject to planning controls whereby a planning application will be required. The approach is consistent with that taken for conventional development.

A suggestion was made that stabling is limited to the provision of facilities to meet the personal needs of horse owners living within the encampment, and not used to support any other personal or business activity, including riding schools or horse riding services. To restrict the use of stables to purely private uses would be contrary to Circular 01/2006, which promotes creating employment opportunities for the Gypsy/Traveller community.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT34 is taken forward whereby planning permission for stables on a Gypsy/Traveller site would be considered if there is an identified need for this use and where it does not result in any significant harmful impact on the site or surrounding area.

<b>GT35/36: Traditional Settlement Areas</b>	
<i>Proposed Approach (GT35)</i> Support: 13 Object: 2 Comment: 2	<i>Rejected Approach (GT36)</i> Support: 7 Object: 0 Comment: 1

Circular 01/2006 requires that the settlement pattern of the Gypsy/Traveller community be reflected in any policy document put forward by SCDC. Therefore, the preference of Gypsy/Traveller to be located close to relatives and friends cannot be ignored. This however cannot be the only consideration when assessing a site as there are other sustainability criteria identified in Circular 01/2006 that must also be addressed.

Option GT36 was rejected because it would have the potential to place undue pressures on local physical and social infrastructure, which would be contrary to Circular 01/2006.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT35 is taken forward whereby sites in traditional Gypsy/Traveller settlement areas should respect the scale of, and not dominate the nearest settled community. They should also avoid placing undue pressure on the local infrastructure and help preserve their rural setting.

<b>GT37: Play Areas</b>
Support: 9 Object: 4 Comment: 4

General support for option GT37, however areas for play would need to be safeguarded through planning conditions so as to avoid the placing of additional pitches/caravans. Insisting on these on-site play areas could however hinder integration with local settled communities. Consideration should be given to the multi-use of play areas for a range of community activities.

It would be unreasonable to expect children to live on a site without play areas or at an excessive walking distance of the nearest community facilities that was not on a safe route. Consultation exercises with the Gypsy/Traveller community were conducted in 2006 and demonstrated a desire for safer, more accessible areas for children to play. Option GT37 reflects the objectives of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach taken for conventional residential development.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT37 is taken forward where an area for children to play in should be available on sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Where appropriate, preference would be given to pitches within a reasonable and safe walking distance of local recreational facilities.

<b>GT38: Site Availability</b>		
<i>Option GT38A</i> Support: 9 Object: 3 Comment: 5	<i>Option GT38B</i> Support: 4 Object: 13 Comment: 3	<i>Option GT38C</i> Support: 6 Object: 2 Comment: 5

Compulsory Purchase Powers are very seldom used for residential accommodation and should not be employed specifically and in isolation for the Gypsy and Traveller community. However, there is some support for option GT38B as a guarantee at securing sites. Options GT38A and GT38C are the more favoured options, however several representations have suggested that a combination of the three options is taken forward as it is necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward through private or public ownership. This approach would be consistent with Circular 01/2006.

Although the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers is encouraged in Circular 01/2006 for the acquisition of appropriate sites, the use of these powers often results in consequences associated with financial cost and community conflict. Therefore, other reasonable alternatives will be considered before the use of CPO. The Council is currently financially unable to purchase land, however if sufficient funding is available then the use of these powers will be considered if problems finding sufficient sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches arises.

SCDC is not a significant landowner and much of what is in its ownership are public amenity areas that are not suitable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. As option GT38C is not expected to yield suitable sites for consideration, the majority of sites for consideration are likely to come from private ownership (Option GT38A).

#### Recommendations:

It is recommended that a combination of options GT38A, GT38B and GT38C are taken forward, whereby (1) Council-owned land could be disposed of for Gypsy/Traveller pitches where such land met the agreed selection criteria, (2) private landowners could come forward with available and suitable land for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, and (3) where problems finding sufficient available sites are encountered, the Council could consider exercising their Compulsory Purchase Powers to secure new sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in appropriate locations.

**Action:** Ensure the relevant GTDPD policy reflects the sequential search outlined in Circular 01/2006 where the following options will be considered:

disposal of local authority land; use of unused and under used public sector land (vacant or under-used local authority land may be appropriate); CPO acquisition of land; and lastly, co-operation with neighbouring authorities to provide more flexibility.

