

GTDPD Issues & Options Report 1: General Approach

Public Participation Report

3. NEED FOR ADDITIONAL GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES

GT1A: Need for Sites - Option A

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
3. NEED FOR ADDITIONAL GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES			
<i>GT1A: Need for Sites - Option A</i>			
19580 - FFT Planning	Our preferred option (A) would be for the District Council to make provision according to the existing accommodation assessment taking into account the proviso contained in that report that their estimates of need were conservative. Future accommodation assessment may well identify further need. The need is current and should be fully met as soon as possible. The Government's aim is to make the substantial provision in the next three to five years and we have concerns about the likely timescale before the DPD is adopted. We hope that South Cambridgeshire will vigorously approach this issue and make substantial progress in accordance with the Governments timeframe.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT1A is not taken forward. 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 a 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. The GTDPD will extend until 2021 and as the needs assessment only identifies need up to 2010, there will be a need to undertake further assessments. The GTDPD will set a policy framework for which planning applications during the plan period can be assessed and determined. Suitable sites may come forward through the planning process over the course of the plan period. Until the GTDPD has been finalised in order to address immediate demand, SCDC will assess current proposals for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and where appropriate will granted temporary planning consents.	None.
19352 - Weston Colville Parish Council	Weston Colville Parish Council considered the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document at its meeting on 21st November. Its conclusion was that there is no suitable site in the parish that fulfils the recommended criteria.	Comments noted.	None.
19053 - Hatley Parish Council	We favour Option B.	Noted. It is recommended that option GT1B is taken forward. 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 a 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19349		The amount of sites / pitches that Government say is required. Is this every District , or just South Cambs? How has this number been determined?	A qualitative and quantitative survey (The Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment) has provided evidence of a need for between 110 and 130 pitches in South Cambridgeshire up to 2010. The distribution of pitches over the East of England is subject to review by EERA.	None.
18556		Perhaps the Government needs to consider why so many more plots are needed - why are many gypsies/travellers coming to Britain and to this area in particular? It's a wealthy area. They're not economic migrants. Should we be allowing so many new gypsies to settle?	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.scambs.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/Equality/	None.
18949 - David Wilson Estates		This is a requirement of Government Guidance and cannot therefore be a policy.	Noted. It will however inform the approach taken SCDC in formulating policies and identify what provision is appropriate	None.
18919 - Histon Parish Council		This does not specifically state SCDC provides all these pitches. Based upon this fact and that we do not have a copy of the recent study we cannot answer this question.	The study has been available from the Council since May 2006. The study identified a need for SCDC to allocate sufficient sites to meet a need for 110 and 130 new pitches up to the year 2010.	None.
19476 - Foxton Parish Council	Object	In view of the large number of pitches already within South Cambridgeshire coupled with the other development pressures in the district, it is reasonable that South Cambridgeshire does not provide this many new pitches such that the overall regional and national distribution is levelled up.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT1A is not taken forward. 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 a 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. It is therefore recommended that SCDC will provide a proportion of the 110-130 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches within the district. The exact number to be provided is still under review by EERA as part of the RSS process.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19384 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	In light of the above Gallagher does not consider it appropriate to accommodate 110-130 new pitches within South Cambridgeshire. Gallagher also consider that such provision and approach is premature particularly in light of the potential review of need for, and location of, new pitches within the region which will be undertaken through the preparation of the East of England RSS.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT1A is not taken forward. 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 a 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.	None.
18736 - Longstowe Parish Council	Object	Para 1.17 'obligation of local authorities to allocate sufficient sites for Gypsies and Travellers in LDPs. It is absolutely unclear what 'sufficient' means and where Cambridgeshire fits into the National requirement. Is it based on static population centres, equal shares per County, current 'illegal' sites etc? Whilst it is accepted that there is a duty of care it needs to be equitable throughout the United Kingdom. Therefore of the two options GT1B is the preferred choice but should be conditional on clear, agreed and understood National requirements.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT1A is not taken forward. The Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment, which has been available to the public since May 2006, is a qualitative and quantitative survey that has determined a need within the district for between 110 and 130 pitches up to 2010. 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 a 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.	None.
18982	Object	As noted is GT1B, SCDC already provides a large number of sites. Therefore other authorities should be expected to provide sites. The provision should be supply limited, rather than demand based.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT1A is not taken forward. 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 a 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19099 - cambourne parish Council 18488 - Croydon Parish Council	Object	Object to option GT1A. The Council already provides a large number of authorised sites. The number of sites should be kept to a minimum.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT1A is not taken forward. 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 a 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.	None.
18915 - Marshall Group of Companies	Object	SCDC has already provided enough gypsy/traveller sites, both on private and on two publicly-owned sites. Its constructive approach is and has been attracting more gypsy/travellers to the area. This is opportunism rather than families/groups returning to an area of traditional resort. The area should not be punished because of SCDC's constructive approach, which has already brought very significant problems, at Smithy Fen and Chesterton Fen Road, which have reputations as "no go areas".	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT1A is not taken forward. 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 a 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.	None.
18808 - CPRE 18633 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	EERA are charged with determining the number of vans and pitches and to apportion them to Local Planning Authorities. It would be imprudent to provide the higher numbers suggested in this policy until that process has been completed. In addition no allocation should be made to SCDC wards bordering other LPAs until they have completed their own assessment. Inadvertent concentration of sites on the borders of LPAs should be avoided. The policy should be amended to include reference to EERA and border issues.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT1A is not taken forward. 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 a 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.	Ensure the proposed three-tier approach to site assessment/identification includes a criterion whereby the proximity of nearby authorised Gypsy/Traveller pitches is considered, including those in neighbouring authorities.
19260 - Cambridge City Council	Support	The alternative of not identifying sufficient pitches to meet identified needs would be unsound as there could be no certainty that this deficit could be made up elsewhere.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT1A is not taken forward. 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 a 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19187 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18700 - Impington Parish Council	Support	SCDC should meet the minimum requirement identified in the Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment. Given the 183 unauthorised pitches in South Cambridgeshire, it may be necessary to exceed 110-130 pitches.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT1A is not taken forward. 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 a 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.	None.
19311 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support Option A. Accommodation needs for Gypsies and Travellers have been assessed by the CTNA. Structure Plan policy P5/4 indicates that Local Plans should include provision to meet the locally assessed housing needs of various specific groups including Travellers and Gypsies. The policy has been saved and will remain part of the Development Plan until replaced by the Regional Spatial Strategy. On this basis, there is an existing policy expectation that Option A be used in the preparation of the G&TDPD.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT1A is not taken forward. 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 a 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.	None.

Decision on GT1A: Need for Sites - Option A

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.

