

Appendix 2 - Comments / Questions from Members

Member	Section	Comment	Officer Response
Cllr Hazel Smith	Tier 1 2a. & 2b	Should be clarified to say - 'Centre NEAR Cambridge or Northstowe'	This part of the table tests the location relative to the level of the settlement in the hierarchy. The word 'near' is not required.
Cllr Hazel Smith	3b	Power lines are mentioned in the policy as hazardous - should be included on the last line	Power lines must be considered according to the option selected by members. They are picked up under the general term 'hazardous installations', and are one of a number of types of installation that must be taken account of.
Cllr Hazel Smith	4a	Concerned about increasing list to include so many types of facilities. Would 3 pubs a community centre and a play area give the 5 required, or do the pubs count as 1? Why 80% of the site?	The list reflects the agreed option, and doesn't introduce any new facilities from that in the options report. It uses a list created by the BRE, and they also recommend the 80% test. In reality, due to the small size of new travellers sites, the 80% is unlikely to make a great deal of difference. The tests will operate more as a yes/no rather than counting, i.e. is there a bank y/n, yes = 1 point, rather than 3 banks = 3 points.
Cllr Hazel Smith	5a	If potential future allocations count, then 2 possible sites within 1000m of each other could rule each other out In this case you would sometimes need to count both in at this stage and choose between them with regard to the Tier 2 criteria?	This test does not rule out sites being near each other. It means that if there are other existing sites nearby, it moves on to the next questions (5b and 5c) of assessing the impact on physical / social infrastructure of additional sites. If you had two potential sites in one area you would need to consider the impact of allocating them both, and this would need to be done as an exercise at the end (tier 3) rather than in the tier 1 sieving.
Cllr Hazel Smith	Tier 2: 2a	Does this give more preference to a site in a built-up area served by a distributor road than to a more rural site where there are no industrial, commercial or housing areas?	This criteria aims to avoid conflict with other uses, by seeking access that minimises disturbance. It doesn't give greater preference to sites in built up areas.

Member	Section	Comment	Officer Response
Cllr Hazel Smith	2c	If one 'could be provided' would it be the subject of a S106?	Yes, sites could be subject to s106 or condition if infrastructure was required to meet the sites needs
Cllr Hazel Smith	Tier 3: 1e	Uses within the site - should include also Business use (GT33) and Stables (GT34)?	This could be examined on a case-by-case basis as appropriate when sites have been identified at tier 3.
Cllr Vicky Ford		Concerned about the points for social infrastructure, and risk of double counting.	There are two distinct testing mechanisms being developed through the matrix. 1) The site should be within 1000m / 2000m of at least 5 key local amenities. This is the test developed from the BRE test, and was included in the Issues and Options Report at GT/15, and draft scoring matrices. It therefore sets a minimum requirement for sites to move to tier 2 (subject to sensitivity testing). 2) An action coming from the representations, that was approved by Council, was to give greater weight in the scoring to sites near key amenities, so that sites that meet all the absolute tests could then be better differentiated by score. Although these do repeat some of the amenities above, they operate in a different function. For example, being within 1000m of a doctor's surgery is not an absolute requirement from the options, but sites that are should be shown up by a higher positive score than sites that are not.
Cllr Simon Edwards		The GTDPD needs to pay more regard to the housing density of the surrounding area, in particular the compatibility with high-density urban land uses. This should be addressed in the 1 st tier rather than the 3 rd tier.	Density was not an issue explicitly covered in the Issues and Options report. It is considered that the density issue can be appropriately covered in the scoring matrix at tier 3. At that time, it will be possible to look at the characteristics of nearby residential areas and consider whether the density of those areas makes them incompatible for locating a travellers site.

Member	Section	Comment	Officer Response
			<p>The first tier is essentially a factual sieve map exercise where locations that do not meet the respective tests are shaded out as potential areas of search for sites for travellers. We do not have detailed information on the density of our built up areas to use for this exercise, and indeed inclusion of such a test would raise questions about what density, measured over what sort of extent of area, would be excluded from further consideration.</p>
Cllr Simon Edwards		<p>Proximity to a medical centre should be given greater importance in the scoring matrix. It needs to be a Yes/No answer and sites without access to medical centre should only be considered when all other sites with good access to medical facilities have been exhausted. It should not have a lower weighting than proximity to a primary School, or be comparable to access to a children's play area.</p>	<p>There is no firm requirement in the Issues and Options Report for sites to have access to medical facilities. However this does not mean it is not an important issue that should be considered through this site selection process.</p> <p>The matrix seeks to develop the accessibility tests so that sites score better if they are close to certain key facilities to help identify the most sustainable sites. In terms of taking a comparable approach to traveller sites and traditional housing, access to a primary school is a key criteria in designating Group villages where modest levels of development are appropriate. A comparable approach is also indicated by Circular 01/2006 which lists both access to schools and health facilities as key sustainability criteria. I see no evidence base for distinguishing between these facilities. However, they both score more than other "key" facilities" because of their importance. The Circular talks about considering the wider benefits of easier access to GP and other health facilities, but there is no suggestion that this is an</p>

Member	Section	Comment	Officer Response
			<p>absolute requirement.</p> <p>The latest version of the matrix has added extra criteria to tier 3 so that those sites that come through the sieving process and are subject to detailed consideration are tested as to how close they are to key facilities, and get extra points to help identify which are the most sustainable and appropriate to take forward as site options for consultation. The weighting proposed gives the highest scores to sites close to a primary school and to a medical centre of a maximum of 4 points depending on how far the facilities are, for specifically the reasons you mention. Additional points are proposed for other key facilities including children's play areas, but only to a maximum of 2 points, so there is a distinction drawn.</p> <p>This scoring is not used to rule sites in or out but what it will do is give detailed information on access to key facilities on a site-by-site basis, rather than mix it in with the sieving part of the process. So, at the 3rd stage, all sites that come through the process can be considered and compared looking at all the relevant criteria and if there were to be a long "short list", a choice can be made on the most sustainable sites to take further.</p> <p>The scoring process can only take us so far. There will be judgements to make at the end of the process. Members could at that point decide that it would be reasonable in the light of the shortlist of sites coming through the process to take forward only sites that are close to medical facilities for example. However, until we</p>

Member	Section	Comment	Officer Response
			undertake the process, we do not have any indication how many sites will meet the tests and whether sufficient sites can be identified to take forward as potential traveller allocations if these sorts of criteria were made absolute requirements.
Cllr Simon Edwards		All the Fringe Developments around Cambridge should be considered for Gypsy and Traveller Sites, not just Cambridge as a whole.	The urban extensions would be covered by the test of being located close to Cambridge. They would be considered alongside other sites around the edge of Cambridge if they meet the locational tests. It is agreed that the urban extensions should be treated as separate entities as opposed to one single settlement when considering the potential scale of development.
Cllr Simon Edwards		A sequential approach to development of sites, in the same way as National Guidance approaches a sequential approach to housing development, is needed. Therefore it makes sense to bring forward sites in the most sustainable areas first, with those less sustainable sites, or those relying on future infrastructure to come forward when appropriate.	The sequential approach is indeed important and it is covered by Tier 1, 2a which gives higher scores to more sustainable settlements. The matrix will be used to identify sites that meet the locational, accessibility and design and deliverability tests. However, it will not (necessarily) do the whole job of identifying the site options for consultation. Depending on how many sites fall through that sieve mapping and assessment process, there will be a choice to be made on which are the most appropriate site options to consult on and that could include consideration of the relative merits of the various sites such as having regard to the settlement hierarchy.