**GTQ1:**

**Recommend Sites Suitable and Available for Gypsy/Traveller Pitches.**

Comments: 9

Support: 1

A site is offered for allocation in Chesterton Fen Road. The representor argues it serves no beneficial purpose and is derelict and, if rejected for comprehensive development, has little potential, despite being in a sustainable location.

A site at Sandy Park, Chesterton Fen is put forward – if not included as a housing allocation.

A representor comments that an audit of the larger pieces of land in SCDC ownership has already been done. However in the light of the apparent preference for smaller sites, the Council did undertake to look at the smaller areas but there has been no report to date. Also the County Council has significant land holdings that do not appear to have been considered at all.

The County Council comments that it has no potential sites to put forward at this stage. Nevertheless, it welcomes the opportunity to be involved in the site selection process. It says it is prepared to respond constructively to any requests to consider, whether or not there is any County Council owned land that might be suitable, and whether or not the County Council might be prepared to dispose of county owned land to accommodate new pitches.

**GT39/40/41: Site Ownership and Management**

*Option A (GT39)*

Support: 5

Object: 6

Comment: 3

*Option B (GT40)*

Support: 6

Object: 4

Comment: 6

*Rejected Option (GT41)*

Support: 6

Object: 4

Comment: 1

Small family sites owned and managed by Gypsies/Travellers will be more effective at dealing with anti-social behaviour. A sense of pride and respect for sites is instilled when they are privately owned. It may be unrealistic to expect that the ownership and management of all sites identified in the GTDPD would be undertaken by Housing Associations. There will inevitably be a desire in the Gypsy/Traveller community for private ownership and management. To develop a policy on the basis of restricting private ownership and management would be contrary to Circular 01/2006.

Although there is some support for council-run sites, option GT41 remains rejected since the Council is financially unable to pay for and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative.

A further option suggested might be to allow Gypsies and Travellers to continue to identify their own land (as they do now) The suitability of the land for the purpose intended will be addressed through the normal planning application process where the Council would consider proposals for Gypsy/Traveller pitches on privately owned land. Options GT39/40/41 relate more specifically to the sites put forward by the GTDPD for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that a combination of option GT39 and option GT40 be taken forward whereby the Council would (1) identify suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the GTDPD in which private landowners would sell each site to members of this community where management would be undertaken privately and (2) Gypsy/Traveller sites will be released to private developers/Housing Associations in the same way as traditional housing sites where the developer/HA would cover costs associated with basic infrastructure and then sell/rent individual pitches to Gypsies and Travellers.

<b>GT42/43: Affordable Housing</b>	
<i>Proposed Option (GT42)</i> Support: 6 Object: 2 Comment: 2	<i>Alternative Option (GT43)</i> Support: 2 Object: 4 Comment: 2

Most private sites are family run and for the accommodation of an extended family. The renting of pitches to other families as a way of generating income may not be culturally acceptable to Gypsies/Travellers who like to live in their own family groupings. It may therefore be an unrealistic expectation that a portion of the pitches on each site be made affordable and rented to Gypsies/Travellers unable to purchase their own. The use of Housing Associations or similar organisations could allow for a more effective approach to providing affordable housing to the Gypsy/Traveller community.

Housing Associations are involved in the development of conventional affordable housing and have successfully assisted those on low incomes and those with special needs to find suitable local accommodation within their financial means. It is reasonable to assume that a similar approach can be applied to the Gypsy/Traveller community. The Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative.



Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT42 is taken forward whereby the Council will assist interested Housing Associations/partners to purchase and oversee a site (or more than one site) providing affordable accommodation to the Gypsy and Traveller community.

<b>GT44: Transit Sites</b>	
<i>Option A (GT44A)</i> Support: 9 Object: 1 Comment: 6	<i>Option B (GT44B)</i> Support: 6 Object: 7 Comment: 2

The Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment May 2006 has identified a need in Cambridge for the provision of a 15-pitch transit site. Although outside the remit of the GTDPD, it is acknowledged that the provision of transit sites within the County should be investigated in partnership with neighbouring authorities. There is general support for option GT44A. Gypsies and Travellers are by their very nature nomadic. Transit sites are necessary to maintain their way of life. The provision of such a site could reduce the occurrence of illegal encampments of Gypsies/Travellers passing through the district.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT44A is taken forward where in addition to providing permanent Gypsy/Traveller sites; SCDC will in cooperation with neighbouring authorities investigate the provision of transit sites within the County.