GT1B: Need for Sites - Option B

18699		There are many traveller sites to the North west of Cambridge. This area has one of the biggest sites in the country and has the proposed new town. Additional sites should be situated to the south of Cambridge.	Comments noted. Circular 01/2006 advocates that the concentration of Gypsy/Traveller pitches should be avoided. SCDC is therefore required to consider all suitable sites across the district.	
-------	--	--	--	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19579 - Huntingdonshire District Council	If option B were to be adopted, South Cambridgeshire would be looking to satisfy its needs beyond its boundaries. Huntingdonshire considers that it is important that the principle is established that needs should be met where the need arises. Gypsies and Travellers will not wish to be provided with pitches outside the general area within which they wish to locate. Any attempt to accommodate away from those areas which, by their special nature are where Gypsies and Travellers wish to locate, will fail and simply perpetuate the problem of unauthorised encampments. Huntingdonshire therefore looks to South Cambridgeshire to adopt an approach, which would provide sufficient pitches to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers which arise within its boundaries.	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 a 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. Therefore, 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.	None.
18951 - David Wilson Estates	If a need has been established, then there is a requirement to address that need.	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 a 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. 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.	None.
18916 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Meeting a proportion of the 110 to 130 pitches could well be an outcome as there does seem to be flexibility expressed about where the accommodation is sited within Cambridgeshire. We would be concerned if this resulted in the overall accommodation needs not being met. The prime importance should be to ensure that the pitches are located on sites that meet the quality standards agreed to ensure health, social, environmental and economic aspects are met. These locations may well not all fall within SCDC, and need to be considered in the wider Cambridgeshire and regional context.	Agreed. The EERA will be reviewing the assessment of need for additional pitches and the distribution pitches across the region through the RSS and this will inform the next stages of the GTDPD.	None.
18900 - Girton Parish Council	This seems the preferable option.	Support noted. 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18983	SCDC already has a large number of sites, and should provide the fewest number of extra site as possible, until all other authorities match the provision in SCDC.	Support noted. 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.	
19312 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Recommend that CCC does not endorse Option B. Accommodation needs for Gypsies and Travellers have been assessed by the CTNA. Under Option B only a proportion of locally assessed housing needs for Travellers and Gypsies would be met. Such an approach would not fully meet the policy requirements of Structure Plan policy P5/4. This requires that Local Plans include provision to meet the locally assessed need for Travellers and Gypsies. The policy has been saved and will remain part of the Development Plan until replaced by the Regional Spatial Strategy.	Noted. 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. 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 a 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.	None.
19636 - GO East	The Government Office welcomes the acknowledgement of the need to provide sufficient sites to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers in the District. In this regard, we would question whether the proposed option not to meet all of the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers arising in the District (GT1B) could be considered a reasonable approach.	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 a 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. 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.	None.
18487 - Croydon Parish Council	Support GT1 B - Cambridgeshire has done more than most in providing sites and further sites should be kept to a minimum.	Support noted. 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19261 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The alternative of not identifying sufficient pitches to meet identified needs would be unsound as there could be no certainty that this deficit could be made up elsewhere. This would not prevent joint working on the provision of sites in the urban extensions where practicable and sustainable.	Objection noted. 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. 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 a 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.	
18701 - Impington Parish Council	Object	If SCDC do not provide all pitches for which there is an identified need then it is not clear who would. All provision should be owned and managed by SCDC. If an insufficient number of pitches are provided then an increase in illegal encampments is likely.	Support noted. 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. 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 a 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.	None.
19188 - Cottenham Village Design Group	Object	Minimum requirement should be to satisfy the needs identified in the Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment, especially since 110-130 new pitches is significantly fewer than the 183 unauthorised pitches that SCDC counted in 2005.	Objection noted. 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. 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 a 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18809 - CPRE	Object	EERA are charged with determining the number of vans and pitches and to apportion them to Local Planning Authorities. Therefore it would be imprudent to provide the higher numbers suggested in this policy until that process has been completed. In addition no allocation should be made to SCDC wards bordering other Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) until they have completed their own assessment (in accordance with EERA guidelines and determined their geographic location. Inadvertent concentration of sites on the borders of LPAs should be avoided. The policy should be amended to include reference to EERA and border issues.	This objection has been address through the Council's response to representation 18808.	None.
18858 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council fully supports Option b. The methodology of the Travellers Needs Assessment (TNS) has not been validated (at least as published in the TNS), and it is to be hoped that the EERA review will address this. Something else that is missing from the TNS is any investigation of whether travellers are currently living where they are because they want or need to live there or because that is where they have been able to identify pitches, be they authorised or unauthorised.	Support noted. 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. 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 a 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.	None.
19314 - Swavesey Parish Council	Support	Swavesey Parish Council supports Option B. S Cambs is becoming more urban and would lack the employment opportunities associated with traditional nomadic lifestyle. Therefore S Cambs should only be expected to meet a proportion of the future sites identified. The Parish Council also wishes to comment that current illegal sites should not be granted permission unless they meet the established criteria for current planning permission.	Support noted. 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. 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 a 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18737 - Longstowe Parish Council	Support	Para 1.17 'obligation of local authorities to allocate sufficient sites for Gypsies and Travellers in LDPs. It is absolutely unclear what 'sufficient' means and where Cambridgeshire fits into the National requirement. Is it based on static population centres, equal shares per County, current 'illegal' sites etc? Whilst it is accepted that there is a duty of care it needs to be equitable throughout the United Kingdom. Therefore of the two options GT1B is the preferred choice but should be conditional on clear, agreed and understood National requirements.	The Council's response to representation no. 18736 has address the concerns raised in this representation.	None.
19100 - cambourne parish Council 19425 - Great Shelford Parish Council 19477 - Foxton Parish Council 19660 - Ickleton Parish Council 18557 18920 - Histon Parish Council 19054 - Hatley Parish Council 18489 - Croydon Parish Council 18600 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Support	Support for Option B. SCDC has already made significant provision for Gypsy/Traveller sites within the district. Provision should be made more equally across the country. SCDC should be flexible in the number of pitches it provides.	Support noted. 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.	None.
19391 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher support Policy Option GT1B which seeks to meet only a proportion of the 110 to130 pitches within South Cambridgeshire. Consideration should be given to more appropriate distribution of sites across the Sub-region.	Support noted. 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. 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 a 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.	None.
Decision on GT1B: Need for Sites - Option B				
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.				
<i>GT2: Need for Sites - Proposed Approach</i>				
19135 - East Cambridgehire District Council		Agree that sites should be proportionately distributed throughout the district but the proposed approach does not say the identified need of 110-130 will be met.	The requirement of meeting the identified need of 110-130 pitches is addressed through options GT1A and GT1B	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18490 - Croydon Parish Council	Sites should be located to minimise environmental and social impact, regardless of location.	When identifying sites for new Gypsy/Traveller pitches, Circular 01/2006 requires that account is 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. This is reflected in options GT27, GT28 and GT29.	None.
19581 - FFT Planning	Whilst recognising the issues associated with most of the existing caravans being in two locations - 280 of 291 caravans on authorised sites are in two locations - we have concerns that trying to proportionately spread pitches across the district may restrict possibilities of provision. It may lead to endless arguments at local level about parishes having their 'share' - an invidious situation that should be avoided. It should be noted that had past planning provision been properly made then this issue of concentration on two sites would have been in all probability avoided.	It is recommended that option GT2 is taken forward whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches will be located proportionally throughout the district so as to minimise any undue pressures on local infrastructure and nearby settlements. When identifying sites for new Gypsy/Traveller pitches, Circular 01/2006 requires that account is 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. Whilst consideration will be given to preference areas for Gypsies/Travellers, this can not be the only determining factor. To concentrate new Gypsy/Traveller pitches in certain areas of the district would be unsound and could place undue pressures on existing infrastructure.	None.
18534 - Meldreth Parish Council	Meldreth Parish Council supports the proportional distribution of new Traveller pitches throughout the district. Both concentration of sites and mixing of sites with different ethnic groups of travellers and travelling showmen should be avoided.	Comments noted.	None.
19637 - GO East	The Government Office also suggests that the approach to distributing sites will need to be underpinned by robust evidence, such as the sustainability implications of the alternative approaches. Without this evidence, plus evidence of how different approaches may meet the locational needs and requirements of Gypsy and Traveller families and evidence that infrastructure and public services could not be improved at existing locations, we would question whether a concentrated approach could be deemed an unreasonable approach at this stage.	Comments noted. Whilst consideration will be given to preference areas for Gypsies/Travellers, this can not be the only determining factor. Circular 01/2006 requires that account is 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. To concentrate new Gypsy/Traveller pitches in certain areas of the district would be unsound and could place undue pressures on existing infrastructure. The Issues & Options Report 2: Site Options will include all proposed and rejected site options for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Each site option will be subject to consultation with local utility and service providers to assess the capacity of local infrastructure and where appropriate suggest any mitigation possible. The Issues & Options Report 2 will be subject to an independent sustainability appraisal, along with a further 6-week public consultation.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19313 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC support GT2. The G&TDPD needs 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. This approach is consistent with ODPM Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 54).	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT2 is taken forward whereby new Gypsy/Traveller pitches should be proportionally distributed throughout the district. The approach is consistent with Circular 01/2006.	None.
18953 - David Wilson Estates		The location of sites should relate to a locational need.	Locational need will be a consideration, however a recent needs assessment determined Gypsies/Travellers do not have a specific geographical preference, just more sites anywhere. To avoid concentration of sites, it is recommended that new pitches are distributed proportionally throughout the district, having regard to the capacity of local physical and infrastructure along with the scale of neighbouring settlements.	None.
18738 - Longstowe Parish Council	Object	Para 1.17 'obligation of local authorities to allocate sufficient sites for Gypsies and Travellers in LDPs. It is absolutely unclear what 'sufficient' means and where Cambridgeshire fits into the National requirement. Is it based on static population centres, equal shares per County, current 'illegal' sites etc? Whilst it is accepted that there is a duty of care it needs to be equitable throughout the United Kingdom. Therefore of the two options GT1B is the preferred choice but should be conditional on clear, agreed and understood National requirements.	Objection noted. The Council's response to representation no. 18736 has address the concerns raised in this representation.	None.
18857 - MCA Developments Ltd	Object	Given the intrinsic nature of the wider family relationships amongst traveller communities, the proportional distribution of new sites across the district will encourage the need to travel between sites by non-sustainable travel modes. The more sustainable approach is to limit new site allocations to the upper limits of the acknowledged settlement hierarchy.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT2 is taken forward whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches will be located proportionally throughout the district so as to minimise any undue pressures on local infrastructure and nearby settlements. When identifying sites for new Gypsy/Traveller pitches, Circular 01/2006 requires that account is 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. Whilst consideration will be given to preference areas for Gypsies/Travellers, this can not be the only determining factor. To concentrate new Gypsy/Traveller pitches in certain areas of the district would be unsound and could place undue pressures on existing infrastructure.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18669	Object	This depends on travellers preferences.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT2 is taken forward whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches will be located proportionally throughout the district so as to minimise any undue pressures on local infrastructure and nearby settlements. When identifying sites for new Gypsy/Traveller pitches, Circular 01/2006 requires that account is 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. Consideration will also be given to Gypsy/Traveller preference areas, however this can not be the only determining factor as this would be contrary to the other requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19353	Object	A concentration of sites/pitches does not work.	Agreed.	None.
18634 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	The term proportionately is not clearly defined. To what does this refer; land area, total demographic spread, population by ward, Parish or settlement. All can give different spatial solutions. The gypsy and Traveller requirements have changed and their profile now more closely resembles the settled community (see 3.4). The LPA must explain why it is abandoning the settlement hierarchy and sequential approach contained in the Structure plan and the Core Strategy. Any deviation from this could run the risk of less sustainable locations being brought forward for development before they are required or necessary.	Objection noted. SCDC does not propose a deviation from the hierarchical structure outlined in the Core Strategy. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider all areas of the district for suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which can include rural or semi-rural locations. To restrict sites to specific areas of the district would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and could result in concentration of pitches. The Council has identified an extensive set of criteria which are to be considered when assessing the suitability and sustainability of potential sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	Ensure a clear definition of "proportionately" is included in the relevant GTDPD policy.
19478 - Foxton Parish Council	Object	Support with the proviso that sites are appropriate to the locality with regard to environmental impact.	Objection noted. When identifying sites for new Gypsy/Traveller pitches, Circular 01/2006 requires that account is 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. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT2 is taken forward whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches will be located proportionally throughout the district so as to minimise any undue pressures on local infrastructure and nearby settlements.	None.
19649 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	The wording is too vague because "proportionately" is undefined. The allocation of pitches needs to ensure that so far as possible every residence in the district has a similar level of proximity to local traveller sites	Objection noted. When identifying sites for new Gypsy/Traveller pitches, Circular 01/2006 requires that account is 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. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT2 is taken forward whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches will be located proportionally throughout the district so as to minimise any undue pressures on local infrastructure and nearby settlements.	Ensure the relevant GTDPD policy clearly defines what is meant by "proportionately".

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18635 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Support	We strongly support this statement, but this is not supported in the rest of the document, which unjustly nominates and promotes areas close to Northstowe and Cambridge. This untenable position is further compromised by setting targets and standards which effectively eliminate a large proportion of villages and towns as possible locations for Gypsy/traveller sites. This disproportionately and greatly increases the pressure on villages that have some, but by no means all basic services and facilities, and this is grossly unjust.	Support noted. The document has presented the issues and options that relate to Gypsy/Traveller issues in the district that related to the preparation of the GTDPD. No areas of the district have been nominated or favoured over others. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites in all areas of the district, including rural and semi-rural locations. The approach proposed by the Council will take account of pressures on local physical and social infrastructure and the impact new pitches might have neighbouring settlements. This is reflected in options GT27, GT28 and GT29.	None.
18810 - CPRE	Support	The term proportionately is not clearly defined. To what does this refer; land area, total demographic spread, population by ward, parish or settlement. All can give different spatial solutions. The gypsy and traveller requirements have changed and their profile now more closely resembles the settled community (see 3.4). The Local Planning Authority must explain why it is abandoning the settlement hierarchy and sequential approach contained in the Structure Plan and the Core Strategy. Any deviation from this could run the risk of less sustainable locations being brought forward for development before they are required or necessary.	Support noted. SCDC does not propose a deviation from the hierarchical structure outlined in the Core Strategy. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider all areas of the district for suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which can include rural or semi-rural locations. To restrict sites to specific areas of the district would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and could result in concentration of pitches. The Council has identified an extensive set of criteria which are to be considered when assessing the suitability and sustainability of potential sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	Ensure a clear definition of "proportionately" is included in the relevant GTDPD policy.
19055 - Hatley Parish Council	Support	But the PC does not consider the need has been established nor do they consider the PC has been properly consulted on the need.	Support noted. Concerns over need and consultation have been address in the Council's response to representation 19095.	None.
18558	Support	They do not need to be on the edges of villages as that's what creates friction with villagers. Perhaps gypsy and travellers specialist tutors could visit sites instead of their children being in and out of schools?	Noted. The comments relating to specialist tutors is however outside the scope of the GTDPD.	None.
19160 - Comberton Parish Council 19101 - cambourne parish Council 18859 - Cottenham Parish Council 19189 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19316 - Swavesey Parish Council 18579 - Milton Parish Council 18486 18702 - Impington Parish Council 18921 - Histon Parish Council 18601 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19531 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for proposed approach GT2 whereby new Gypsy/Traveller sites will be proportionally distributed throughout the district. Concentration of sites is likely to lead to similar problems to those of large sites. Milton Parish Council has a large concentration of Gypsy/Traveller sites which has lead to conflict with local residents. Similar situation exists in Cottenham, other areas of the district should share responsibility for supporting the Gypsy/Traveller community.	Support noted.	None.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Action

Decision on GT2: Need for Sites - Proposed Approach

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4. IDENTIFYING NEW GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES			
<i>GT3: Identifying Sites ? Proposed Approach</i>			
19056 - Hatley Parish Council	Although the criteria stated are reasonable we consider that the proximity to existing sites should be taken into account even across county boundaries.	Noted. The proximity of new sites to existing sites has been addressed by GT2, where the Council's proposed approach is to avoid geographical concentration of sites in particular areas of the district.	None.
18918 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Although the 3 tier approach does not explicitly mention 'health' as an indicator, we feel confident that this is covered through the three environmental, economic and social aspects. These aspects pick up the wider determinants of health and also cover health protection. Health services are covered through access to local services. Under 'meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers' we would further propose that community facility/area is added as one of the criteria.	Agreed. Proximity to healthcare and community facilities is considered under Sustainability of Site (access to local services and amenities).	None.
18491 - Croydon Parish Council	Use of brown field sites is also of environmental value as history tells us that sites are not usually well maintained and do not fit in with local countryside.	Noted. Circular 01/2006 requires the Council to explore the potential of sites on formally used land or brownfield sites, and this must therefore form part of the Council's criteria-based approach.	None.
19582 - FFT Planning	We have concerns about the tiered approach to site selection. We can envisage a situation where such an approach, given the difficulties of finding suitable places in planning terms, could severely restrict potential locations to those which have no hope of becoming available. A more flexible system needs to be developed taking into account the potential difficulties.	The three-tier approach proposed by SCDC was designed to meet the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and allows for the most flexible and equitable approach to site identification.	None.
18954 - David Wilson Estates	Noted.	None.	None.
19315 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Recommend that CCC supports the general approach to site specific site criteria. There is no material conflict with the suggested site criteria CCC has recommend to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review process. The CCC recommends that the following factors are added to the suggested site criteria for completeness: Mineral Safeguarding Areas (SSP DPD Preferred Option SSP7): Mineral Consultation Areas (SSP DPD Preferred Option SSP9): Waste Safeguarding Areas (SSP DPD Preferred Option SSP14): Sustainable Transport Protection Zones (SSP DPD Preferred Option SSP16): Listed buildings: International designations such as SACs.	Noted. These areas are covered by GT12, GT24 and GT26 whereby internationally, nationally and locally recognised designations are protected.	Ensure the wording of the relevant policy/policies make mention of these areas.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19244 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships consider that the Preferred Options DPD ought to identify specific sites, which may be consulted upon at this stage, as in accordance with Circular 01/2006.	The identification of specific sites will be made in the Council's GTDPD Issues & Options Report 2: Site Options. The process SCDC has adopted, outlined in Chapter 1 of this first report, is in accordance with Circular 01/2006 and the LDF preparation and consultation process outlined in PPS12.	None.
18559	Object	Just look at where there's space. They do not need to be on the edges of villages as that's what creates friction with villagers. Perhaps gypsy and travellers should have specialist tutors that could visit sites instead of their children being in and out of schools? What economic reasons could there be? Gypsy and travellers don't tend to work in local businesses, they work for themselves, and can travel from their sites wherever they are.	Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to adopt a flexible approach to finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Therefore, sites must be considered in all areas of the district, including areas within and outside settlement frameworks, rural or semi-rural locations and areas within the Green Belt. Best practice guidance for sustainable development recommends consideration of economic, social and environmental factors when selecting potential sites. Economic factors can include employment areas and ideally sites should be located close to these areas to minimise reliance on private vehicle use. The recommendation for specialist tutors is a matter which is beyond the scope of the GTDPD.	None.
18811 - CPRE 18682 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	The tiered structured approach is an acceptable method of identifying suitable sites, which can then be assessed for implementation using the sequential test outlined in this policy. However, we would add the following criteria: Locally cherished landscape. Biodiversity action plans, species and habitats.	Objection noted. The criteria recommended would fall under "Impact on Valued Areas", which include nationally and locally recognised designations and cover important landscapes and biodiversity.	None.
19259 - Graveley Parish Council	Object	The small village of Graveley has no infrastructure or services, neither post office nor school. There is extremely limited bus service and vehicular access is limited to one road through the village. Therefore Graveley would not be a suitable site.	Objection noted. Circular 01/2006 requires the Council to examine all potential sites within the district for Gypsy/Traveller pitches based on environmental, economic and social criteria.	None.
19354	Object	I think this is a complicated approach.	Objection noted. Circular 01/2006 outlines guidance which requires the Council to examine a set of criteria for identification of sites. The three-tier approach proposed in option GT3 is consistent with this guidance.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19396 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher consider that deliverability issues including initially the availability of Council owned and available sites, unauthorised sites and site development costings should be considered at the outset of the site identification process and not the 3rd Tier. This should ensure that economic impacts including on existing and emerging communities and the delivery of new communities (a key consideration) are fully taken into account. It should ensure the more proactive approach in releasing public sites sought in the Circular is better able to be resolved. The need for a tiered approach in its current form is therefore questioned.	Objection Noted. The three-tier approach proposed by the Council is thought to be the most comprehensive and sustainable approach for identifying sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Gallagher has suggested the Council look at suitable sites in its ownership or other public bodies. SCDC is not a significant land owner and is therefore limited in its options. Nevertheless, the Council has undertaken an initial exercise to investigate potential sites in its ownership but has found no suitable site to date. As part of the site selection process, the Council will approach Public Bodies for potential land which can be made available for Gypsy/Traveller use. However, the Council can not rely solely on this source for sites - it must therefore cast a broad net across the district for possible site locations. The Council is committed to promoting sustainable forms of development as outlined in its Core Strategy. It must therefore apply these same principles of sustainable development not just for conventional development but also to the process of identifying suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. This highlights the importance of the first tier, where potential search areas are identified based on sustainability criteria. As a result, the broad net initially cast results in a more manageable search area based on sustainability criteria. Within these search areas there may be land in the ownership of public bodies or in private ownership, which is when the Council will approach land owners to find a suitable site. Compulsory Purchase is an option, as Gallagher have suggested, however the Council will only use this as a last resort. As part of the site selection process the Council will also examine existing authorised sites, unauthorised sites, and underutilised Council-owned site in terms of their sustainable, suitability and growth potential. However, based on initial consultation with the community, the Council has determined that site size should be no more than 10-15 pitches. This therefore limits the possibility of expanding many existing sites, as Gallagher has recommended as an option worth investigating. The Council believes the proposed approach is consistent with the guidance contained in Circular 01/2006 and as a strategy which has been used in other authorities within the UK, it forms part of a robust strategy for identifying sites to meet the short-term and long-term accommodation needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18735 - Longstowe Parish Council	Support	SCDC should consider all aspects to identify the most suitable sites, within Longstowe we cannot provide any of the points required. There are no work prospects, transport is poor, policing is difficult due to lack of manpower/time, schools are full. Sites should be considered in areas where facilities are more appropriate to the needs of travellers/gypsies.	Support noted. Circular 01/2006 requires the Council to examine all potential sites within the district for Gypsy/Traveller pitches based on environmental, economic and social criteria.	None.
19319 - Swavesey Parish Council	Support	Swavesey Parish Council supports this policy, however, it considers there could be a serious danger of using individual criteria to determine the suitability of a site. This is that, unless the site is viewed holistically the true level of suitability will be determined by a score and fundamental failings will be hidden in the criteria. It is the practical application of each site which must be considered, not individual scores.	Support noted. Circular 01/2006 requires the Council to examine all potential sites within the district for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. The Council believes the proposed approach to be a holistic and robust approach which will take account of all factors and produce a range of potential sites to meet the accommodation needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community.	None.
19102 - Cambourne Parish Council 18860 - Cottenham Parish Council 19190 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19479 - Foxton Parish Council 18703 - Impington Parish Council 18922 - Histon Parish Council 19262 - Cambridge City Council 18602 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19532 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for the proposed three-tier approach as it seems to be comprehensive and consistent with the provisions of ODPM Circular 01/2006 and addresses the key issues need for identifying sites.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT3 be taken forward as the preferred approach as it meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and allows for a comprehensive, flexible approach to finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.

Decision on GT3: Identifying Sites ? Proposed Approach

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.