Action: Consideration should be given to the provision of transit-only pitches within authorised sites.

<b>GT45: Temporary Special Events Sites</b>	
<i>Option A (GT45A)</i> Support: 9 Object: 0 Comment: 3	<i>Option B (GT45B)</i> Support: 5 Object: 9 Comment: 2

Currently no site is identified to accommodate the influx of additional Gypsies/Travellers who come to the District during special events. Support exists for the establishment of such a site. There is concern that other jurisdictions would benefit from a site, particularly Cambridge City.

The lack of a temporary special event site(s) within the District has lead to increases in the number of illegal encampments within the District during these

periods, which has resulted in conflict between the Gypsy/Traveller community and the settled community. The Council recommends that in cooperation with neighbouring authorities it investigates the feasibility of establishing temporary site(s) during special events.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT45A is taken forward whereby SCDC would, in cooperation with neighbouring authorities, investigate the feasibility of establishing temporary Gypsy/Traveller sites during special events, such as the Mid-summer fair.

<b>GTQ2: Further Issues Not Addressed</b>
---

Key recommendations are outlined below. Other representations related to the need for allocating additional pitches in the district, the impact Gypsy/Traveller pitches might have on a locality's infrastructure, and questions relating to the GTDPD process, and other issues that have already been address in this report.

**Action:** Consider addition of a new preferred option: Integration with the settled community. Circular 01/2006 suggests "the promotion of peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community" as an important sustainability consideration. This is partly addressed through option GT49, however a more detailed option policy could be included in the GTDPD to address issues of inclusion and integration.

**Action:** Greater preference is to be given to 'key' amenities such as food shop, postal facilities, pharmacy, primary school/secondary school, and medical centre. This can be reflected by varying scores in the proposed three-tier approach to site assessment. Response time from emergency services must also be considered. This can be reflected through the scoring in the three-tier matrix, where 'key' amenities are awarded a higher score than the 'nice to have' amenities.

**Action:** Ensure a clear distinction between 'locational' criteria and other criteria that are applied once a site location has been selected. The recommendation is already reflected in the three-tier approach to site assessment. Locational criteria guiding the identification of suitable sites (GT3 to GT29) are dealt with mainly in tier one and tier two. More detailed site design and management aspects reflected in options GT30-35, GT37, GT39-43, are dealt with in tier three.

<b>GT46: Methodology</b>
--------------------------

Support: 9 Object: 3 Comment: 4
---------------------------------------

Option GT46 encompasses a holistic, robust strategy for identifying suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. The criteria identified in the proposed approach reflect the Circular 01/2006 requirement to consider the social, economic and environmental impacts of Gypsy/Traveller development.

SCDC is not a significant landowner and much of what is in its ownership are public amenity areas that are not suitable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Other sources must therefore be considered and a framework is required to assess the suitability of these sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.

The Council believes sites must first be assessed in terms of their suitability and sustainability (or location aspects) before any details of costing can be ascertained (management and design aspects once a location has been determined). Detailed castings of site development is beyond the remit of the GTDPD, which is mainly concerned with setting a policy framework for meeting accommodation needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community up to 2021.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT46 is taken forward where subject to selection of preferred options/approaches listed previously, SCDC will use this three-tier approach to develop a list of site options for consultation.

**Action:** In addition to providing a safe and independent access, ensure that the capacity of the local highway network is considered within the selection criteria.

<b>GT47: Potential Sites</b>
Support: 9
Object: 3
Comment: 2

General support for the preferred approach as outlined in GT47 in providing for existing unauthorised sites to be proposed as allocated sites if they meet the tests of the 3-tier approach. They would then need to apply for planning permission and be considered in the normal way. Without prejudice to the assessment of unauthorised sites, much of the District's needs could potentially be accommodated if this approach were to be adopted.

The Council believes it to be fair and reasonable to assess all currently unauthorised using the proposed three-tier criteria-based approach, which is supported by Circular 01/2006.