GT4A: Relationship to Settlements ? Option A

19317 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT4A - Option A as worded. CCC has recommend to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review process that preference be given to the allocation of new Traveller and Gypsy sites in sustainable locations within or adjoining settlements with access to services (e.g. close to shops, schools and doctors). Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" states that sites on the outskirts of built up areas may be appropriate as well as rural or semi rural locations (See paragraph 54).	Agreed.	None.
---------------------------------------	--	---	---------	-------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18734 - Longstowe Parish Council	Object	Object most strongly Site suitability - of the 3 GT4 options, none are applicable to Longstowe as the village cannot provide any of the proposals due to lack of infrastructure and facilities. If one had to be selected then the only possible option would be 4B.	Objection noted. Circular 01/2006 makes it clear that sites in rural or semi-rural areas are acceptable in principle. Therefore, the Council is obligated to consider sites outside settlement frameworks and in the open countryside should it meet the requirements of the Circular and the needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community.	None.
18704 - Impington Parish Council	Object	Impington Parish Council object to this option as it would enable incursion into the green belt.	Objection noted. Circular 01/2006 makes it clear that sites in rural or semi-rural areas are acceptable in principle, including areas within the Green Belt. Therefore, the Council is obligated to consider sites outside settlement frameworks and in the open countryside should it meet the requirements of the Circular and the needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community.	None.
18923 - Histon Parish Council 19057 - Hatley Parish Council	Object	Object to Option GT4A.	Objection to Option GT4A noted. Circular 01/2006 makes it clear that sites in rural or semi-rural areas are acceptable in principle. Therefore, the Council is obligated to consider sites outside settlement frameworks and in the open countryside should it meet the requirements of the Circular and the needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community.	
19480 - Foxton Parish Council 18683 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	Object to GT4A. Would set a double-standard allowing development in the open countryside for Gypsies/Travellers pitches but not for conventional housing, which could lead to tension between both communities and is contrary to Government guidance stating both should be treated equally.	Objection noted. Circular 01/2006 makes it clear that sites in rural or semi-rural areas are acceptable in principle. Therefore, the Council is obligated to consider sites outside settlement frameworks and in the open countryside should it meet the requirements of the Circular and the needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community.	None.
19398 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher generally supports the preferred approach in locating gypsy and traveller pitches outside of settlement frameworks. Circular 01/2006 stipulates that sites on the outskirts of built-up areas may be appropriate. The Circular also states that sites may be acceptable in principle in rural or semi-rural settings with access to local services. This appears to meet expectations of Gypsies and Travellers.	Agreed. 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. GT4C would perhaps therefore be the most appropriate approach.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18560	Support	Settled villagers should not fund improvements to the lifestyles of those who do not contribute to taxes which pay for the basics such as roads, parks. If gypsy and travellers want sites with facilities, they should pay fees to stay on them, covering the cost of litter clearance, road access, electricity and water access etc. If gypsy and travellers contributed a fair proportion few people would begrudge them access to our village amenities.	Similar to conventional forms of residential development, costs and contributions towards basic infrastructure and site facilities/services are generally borne by an applicant/developer, and we expect this to be no different with the Gypsy/Traveller community. Where sites are developed and paid for by Gypsies/Travellers themselves, there will be no fee to stay on them other than the rates required from all homeowners. A rent is likely to be paid where the site is owned and managed by a third party, for example a Housing Association. The payment of council tax is outside the remit of the Local Development Framework and all Development Plan Documents, including those proposing new housing developments. 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/	None.
19103 - cambourne parish Council 18854 - Estate Management and Building Service 18832 - Gamlingay Parish Council 18535 - Meldreth Parish Council 18892 - Over parish council	Support	Support for GT4A whereby sites may be located outside settlement frameworks. The option minimises impacts on existing settlements. Circular 01/2006 states rural settings are acceptable in principle (paragraph 54).	Support noted.	None.
Decision on GT4A: Relationship to Settlements ? Option A				
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.				
GT4B: Relationship to Settlements ? Option B				
19318 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT4B - Option B as worded. CCC has recommend to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review process that preference be given to the allocation of new Traveller and Gypsy sites in sustainable locations within or adjoining settlements with access to services (e.g. close to shops, schools and doctors).	Agreed.	None.
19104 - cambourne parish Council 18561 18705 - Impington Parish Council	Object	Object to GT4B as being too restrictive and there is no justification for having sites close to settlements. The siting of pitches within a settlement could adversely affect existing communities	Objection noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to investigate areas within the district that allow for access to local services and facilities. Circular 01/2006 also refers to the Government's key objective for planning for housing - to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home - and that the Gypsy/Traveller community should have the same rights and responsibilities as other citizens. Suitable sites may therefore be found within, adjoining or outside settlement frameworks.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18732 - Longstowe Parish Council	Support	Site suitability - of the 3 GT4 options, none are applicable to Longstowe as the village cannot provide any of the proposals due to lack of infrastructure and facilities. If one had to be selected then the only possible option would be 4B.	Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to investigate areas within the district that allow for access to local services and facilities. Circular 01/2006 also refers to the Government's key objective for planning for housing - to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home - and that the Gypsy/Traveller community should have the same rights and responsibilities as other citizens. Suitable sites may therefore be found within, adjoining or outside settlement frameworks.	None.
19481 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support for GT4B.	Support noted.	None.
18924 - Histon Parish Council				
19058 - Hatley Parish Council				

Decision on GT4B: Relationship to Settlements ? Option B

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.

GT4C: Relationship to Settlements ? Option C

18492 - Croydon Parish Council		As long as the site is well cared for and users are socially responsible.	It is hoped the provision of sites through the GTDPD, mainly in private ownership, will instil a sense of pride and respect for sites, reducing the problems also perceived on unauthorised encampments.	None.
18956 - David Wilson Estates		Agreed. Sites, if appropriate both within and outside settlement boundaries should be considered.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT4C is taken forward as the preferred approach as it best conforms to the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and allows for the greatest flexibility in searching for suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
18901 - Girton Parish Council		It may be preferable to have gypsies inside, travellers outside.	Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to investigate areas within the district that allow for access to local services and facilities, which can include areas within and outside settlement frameworks. Circular 01/2006 also refers to the Government's key objective for planning for housing - to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, and that the Gypsy/Traveller community have the same rights and responsibilities as other citizens. Suitable sites may therefore be found within, adjoining or outside settlement frameworks. It is recommended that option GT4C is taken forward as it allows SCDC the greatest flexibility in finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19599 - West Wrating Parish Council		A modification of this would be preferred as criteria beyond those within Circular 01/2006 may be appropriate for a specific locality and if so such criterion should be included. Hence "...if the site can meet the requirements of ODPM Circular 01/2006 and all other criterion appropriate for the location under consideration with regard to site location..."	SCDC has proposed in this Issues & Options Report 1 a number of criteria which would be used to identify suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. The three-tier approach proposed would assess potential sites against a series of criteria, which goes beyond the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19355		Which ever is adopted , it has to be fair to the settled community and the travellers the same.	Agreed. SCDC believes option GT4C provides the most flexible and balanced approach to finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and best meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19105 - cambourne parish Council 18925 - Histon Parish Council 19059 - Hatley Parish Council	Object	Object to GT4C. The siting of pitches within a settlement could adversely affect existing communities.	Objections noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to investigate areas within the district that allow for access to local services and facilities. Circular 01/2006 also refers to the Government's key objective for planning for housing - to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, and that the Gypsy/Traveller community have the same rights and responsibilities as other citizens. Suitable sites may therefore be found within, adjoining or outside settlement frameworks. Option GT4C provides SCDC with the greatest flexibility in finding the most suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
18733 - Longstowe Parish Council	Object	Object most strongly. Site suitability - of the 3 GT4 options, none are applicable to Longstowe as the village cannot provide any of the proposals due to lack of infrastructure and facilities. If one had to be selected then the only possible option would be 4B.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT4C is taken forward as it allows SCDC the greatest flexibility in finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to investigate areas within the district that allow for access to local services and facilities, which includes areas within and outside settlement frameworks. Circular 01/2006 also refers to the Government's key objective for planning for housing - to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, and that the Gypsy/Traveller community have the same rights and responsibilities as other citizens. Suitable sites may therefore be found within, adjoining or outside settlement frameworks.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18562	Object	There is no reason why traveller sites need to be close to settlements. They are as able to shop then drive like everyone else.	Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to investigate areas within the district that allow for access to local services and facilities, which can include areas within and outside settlement frameworks. Circular 01/2006 also refers to the Government's key objective for planning for housing - to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, and that the Gypsy/Traveller community have the same rights and responsibilities as other citizens. Suitable sites may therefore be found within, adjoining or outside settlement frameworks. It is recommended that option GT4C is taken forward as it allows SCDC the greatest flexibility in finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
19482 - Foxton Parish Council	Object	It is vital that the Parish Council not only act fairly between the gypsy and traveller community and the settled community but that they are seen to do so. The situation where a site was given planning permission in a community on a plot of land equivalent to one in which a standard development application had been refused would cause a severe breakdown in relations between the two communities.	Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to be flexible in its approach to finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which can be areas within settlements, areas in rural locations and areas in the Green Belt. The Council will wherever possible adopt an equitable approach which satisfies the needs of both the settled community and the Gypsy/Traveller community.	None.
18685 - Steeple Morden Parish Council 18684 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	To ensure equality of treatment for all we would recommend that this option is amended by adding: settlements will only be considered for a site if all affordable housing needs for that settlement have been fulfilled. This includes those people who have local connections that do not currently reside in the settlement. However, they have indicated a desire to live there.	Objection noted. SCDC in its Development Control Policies DPD has set out its strategy for meeting the affordable housing needs of the District by requiring developers to make provision for affordable housing units (HG/3). Gypsies/travellers are by their very nature nomadic and so will not always have local connections. To place such restrictive conditions as recommended could limit the availability of suitable sites and would therefore be contrary to Circular 01/2006.	None.
19320 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT4C - Option C. This Option is consistent with CCC's recommend overarching site selection criteria to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review process that preference be given to the allocation of new Traveller and Gypsy sites in sustainable locations within or adjoining settlements with access to services (e.g. close to shops, schools and doctors). It is also consistent with the degree of flexibility in terms of location outlined in Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 54).	Support noted. SCDC agree that option GT4C provides the greatest flexibility in finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and recommends that it is taken forward as the preferred approach.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19429 - Great Shelford Parish Council 18861 - Cottenham Parish Council 19191 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19323 - Swavesey Parish Council 18707 - Impington Parish Council 19136 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19263 - Cambridge City Council 19583 - FFT Planning 19533 - Peterborough City Council	Support	As wide a range of sites as possible needs to be considered and this seems the best and most flexible option, provided suitability criteria are met. Options GT4A and GT4B are not necessary. Sites outside of settlement frameworks are generally likely to be preferable, but appropriate infill development should not be ruled out.	Support for GT4C noted. SCDC believes Option C provides the most flexible approach in searching for suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, meeting the needs of Circular 01/2006.	Option GT4C be used as the Council's preferred approach.
18580 - Milton Parish Council	Support	We support this however it is important that sites outside the settlement framework be closely monitored by planners to ensure that they don't evolve over time to become permanent building e.g. houses. Otherwise implicitly allowing development outside the settlement framework when the settled community cannot do so will result in resentment and conflict between the communities.	Support noted. SCDC has in the Development Control Policies DPD outlined its strategy for avoiding unnecessary development outside settlement frameworks and is committed to limiting residential development in the countryside. However, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in rural and semi-rural locations.	None.
Decision on GT4C: Relationship to Settlements ? Option C				
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.				
<i>GT5: Flood Risk ? Proposed Approach</i>				
18958 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed and is therefore the reason why it is recommended that option GT5 be taken forward.	None.
18984		Since travellers can move, sites can exist in areas liable to flooding providing that adequate flood warnings can be given to allow sites to be cleared if a flood is highly likely to occur.	Noted, however SCDC wish to limit unnecessary development in areas of flood risk which could result in risks to health and safety along with damage to property. It is therefore recommended that option GT5 is taken forward.	None.
18563	Object	No-one should be living in flood risk zones. Why risk lives? Leave as meadows to do flood plain job.	Agreed.	None.
19321 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT5. The approach is consistent with Structure Plan Policy P1/2 (P6/4) and CCC suggested site selection criteria ix (Flood Risk) to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review.	Support Noted. SCDC's proposed approach is consistent with its approach applied to conventional forms of development, and therefore it is recommended that GT4 be taken forward.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19161 - Comberton Parish Council 19106 - cambourne parish Council 19192 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19483 - Foxton Parish Council 19662 - Ickleton Parish Council 19600 - West Wratting Parish Council 18671 18708 - Impington Parish Council 18926 - Histon Parish Council 19060 - Hatley Parish Council 19137 - East Cambridgehire District Council 19264 - Cambridge City Council 18493 - Croydon Parish Council 18603 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19534 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support option GT5 where SCDC will not permit Gypsy/Traveller pitches on sites prone to flooding or where a risk of flooding has been identified.	Support Noted. SCDC's proposed approach is consistent with its approach applied to conventional forms of development, and therefore it is recommended that GT4 be taken forward.	None.
18862 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council supports this proposal but are concerned with the comment "alleviation and mitigation matters secured by planning conditions or S106" - How will this work in practice? Is it expected that all provision will be 'delivered' and subsequently be rented or sold onto individuals. Therefore there will be a 'developer' to cover these costs?	Early consultation has indicated a preference for privately owned sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Therefore, as with conventional forms of development, if alleviation and mitigation has been identified to address any potential flood risk, the cost of these measures will be the responsibility of the applicant/developer. Planning conditions or Section 106 agreements will be necessary to insure the appropriate implementation of these measures. Management of private sites is beyond the scope of the GTDPD.	None.
Decision on GT5: Flood Risk ? Proposed Approach				
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.				
GT6: Highway Access ? Proposed Approach				
19138 - East Cambridgehire District Council		Whilst supporting this stance, it is known that many country villages are not interlinked with safe footpaths.	SCDC will be flexible in its approach. Where it is not possible to provide safe pedestrian access to a local centre, preference would then be given to sites located within walking distance of a public transport node providing frequent service to a local centre with access to a range of services and amenities.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19525 - Highways Agency		If the location of a proposed site could result in extra movements on the trunk road network, assessment should be conducted in accordance with HA policy to ensure that development would not detrimentally affect the strategic highway network both in terms of safety and capacity.	During the identification of sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the GTDPD, SCDC will seek advice from the Highway Agency on potential sites and their potential impact on the trunk road network. When assessing applications for Gypsy/Traveller, SCDC will continue to seek advice from the Highway Agency and request that highway impact assessments be undertaken by the applicant if deemed necessary.	None.
18494 - Croydon Parish Council		Impact of frequent travel of larger than average vehicles must be taken into consideration, and effect on traffic management.	Agreed.	None.
18636 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		The principle of a safe pedestrian route is sound, but it is very much dependent on what is deemed to be safe and what is not. Further clarification is vital.	The wording of the final policy of the GTDP relating to highway access will outline what would constitute a safe access.	None.
18637 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		14.4 The well intend requirement for a site to be within walking distance of local services via a safe route is effectively negated by the introduction of the word "ideally" to qualify each of these requirements. Surely both requirements need to be mandatory.	The policy must not be overly prescriptive or restrictive as this would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006. A level of flexibility must therefore be accommodated. It may not be always possible to located new Gypsy/Traveller pitches within walking distance of local services and amenities. In these instances, preference would be given to sites located within walking distance of a public transport node providing frequent service to a local centre with access to a range of services and amenities.	None.
19457 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed.	None.
18936 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust		A safe pedestrian route to a local centre is essential to ensure equity of access to local facilities and to enhance social inclusion. We would recommend this is enhanced to a safe pedestrian and cycle route to maximise opportunities for physical activity and accessibility. This would be in keeping with approaches being adopted for new housing developments.	Agreed.	None.
18564	Object	Why should taxpayers fund easy access? By nature gypsies and travellers like to move on. Why over-landscape the area? Having a nice level path is something many settled villagers aren't provided with.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT6 be taken forward. Circular 01/2006 requires that a safe access be provided on sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. The Circular reflects of Government's key objective to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home. The proposed approach is consistent with SCDC's approach for conventional residential development as outlined in the Development Control Policies DPD.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19601 - West Wratting Parish Council	Support	Strict adherence to this and the assessment of standards is essential. A lack of safety at an access may cause death or injury to a totally innocent party using the public highway. Hence safety does not just concern the Gypsy and Traveller community using the highway access but could involve any person on the highway.	Support noted. It is recommended that GT6 be taken forward as it meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for assessing suitability of conventional residential development.	None.
19162 - Comberton Parish Council 19107 - Cambourne Parish Council 18863 - Cottenham Parish Council 19193 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19484 - Foxton Parish Council 18536 - Meldreth Parish Council 18709 - Impington Parish Council 18927 - Histon Parish Council 19061 - Hatley Parish Council 18604 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19535 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for GT6. An adequate safe access should be provided in the interests of health and safety.	Support noted. It is recommended that GT6 be taken forward as it meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for assessing suitability of conventional residential development.	None
19265 - Cambridge City Council	Support	In the interests of health and safety but note that no definition of a safe pedestrian route is given.	Support noted. It is recommended that GT6 be taken forward as it meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for assessing suitability of conventional residential development.	The wording of the final policy will clarify what constitutes a safe pedestrian route.
19322 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT6. The approach is consistent with Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 4 Annex C) and CCC suggested site selection criteria viii (Traffic Movement) to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review.	Support noted. It is recommended that GT6 be taken forward as it meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for assessing suitability of conventional residential development.	None.

Decision on GT6: Highway Access ? Proposed Approach

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.

GT7: Site Safety ? Proposed Approach

19458 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed.	None.
18638 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		Notably, phone and other telecommunications masts are not included in the list. It is imperative that the same standards are applied to traveller encampments as to normal housing.	Noted, however ODPM Circular 01/2006 requires that SCDC to not rule out locations near or adjoining motorways, power lines, landfill sites or railways, which could include phone/telecommunications masts, any more than it does conventional housing.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19602 - West Wrattling Parish Council		This should not be applied with any more rigour to Gypsy and Traveller sites than to the ordinary community. Indeed those in the Gypsy and Traveller community can choose to come to a location or not and hence can decide if they feel they can provide adequate control of their own family to ensure a potentially less safe element (eg. A power line) is avoided. That is as much a parent or adults responsibility as it is a community matter. All our existence has risks, being aware of them and managing them is the safe solution.	As with conventional housing, SCDC will not rule out completely locations near or adjoining motorways, power lines, landfill sites or railways. This is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006. The management of private sites is beyond the scope of the GTDPD	None.
18985		None of the items listed are dangerous provided there is adequate parental supervision. Motorways and railways must be protected by fences, and electricity pylons should not be climbed.	As with conventional housing, SCDC will not rule out completely locations near or adjoining motorways, power lines, landfill sites or railways. This is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18495 - Croydon Parish Council		Many existing private properties suffer from such hazards.	Noted. SCDC would ideally not locate Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the vicinity of these areas, however, Circular 01/2006 requires that these locations not be ruled out in the same way as conventional housing.	None.
18963 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust		Gypsy and Traveller families experience higher than average accident rates associated with their environment. This is a health inequality issue and site safety considerations are paramount.	Agreed.	None.
19584 - FFT Planning		Site safety is an important consideration. It should be noted that noise considerations should be treated differently from those involving bricks and mortar housing in view of the much poorer noise insulation characteristics of caravans and the time spent outside by many travellers. In the past many Traveller sites around the country have been located close to unsuitable land uses and provision for safety has been via high fences producing an unpleasant ghetto-like environment. This must be avoided in the future.	Agreed. SCDC will ideally avoid locating Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the vicinity of these areas. Nevertheless, as with conventional housing, these areas must not be completely ruled out as this would be contrary to Circular 01/2006.	None.
19139 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19266 - Cambridge City Council	Support	In the interests of health and safety and residential amenity. This policy approach reflects that taken for conventional housing, and affords gypsy sites the same protection.	Agreed. It is therefore recommended that option GT7 be taken forward as it best reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and SCDC's approach used for conventional residential development.	None.
19324 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT7. The approach is consistent with Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 5 Annex C) and CCC suggested site selection criteria x (Site Suitability) to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review.	Support noted.	None.
19536 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Site safety is important especially when considering the needs of children.	Agreed.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19163 - Comberton Parish Council 19108 - cambourne parish Council 18864 - Cottenham Parish Council 19194 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19485 - Foxton Parish Council 19664 - Ickleton Parish Council 18565 18710 - Impington Parish Council 18928 - Histon Parish Council 19062 - Hatley Parish Council 18605 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Support	Support for option GT7.	Support noted.	None.
Decision on GT7: Site Safety ? Proposed Approach				
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.				
GT8: Basic Infrastructure ? Proposed Approach				
18986 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust		In addition, infrastructure for IT should also be in place. This relates to opportunities for social inclusion, learning and acquisition of skills.	Noted. Broadband services are available through telecommunication providers and can be easily provided to Gypsy/Traveller sites. This service would be provided at the expense of site owners/developers as with conventional housing.	None.
18537 - Meldreth Parish Council		Meldreth Parish Council believes, from local experience, not only should the infrastructure listed in GT 8 be available but its installation should be a planning condition.	The provision of these services are to be made on sites to be considered by SCDC through planning applications and those sites which are brought forward through the GTDPD.	None.
18639 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		In most cases mains sewerage will not be available, therefore it is essential that ownership and responsibility for the proper regular inspection and maintenance of the on site sewerage disposal facilities is vested in a suitably qualified and equipped organisation that is not dependant on the transitional occupants of the site. Otherwise pollution of adjacent watercourses cannot be prevented with sufficient certainty. Also, there needs to be adequate means to contain the contents of the system in the event of local flooding.	The proposed approach in GT8 is consistent with that used for conventional housing. As with conventional housing, SCDC will seek the same level of compliance when the use of private sewerage facilities are deemed suitable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Conditions will be imposed on planning consents to insure appropriate use and regular maintenance of these systems.	None.
19459 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18902 - Girton Parish Council		Sewage is in a different category from the others. Does either group demand all of these?	The basic infrastructure needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community (water, sewage disposal, electricity) are the same as conventional housing. The proposed approach meets the requirement of Circular 01/2006 that Gypsies/Travellers be given equal access to housing and services as the settled community. It is therefore recommended that option GT8 be taken forward for these reasons.	None.
19109 - cambourne parish Council		Such provision should not be at the expense of local communities.	Noted. SCDC will assess the capacity of local infrastructure as proposed in its three-tier approach to site assessment (see paragraph 5.13).	None.
18640 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	4.17 The implied suggestion that it would be a good idea to put encampments in, or near to wooded areas so that they could take advantage of the timber for heating etc is certainly not a sensible move, because it would place an unjust burden on whoever the trees belong to and could provide a well screened dumping ground for old cars and all of the other bulky rubbish that is also associated with many of the travelling community.	Biomass installations make use of sustainable materials which are purchased through commercial suppliers. The cutting of trees require specialist equipment at a high costs, which would not be financially viable for development of this scale. Therefore the concerns raised by this representation are not justified. SCDC will continue, as it does with conventional housing, promote the use of sustainable technologies.	None.
18566	Object	Suitability of location takes preference to availability of infrastructure.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT8 is taken forward as it reflects the same approach used by SCDC for conventional housing as outlined in the Development Control Policies DPD and is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18686 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	The provision of infrastructure is a matter for the developer (either public or private). They are subject to the normal negotiation through section 106 agreements or contractual arrangements with utility providers.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT8 is taken forward as it reflects the same approach used by SCDC for conventional housing as outlined in the Development Control Policies DPD and is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18833 - Gamlingay Parish Council 19486 - Foxton Parish Council 18711 - Impington Parish Council 18739 - Longstowe Parish Council 18929 - Histon Parish Council 19063 - Hatley Parish Council 19267 - Cambridge City Council 18496 - Croydon Parish Council 18606 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19537 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for GT8 in the interests of health and safety and residential amenity. Infrastructure is a key requirement.	Support noted and it is recommended that GT8 be taken forward as the preferred approach.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19140 - East Cambridgeshire District Council	Support	This policy approach reflects that taken for housing developments, and affords gypsy sites the same level of facilities.	Support noted and it is recommended that option GT8 is taken forward. The proposed approach reflects the same approach used by SCDC for conventional housing and is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18866 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council agrees with this proposal but they have concerns. The infrastructure must be in place and approved by appropriate authorities before occupation. This proposal should also contain reference to the 'quality' of the water supply, sewage disposal etc. The same standards which apply to the settled community should also apply to the Gypsy and Traveller community. Again as stated in GT5 as to how this is to be obtained by planning condition or S106, how will this work in practice? Who will be the developer?	Support noted. Early consultation has indicated a preference for privately owned sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Therefore, as with conventional forms of development, infrastructure is implemented prior to occupation of the development. The cost of connections to basic infrastructure will generally be borne by private land owners/developers. Planning conditions or Section 106 agreements will be necessary to insure the implementation of infrastructure. Management of private sites is outside the remit of the GTDPD.	None.
19325 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT8. The approach is consistent with Structure Plan Policy P1/3.	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT8 be taken forward as SCDC's preferred approach as it is consistent with Circular 01/2006.	None.