The Council will use the criteria-based approach to assess unauthorised sites against the policies contained in the GTDPD and sites that do not meet the

criteria will be subject to enforcement action should they be deemed inappropriate.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT47 is taken forward where, using the three-tier, criteria-based approach, currently unauthorised sites will be assessed as part of the site options process and if they meet the tests of the 3-tier approach might be deemed as suitable and sustainable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and therefore be proposed as allocated sites.

### **GTQ3: Further Options**

*Gypsy/Traveller pitches in neighbouring authorities.* Should a village close to the border of South Cambridgeshire be considered for new Gypsy/Traveller pitches, consideration must be given to authorised sites across the border in neighbouring authorities and the impact they might have on settlements within South Cambridgeshire.

**Action:** Consider new Preferred Option: Ensure the impact of Gypsy/Traveller pitches on a locality takes account of any authorised sites that may be located in neighbouring authorities.

*Illegal Encampments.* The Council believes the issue of illegal encampments can be addressed in part through the authorisation of additional privately owned and managed sites to meet existing and expected demand. More detailed issues of enforcement are beyond the scope of the GTDPD.

*Question of actual need.* The identification of need has been addressed through the preparation of the Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Survey. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to provide sufficient sites to meet identified need across the district. The district is expected to grow by approximately 20,000 houses over the next 20 years. It would be unreasonable to ignore the increase in the Gypsy/Traveller population and their demand for additional accommodation that is also expected. The Council is committed to treating everyone fairly and justly and this is core to its Race Equality Scheme, which can be found on <http://www.scams.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/Equality/>

Option GT1B is proposed whereby SCDC will provide a proportion of the 110-130 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches identified in the needs survey for within the district, through allocations focusing on those in priority need. This is in view of the RSS review, which will identify how many plots need to be identified in South Cambridgeshire for the period to 2021, looking at the district in the context of the wider area and provision elsewhere. It is possible that this could result in a lower figure than that identified in the Traveller needs survey for South Cambs if the

RSS finds that a different distribution of Traveller sites is appropriate. The requirements of the RSS will be addressed by an early review of the DPD, but there is a priority need to prepare a DPD now to meet urgent needs.

*Lack of consultation.* This Issues & Options report has been subject to a six-week consultation period. A further six-week consultation will be undertaken when the Issues & Options Report 2: Site Options is produced. The Preferred Options draft GTDPD will also be subjected to six-weeks public consultation and scrutiny before the plan is submitted to the Secretary of State, at which time formal objections can be made and considered by an Independent Inspector at public examination who will then issue a report with binding changes to the plan. The level of consultation undertaken by SCDC exceeds the minimum requirements of government regulations.

<b>GT48: Regenerating Existing Sites</b>
Support: 9 Object: 1 Comments: 5

The Council wishes to improve the quality of life for all residents of the District and will continue to explore the feasibility of regenerating Gypsy/Traveller sites it owns/manages. There is general support for this approach.

The regeneration of existing sites would help to improve standards of living and create a better sense of pride in sites. The refurbishment of existing sites could also reduce the need for additional new sites.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT48 is taken forward whereby SCDC will support and encourage programmes and initiatives to regenerate SCDC managed Gypsy/Traveller sites, if they remain following this GTDPD.

<b>GT49: Education Programmes</b>
Support: 9 Object: 1 Comments: 5

Promotion of education programmes and approaches that increase opportunities for understanding between the Traveller and settled communities, tackle discrimination and improve community cohesion should be given a high priority. This is about increasing social inclusion and building social capital - factors which underpin improving health and tackling inequalities. It is an objective that should be shared between partners in the statutory, community and voluntary sectors.

Government guidance and legislation requires the consideration of race relations. The health and cohesiveness of communities within the District is a priority for the Council and therefore the Council will continue to support initiatives/programmes that encourage greater levels of communication, cooperation and education between both the settled community and the Gypsy/Traveller community. It is only through increased dialogue between both communities that issues of discrimination, social inclusion, and equality can be tackled effectively.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that option GT49 is taken forward whereby SCDC will continue to promote education programmes in local schools and initiatives in the wider community to increase awareness of the issues and needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community whilst resources are available.