Decision on GT8: Basic Infrastructure ? Proposed Approach

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.

GT9: Ground Stability ? Proposed Approach

19460 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT9 be taken forward as it is a similar approach used by SCDC for conventional housing and meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 to provide safe areas for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
18497 - Croydon Parish Council		Or land which is on an incline.	Agreed. Proposals for Gypsy/Traveller pitches on sites which are of poor ground stability, which include those at risk to landslides or similar due to steepness of slope, will not be permitted.	None.
19603 - West Wrating Parish Council		This maybe less of an issue than for conventional housing sites, hence certain marginal sites, not suitable for conventional house may nonetheless provide for certain forms of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.	Support Noted. The Council will generally avoid allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches in areas of poor ground stability. Where ground stability issues arise the Council will assess the appropriateness of the proposal on a case-by-case basis, taking account of all factors including load bearing.	None.
19585 - FFT Planning		This is unobjectionable but of course it should be recognized traveller sites do not impose lower loads on the ground than conventional housing and this should be taken into account when identifying sites. Load bearing criteria will thus have to be different from that adopted for housing.	Support Noted. The Council will generally avoid allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches in areas of poor ground stability. Where ground stability issues arise the Council will assess the appropriateness of the proposal on a case-by-case basis, taking account of all factors including load bearing.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18867 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council support this proposal but again has concerns re comment difficulties 'will be overcome by appropriate alleviation and mitigation measures secured by planning conditions or S106' How will this work in practice? Who is the developer in the case of S106?	Support noted. 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 or Section 106 agreements if deemed to be appropriate. The cost and implementation of such proposals will be the responsibility of the applicant/developer	None.
19141 - East Cambridgeshire District Council	Support	This policy approach reflects that taken for housing developments, and affords gypsy sites the same protection.	Agreed.	None.
19195 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19487 - Foxton Parish Council 18567 18712 - Impington Parish Council 18930 - Histon Parish Council 19066 - Hatley Parish Council 19268 - Cambridge City Council 18607 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19538 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for option GT9 limiting Gypsy/Traveller pitches on land deemed to be unstable for development.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT9 be taken forward as it is a similar approach used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.
19326 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT9. The approach is consistent with Structure Plan Policy P1/3.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT9 be taken forward as it is a similar approach used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.

Decision on GT9: Ground Stability ? Proposed Approach

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.

GT10: Drainage ? Proposed Approach

18498 - Croydon Parish Council		Must not run the risk of overloading drainage capacity of the local area.	Noted. SCDC will consult with statutory bodies to ensure the drainage capacity of a locality is not significantly impacted by Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
19461 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed. As this approach is consistent with that taken by SCDC for conventional housing, it is recommended that option GT10 be carried forward.	None.
18568	Object	They're travellers living in caravans temporarily on these sites. They're not building homes and growing crops.	Objection Noted. The Council treats Gypsy/Traveller housing like any other form of residential development. Therefore, the Council's proposed approach remains to avoid allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches in areas of poor drainage.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19197 - Cottenham Village Design Group	Object	Sustainable drainage systems impose a maintenance burden that is inappropriate for a traveller site. However we do agree that pitches should not be permitted in areas of poor drainage.	Objection Noted. The Council will avoid allocating Gypsy/Traveller pitches in areas of poor drainage. Where mitigation is possible, the Council will fully consider proposals made by an application/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.	None.
18869 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council supports this proposal but has concerns - The infrastructure must be in place and the comment, difficulties overcome by appropriate alleviation and mitigation measures secured by 'planning conditions' or 'S10' How will this work in practice? Who is the developer in the case of S106?	Support Noted. As with other development, proposals for Gypsy/Traveller pitches will be considered through a planning application. Therefore SCDC will consider any mitigation measures an applicant/developer believes could address any problems present on the site, such as poor drainage. The implementation of these measures is secured through planning conditions and/or Section 106 agreements and any cost will be borne by the applicant/developer. This approach is consistent with that taken for conventional housing.	None.
19488 - Foxton Parish Council 18714 - Impington Parish Council 18740 - Longstowe Parish Council 18931 - Histon Parish Council 19067 - Hatley Parish Council 19142 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19269 - Cambridge City Council 18608 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19539 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for option GT10 limiting Gypsy/Traveller pitches in areas of poor drainage in the interests of health and safety, residential amenity, and overall sustainability.	Support Noted. It is recommended that option GT10 be carried forward as it is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for conventional forms of development, as outlined in the Development Control Policies DPD.	None.
19328 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT10. The approach is consistent with Structure Plan Policy P1/3 and P6/4.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT10 be carried forward as it is consistent with SCDC's approach for conventional housing as outlined in the Development Control Policies DPD and is consistent with Structure Plan policies.	None.
19604 - West Wrating Parish Council	Support	Whilst sites exposed to major flood risk should be avoided design and detailing of units might permit use of sites only susceptible to shallow water cover. This might provide sites not suitable for other uses.	Support noted. Generally SCDC will avoid allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches in areas of poor drainage. However proposals for mitigation made by an applicant/developer that could address concerns over poor drainage would be considered. This consistent with the approach used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.

Decision on GT10: Drainage ? Proposed Approach

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT11: Hazardous Installations and Contaminated Land ? Proposed Approach</i>				
19462 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT11 be taken forward as it is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for conventional housing and meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18499 - Croydon Parish Council		No Comments.	None.	None.
19489 - Foxton Parish Council 19605 - West Wrattling Parish Council 18569 18715 - Impington Parish Council 18932 - Histon Parish Council 19069 - Hatley Parish Council 19270 - Cambridge City Council 18609 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19540 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for option GT11 limiting Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the vicinity of hazardous installations and/or contaminated land. No one should be exposed to contaminated land in the interest of health and safety.	Support Noted. The proposed approach conforms to Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach used by SCDC when assessing other forms of conventional development. It is therefore recommended that option GT11 be taken forward.	None.
19331 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT11. The approach is consistent with Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 5 Annex C) and CCC suggested site selection criteria x (Site Suitability) to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT11 be taken forward as it is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for conventional housing and meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18870 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council supports this proposal but with the following concern, difficulties overcome by appropriate alleviation and mitigation measures secured by 'planning conditions' or 'S106' How will this work in practice? Who is the developer in the case of S106?	Support noted. As with other forms of development, proposals for Gypsy/Traveller pitches will generally be considered through the planning application process. Therefore, SCDC will consider any mitigation measures made by an applicant/developer to address any problems present on the site, such as contamination. The implementation of these measures is secured through planning conditions and/or Section 106 agreements and any cost will be borne by the applicant/developer. This approach is consistent with that taken for conventional housing.	None.
19143 - East Cambridgeshire District Council	Support	This policy approach reflects that taken for housing developments, and affords gypsy sites the same protection.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT11 be taken forward as it is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for conventional housing and meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.

Decision on GT11: Hazardous Installations and Contaminated Land ? Proposed Approach

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT12: Protection of Mineral Workings ? Proposed Approach</i>				
18500 - Croydon Parish Council 19463 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT12 be taken forward as it meets the requirements of East of England Regional Spatial Strategy and is consistent with SCDC's approach for conventional housing.	None
18641 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		Potential mineral extraction sites may be designated as such many decades before they are opened up. It is true that it would be impractical in terms of cost to have to remove conventional housing in order to make the site accessible at the appropriate time, but it is very much less of a problem with travellers sites and so it would be perfectly reasonable to put encampments in such places, with suitable legal obligations that would ensure that the site could be vacated in a timely manner.	The Council may, where appropriate, consider granting temporary consents for Gypsy/Traveller sites near protected mineral sites. However, the Council will at this stage avoid allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the vicinity of these protected areas, which is consistent with the Council's other LDF's policies and proposals.	None.
19333 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC support GT12 but request that the District Council add the following factors: Mineral Safeguarding Areas (SSP DPD Preferred Option SSP7); Mineral Consultation Areas (SSP DPD Preferred Option SSP9); Waste Safeguarding Areas (SSP DPD Preferred Option SSP14); Sustainable Transport Protection Zones (SSP DPD Preferred Option SSP16).	This issue has been addressed through the proposed approach in option GT26 (Locally Designated Areas) where areas such as those outlined by the Respondent will be protected.	None.
18871 - Cottenham Parish Council 19490 - Foxton Parish Council 18716 - Impington Parish Council 18933 - Histon Parish Council 19070 - Hatley Parish Council 19144 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 18610 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19541 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for option GT12 whereby mineral workings will be protected against development which might put these resources at risk.	Support Noted. It is recommended that option GT12 be taken forward as it meets the requirements of East of England Regional Spatial Strategy and is consistent with SCDC's approach for conventional housing.	None.

Decision on GT12: Protection of Mineral Workings ? Proposed Approach

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT13A: Sustainability of the Location ? Option A</i>				
19526 - Highways Agency		Both policies GT13A and GT13B accord with ODPM Circular 01/2006 "to create and support sustainable, respectful, and inclusive communities where Gypsies and Travellers have fair access to suitable accommodation, education, health and welfare provision". Those sites with the best links to sustainable transport facilities should be preferred in order to reduce the number of trips generated.	Agreed. It is therefore recommended that both GT13A and GT13B are carried forward as the preferred approach as they best reflect the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18501 - Croydon Parish Council		I suspect travellers prefer an identifiable location and not spread amongst other properties.	Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as this would provide the most flexible approach.	None.
19327 - Swavesey Parish Council 18988 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust 19145 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19542 - Peterborough City Council		Proximity to local centres is important and preference of Gypsy/Traveller community not to be within a settlement will need to be considered. Recommend that a combined option be the approach in which locations within and near settlements be considered as a solution that promotes social inclusion and ensures access to facilities and services. There is no one 'ideal' approach.	Agreed. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as this would provide the most flexible approach.	None.
19464 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed. However, in order to best meet the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and provide for the most flexible approach, it is recommended that a combination of option GT13A and GT13B is reflected in the final policy of the GTDPD.	None.
19336 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT13A - Option A as worded. Recommend that a further Option be introduced such that preference be given to the allocation of new Traveller and Gypsy sites in sustainable locations within or adjoining settlements with access to services (e.g. close to shops, schools and doctors). This Option would be more consistent with the flexibility to site location advocated in Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 54).	Agreed. A combination of options GT13A and GT13B would best reflect the requirement of Circular 01/2006 to adopt a flexible approach and consider all sites, not only in areas adjoining settlements, but also areas within settlements and in rural and semi-rural locations.	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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18687 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	Steeple Morden Parish Council would recommend a new policy: gypsy and traveller pitches would be located either within or close to settled communities that have access to a range of services. These settlements would only be considered for a site if affordable housing needs of the settlement have been fulfilled. This includes those people with local connections, but currently do not reside in the settlement.	<p>Agreed with (1). Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as this would provide the most flexible approach. Disagree with (2). SCDC is committed to meeting the housing needs of all its residents. Government suggests that meeting affordable needs and Gypsy/Traveller accommodation needs are equal in their importance.</p> <p>SCDC has addressed affordable housing needs through policies HG/2, HG/3 and HG/4 of the Development Control Policies DPD whereby proposals for housing developments will only be permitted if they provide an agreed mix of affordable housing types to meet local needs. The level of affordable housing sought by the Council will generally be at least 50% for developments of over 2 units. The Council therefore rejects the recommendation that the suggested stipulation be included into the GTDPD as it would lead to a restrictive policy, contrary to Circular 01/2006.</p>	None.
18570	Object	There is no reason why traveller sites need to be close to settlements. They are as able to shop then drive like everyone else, and my other suggestion about specialist tutors visiting sites to teach gypsy and travellers children if parents are willing to fund. We have to fund our children's education.	Objection noted, however SCDC wishes to promote sustainable forms of development where reliance on private vehicles are reduced. Circular 01/2006 requires that sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches be located within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities. Therefore, it is recommended that the option is carried forward.	None.
18865 - MCA Developments Ltd	Object	Option A is supported in principle however the location of Gypsy and Traveller pitches outside but near to villages would have a disproportionate socio-economic impact upon such a settlement in comparison to that of a larger town or the Cambridge fringe. The location of new travelling communities must be consistent with the spatial strategy of the new Core Strategy, and locations such as Northstowe new town, where the level of community service provision is currently being planned, can respond at an early stage to fully accommodate the needs of such communities.	Objection noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires that SCDC consider sites within settlements, areas adjoining settlements and locations in rural and semi-rural locations. SCDC will ideally locate Gyps/Traveller pitches where a range of services can be easily accessed. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19650 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	Add ", cities" after the word "towns". Also clarify that "outside existing villages" means at least 500m from existing buildings.	Objection noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as this would provide the most flexible approach. It would be contrary to this flexible approach advocated by Circular 01/2006 to place the suggested restriction of 500m.	None.
19606 - West Wrating Parish Council	Object	We believe there should be an Option C. Gypsy and Traveller pitches would ideally be located within or on the edge of towns or villages with access to a range of service	Agreed. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as this would provide the most flexible approach.	None.
19401 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher support the approach included in GT13A that seeks to accommodate sites outside but near to local centres, towns or villages with access to a range of services. Circular 01/2006 states that in deciding where to provide for gypsy and traveller sites consideration local planning authorities should consider locations on or near existing settlements with good access to local services. This is also consistent with the approach adopted in PPS7 which aims to promote development in or next to existing towns and villages. The approach promoted in GT13A is consistent with the preferred approach for Policy GT4A.	Support noted. Circular 01/2006 requires a flexible approach to identifying sites that may not only be in areas adjoining settlements, but also in areas within settlements and in rural and semi-rural locations. Therefore, it is recommended that a combination of GT13A and GT13B is carried forward.	None.
19586 - FFT Planning	Support	The approach to sustainability should be balanced against the potential for site acquisition. In general it is probably desirable that locations are reasonably close to existing settlements but this should not be the sole determinant. Of the three options A would be preferable with the proviso that some suitable sites may not be ideally located in relation to settlements if other indicators are positive.	Support noted. It is proposed that a range of criteria will be used to assess the suitability of potential sites, as demonstrated by the proposed three-tier approach. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as this would provide the most flexible approach.	None.
19198 - Cottenham Village Design Group	Support	Traveller sites generally coexist best with local communities when they are nearby but not immediate neighbours. However, the possibility of infill sites should not be ruled out	Support noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as this would provide the most flexible approach.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18581 - Milton Parish Council	Support	We think both this and GT13B are valid and tie in with our support for GT4C, however we would stress that if GT13A is adopted then our comments about permanent buildings again apply.	Support noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as this would provide the most flexible approach.	None.
19110 - cambourne parish Council 19433 - Great Shelford Parish Council 18872 - Cottenham Parish Council 18717 - Impington Parish Council	Support	Support this option as it provides best access whilst allowing a degree of separation and Gypsy/Traveller community have expressed a preference for living in small groups close to local communities. Traveller sites generally coexist best with local communities when they are nearby but not immediate neighbours - this minimises conflict between the two communities but still allows pitches to be close to the necessary infrastructure. This approach allows possible integration of the communities over time.	Support noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as this would provide the most flexible approach.	None.
18834 - Gamlingay Parish Council 19491 - Foxton Parish Council 18538 - Meldreth Parish Council 18934 - Histon Parish Council	Support	Support of option GT13A where Gypsy/Traveller pitches would ideally be located outside but near to local centres, towns or villages with access to a range of services.	Support noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as this would provide the most flexible approach.	None.
19071 - Hatley Parish Council	Support	Would add qualification that sites should be located such as to avoid conflict with nearby existing sites or to the detriment of the settled community. Please see GTQ2 or GTQ3.	Support noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as this would provide the most flexible approach.	None.

Decision on GT13A: Sustainability of the Location ? Option A

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.

GT13B: Sustainability of the Location ? Option B:

19527 - Highways Agency		Both policies GT13A and GT13B accord with ODPM Circular 01/2006 "to create and support sustainable, respectful, and inclusive communities where Gypsies and Travellers have fair access to suitable accommodation, education, health and welfare provision". Those sites with the best links to sustainable transport facilities should be preferred in order to reduce the number of trips generated.	Agreed. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B are reflected in the GTDPD policy relating to sustainability of location.	None
19329 - Swavesey Parish Council 19543 - Peterborough City Council		Support locations for new sites either outside or within local communities, depending on suitability of site and pressure on local services. A combination of both option A and option B would be suitable.	Agreed. It is recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward as it best reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19465 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed.	None
19651 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	Except for cities which by their nature have a range of features, siting within existing communities would simply be inappropriate. The style of traveller life and permanent village life are different enough that both parties would benefit from remaining separate.	Objection noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires that SCDC consider sites within settlements, areas adjoining settlements and locations in rural and semi-rural locations. SCDC will ideally locate Gyps/Traveller pitches where a range of services can be easily accessed. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is carried forward.	None.
18571	Object	There is no reason why traveller sites need to be close to settlements. They are as able to shop then drive like everyone else, and my other suggestion about specialist tutors visiting sites to teach gypsy and travellers children if parents are willing to fund. We have to fund our children's education.	Objection noted, however SCDC wishes to promote sustainable forms of development where reliance on private vehicles are reduced. Circular 01/2006 requires that sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches be located within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities. Therefore, it is recommended that the option is taken forward.	None.
19337 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT13B - Option B as worded. Recommend that a further Option be introduced such that preference be given to the allocation of new Traveller and Gypsy sites in sustainable locations within or adjoining settlements with access to services (e.g. close to shops, schools and doctors). This Option would be more consistent with the flexibility to site location advocated in Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 54).	Agreed. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B are reflected in the GTDPD policy relating to sustainability of location.	None.
19111 - cambourne parish Council 19200 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18855 - Estate Management and Building Service 19492 - Foxton Parish Council 18718 - Impington Parish Council 18935 - Histon Parish Council 19072 - Hatley Parish Council	Object	Object to GT13B. Difficult to locate a site within a settled community without risk of conflict. Would not allow for easy integration between settled and travelling communities - Gypsy/Traveller community and the settle community generally coexist best when they are not immediate neighbours. The Gypsy/Traveller community has expressed a desire to be located close to local communities and the benefits of local services, but a preference for not being within these communities.	Objection noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in rural and semi-rural locations, but also suitable sites on land within and adjoining settlements. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is taken forward as this would provide the most flexible approach.	None.
19607 - West Wrattling Parish Council	Object	We believe there should be an Option C. Gypsy and Traveller pitches would ideally be located within or on the edge of towns or villages with access to a range of service	Agreed. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B are reflected in the GTDPD policy relating to sustainability of location.	None.
18582 - Milton Parish Council	Support	We think both this and GT13A are valid and tie in with our support for GT4C, however we would stress that if GT13A is adopted then our comments about permanent buildings again apply.	Support noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches not only in suitable areas adjoining settlements, but also areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that a combination of options GT13A and GT13B is taken forward as this would provide the most flexible approach.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Decision on GT13B: Sustainability of the Location ? Option B:				
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.				
<i>GT14: Sustainability of the Location ? Rejected Option</i>				
18719 - Impington Parish Council		Impington Parish Council support the rejection of this option.	Support noted. It is recommended that GT14 not be taken forward and remain a rejected option as it would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19466 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Support noted, however support of this option would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and it is therefore recommended that GT14 remain a rejected option.	None.
18893 - Over parish council	Object	The Parish Council believes this should not be a rejected option because there is conflict when the two communities are close together.	Objection noted, however support of this option would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 requiring 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." The option would also 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.	None.
18987	Object	Whilst GT13A & GT13B would be great in an ideal world, this option should not have been rejected. If conflict can be prevented by the use of this option, then it is still valid.	Objection noted, however support of this option would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 requiring 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." The option would also 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.	
19112 - cambourne parish Council	Object	The siting of pitches remotely makes access to the required infrastructure more difficult, and adds to the separation and isolation of Gypsy and Traveller communities.	Agreed. It is recommended that GT14 remain a rejected option as it is contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19665 - Ickleton Parish Council 19073 - Hatley Parish Council 18502 - Croydon Parish Council	Support	Support for the option. The options should not be overlooked as long as there is no environmental impact on sensitive areas.	Support noted, however support of this option would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 requiring 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." The option would also 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18572	Support	Yes. Experience has shown that neither settled or gypsy and travellers are willing to mix effectively, safe for children in the short time they're at school. Why have them close by each other?	Support noted, however support of this option would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 requiring 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." The option would also 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.	None.
19339 - Cambridgeshire County Council 19201 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19271 - Cambridge City Council 19544 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for rejection of GT14. The rejected approach would have been contrary to CCC's suggested criteria to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review and the Structure Plan. This option should be rejected on grounds of sustainability both environmental and social. Locating sites away from settlements goes against the idea of sustainable inclusive communities.	Support noted. It is recommended that GT14 not be taken forward and remain a rejected option as it would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
Decision on GT14: Sustainability of the Location ? Rejected Option				
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.				
GT15A: Access to Local Amenities ? Option A				
19467 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to search for suitable sites in areas within and adjoining settlement frameworks, along with rural and semi-rural locations. SCDC will ideally allow Gypsy/Traveller pitches to be located where local amenities are easily accessible. It is recommended that option GT15C provides the most flexibility in the search for suitable sites.	None.
19007 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust		We support the ODPM guidance set out in 4.3 stressing the importance of access to education and health facilities, and the importance in promoting inclusion. It would be ideal if sites were located near centres which have these facilities - be this a rural or minor rural centre. Other amenities set out by the BRE which include postal facilities, community facilities and food shops are also very important and are likely to be in place in such centres. We would propose that the wording should be amended to 'via a safe walking and cycling route'.	Agreed.	Ensure that the wording of the GTDPD policy relating to access to local amenities makes reference to walking and/or cycling routes.
19146 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		This option narrows the land search and appears too restrictive.	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT15C is taken forward over option GT15A as it offers the most flexibility in terms of searching for suitable sites in areas where a range of services are available to the Gypsy/Traveller community and best meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18706 - Linton Parish Council		Linton is classed as a minor rural centre and as such should not be considered as a suitable settlement.	Noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to search for suitable sites in areas within and adjoining settlement frameworks, along with rural and semi-rural locations. SCDC will ideally allow Gypsy/Traveller pitches to be located where local amenities are easily accessible. It is recommended that option GT15C provides the most flexibility in the search for suitable sites.	None.
18642 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		The omission of the word 'within 1000m' in relation to Northstowe could be taken as meaning no site would be selected in Northstowe. By making it clear that there is every intention to place traveller sites close to Northstowe means that without clarification of the point undue pressure would be placed on the villages surrounding Northstowe. This would be grossly unfair to people living in those villages.	Circular 01/2006 requires consideration of suitable sites in all areas of the district, including areas within settlements. This is reflected in the Council's proposed approach in option GT13B. Option GT27 proposes an approach whereby the Council would not allow Gypsy/Traveller pitches where undue pressures would be placed on the social and physical infrastructure of the nearest settlement and similarly option GT29 would not allow pitches in areas that would adversely impact on local amenities.	None.
18812 - CPRE	Object	The site selection process should follow 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. Any deviation from this search hierarchy would be inconsistent with the Structure Plan and core LDD. It would lead to unsustainable patterns of development with less suitable locations being brought forward before they are required or necessary.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT15C is carried forward as it best meets the needs of Circular 01/2006, which requires SCDC to consider areas within and adjoining settlements, along with areas in rural and semi-rural locations. GT15C allows for a flexible approach in searching for suitable sites where access to a range of local services is possible and also better reflects the Council's Core Strategy.	None.
19341 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT15A - Option A on the grounds that it is overly restrictive in terms of the settlement hierarchy (i.e. Cambridge, Northstowe, Cambourne, Great Shelford and Stapleford, Histon & Impington, Sawston and Fulbourn only). It would reduce the number of potential sites significantly and encourage greater concentration of pitches in remaining areas placing strain on local services in those areas.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT15C be carried forward as it offers the most flexibility in terms of searching for suitable sites in areas where a range of services are available to the Gypsy/Traveller community.	None.
18688 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	The site selection process should follow 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. Any deviation from this search hierarchy would be inconsistent with the structure plan and core LDD. It would lead to unsustainable patterns of development with less suitable locations being brought forward before they are required or necessary.	Objection noted. SCDC does not propose a deviation from the hierarchical structure outlined in the Core Strategy. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider all areas of the district for suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which can include rural or semi-rural locations. It is recommended that option GT15C would allow for the most flexibility in searching for suitable sites in areas where one can reasonably expect a range of services to be available. This approach would be consistent with the needs of Circular 01/2006 and the Core Strategy settlement hierarchy.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19202 - Cottenham Village Design Group	Object	The January 2006 consultation draft of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document only defines four Rural Centres, so restricting traveller sites to being within 1000m of Cambridge, Northstowe or a Rural Centre is likely to result in far too few pitches.	Objection noted. SCDC recommends that option GT15C is carried forward as it best meets the needs of Circular 01/2006 and allows a more flexible approach to finding areas for Gypsy/Traveller pitches where access to a range of services is available.	None.
19652 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	Delete the reference to Northstowe. Northstowe will not offer a viable town centre for a decade so by definition it falls outside the window of time currently under consideration. Additionally it must be made clear that sites cannot be positioned on land earmarked as Separation between existing villages and Northstowe since this would violate the principle of Separation.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT15A is not taken forward as it could result in the concentration of Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which would be contrary to Circular 01/2006. 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 2021. 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. 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. This approach is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19247 - English Partnerships	Object	Until the Inspector's Report has been published in relation to the Northstowe Area Action Plan Examination, English Partnerships believe that a reference to the town of Northstowe should not be included in this DPD.	Objection noted. It is however recommended that option GT15A is not take forward. It is necessary that Northstowe is reflected in the GTDPD as this is expected to form a significant part of the district's growth.	None.
18886 - MCA Developments Ltd	Object	The Core Strategy identifies a settlement hierarchy which is heavily predicated upon development at Cambridge and Northstowe and the majority of new service provision is planned at these locations. Given the conscious effort of the Examination Inspector to limit further development in the rural area, it logically follows that there needs to be a synergy of policy response in relation to appropriate settlement locations for the travelling community. Accordingly Option A should be revised to include only locations within 1000m of a centre in Cambridge or Northstowe, with reference to the Rural Centres deleted from this option.	Objection noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites not only in areas within or adjoining settlements, but also in rural and semi-rural locations. It is recommended that option GT15C allows for the greatest flexibility in searching for sites and best meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18643 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 18720 - Impington Parish Council	Object	Do not support this option as it is too restrictive and would result in a concentration of sites in one area.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT15C is taken forward over option GT15A as it offers the most flexibility in terms of searching for suitable sites in areas where a range of services are available to the Gypsy/Traveller community and best meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19578 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	Locating pitches on or very near a vast construction site unsuited to meet the specific socio-economic needs of the traveling community is pure wishful thinking on the part of SCDC. What it would amount to is arbitrarily locating pitches on land on the edge of villages near the development site. The unacceptable drawbacks would be that the Longstanton community could be asked to integrate travellers very early on by its own inadequate means, and that SCDC's 3 tiers approach does not discuss any trade-off or how these would be applied or who would pay mitigation cost.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT15A is not taken forward as it could result in the concentration of sites, which would be contrary to Circular 01/2006. Nevertheless, the consideration of Northstowe as a possible location for Gypsy/Traveller pitches is valid. The GTDPD will set out a policy framework for up to 2021 and it can be reasonably assumed that significant advances would have been made to Northstowe during this period. 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. Habitation of potential pitches could take place during the development process, as is the case with conventional housing in Northstowe.	None.
19113 - cambourne parish Council	Object	As the siting of pitches close to the larger settlements although close to the required infrastructure, Gypsy and Traveller communities would find it harder to integrate and there would be greater chance of conflict.	Objection noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider potential sites within or adjoining settlements, along with areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that option GT15C be carried forward as it allows for the most flexible approach in finding suitable sites where there is potential for access to a range of local amenities.	None.
18573	Object	Totally unnecessary.	Objection noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to make provision for sites throughout the district in areas within or adjoining settlements, which may include rural or semi-rural location.	None.
19272 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Such an approach is inconsistent with The Core Strategy approach, which would allow up to 30 dwellings in a minor rural centre and by so doing unnecessarily restricts opportunities for provision in sustainable locations.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT15C be carried forward as it offers the most flexibility in terms of searching for suitable sites in areas where a range of services are available to the Gypsy/Traveller community and best meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18835 - Gamlingay Parish Council 19493 - Foxton Parish Council 18539 - Meldreth Parish Council 18672 18680 18741 - Longstowe Parish Council 19010 18503 - Croydon Parish Council 18611 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Support	Support this approach due to the ability of larger communities to support all the associated issues and facilities required for traveller settlements. Rural centres have more facilities than minor rural centres, they will therefore be better placed to serve any proposed traveller site. Travellers should be able to take advantage of a wide range of local facilities and not be isolated in a rural area. Sites should not be located adjacent to small villages and minor rural centres, as these facilities and support networks and infrastructure requirements are not present.	Support noted. However, it is recommended that option GT15A is not taken forward as it could result in the concentration of Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which would be contrary to Circular 01/2006. It is recommended that option GT15C is taken forward as it 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.	None.

Decision on GT15A: Access to Local Amenities ? Option A

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.

GT15B: Access to Local Amenities ? Option B

19468 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed, however it is recommended that option GT15C be taken forward over option GT15B as it allows for a more flexible approach to finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller use where access to a range of local amenities is available.	None.
18887 - MCA Developments Ltd	Object	The Core Strategy identifies a settlement hierarchy which is heavily predicated upon development at Cambridge and Northstowe and the majority of new service provision is planned at these locations. Given the conscious effort of the Examination Inspector to limit further development in the rural area, it logically follows that there needs to be a synergy of policy response in relation to appropriate settlement locations for the travelling community.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT15C be taken forward as it best meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the settlement hierarchy identified in the Core Strategy. SCDC is required to consider suitable sites not only within and adjoining settlements, but also in rural and semi-rural locations. Ideally, sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would be located within access of a range of local amenities. It is felt that option GT15C allows for the most flexible and reasonable approach to site identification.	None.
19114 - cambourne parish Council	Object	As the siting of pitches close to the larger settlements although close to the required infrastructure, Gypsy and Traveller communities would find it harder to integrate and there would be greater chance of conflict.	Objection noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider potential sites within or adjoining settlements, along with areas in rural and semi-rural locations. It is therefore recommended that option GT15C be carried forward as it allows for the most flexible approach in finding suitable sites where there is potential for access to a range of local amenities.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19343 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT15B - Option B on the grounds that it is overly restrictive in terms of the settlement hierarchy (i.e. it would exclude Group Villages). It would reduce the number of potential sites and encourage greater concentration of pitches in remaining areas placing strain on local services in those areas.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT15B not be taken forward as it would restrict the number of suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and may result in the concentration of pitches near larger settlements in the district, which would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006 for a more flexible approach to site identification. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT15C be taken forward.	None.
18644 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 19203 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18721 - Impington Parish Council	Object	Impington Parish Council do not support this option as it may result in a concentration of sites in one area. Some Group Villages could easily support a small site	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT15B is not be taken forward as it would result in an approach to site selection that is too restrictive and focused on only a small number of settlements within the district. Option 15C would allow greater flexibility in searching for suitable sites within the district where a range of local amenities is expected, therefore meeting the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19653 - Longstanton Parish Council 18574 18673 18742 - Longstowe Parish Council 19012 18612 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Object	Objection to Option B as there are insufficient services/facilities in rural or minor centres.	Objection noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider a range of potentially suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, including those in rural or semi-rural locations. Therefore the consideration of rural or minor centres for new pitches is valid.	None.
19494 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Option A is preferred in principle, but it is accepted that to meet the quota Option B may be needed as a fall back.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT15B not be taken forward. Taking forward option GT15A or GT15B could result in concentration of Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the largest settlements of the district. This concentration would be contrary to the requirement of Circular 01/2006 to consider suitable sites in rural and semi-rural locations. Therefore it is recommended that option GT15C be taken forward as it allows for the most flexible search of suitable sites in areas of the district where it would be expected that a range of local amenities would be available.	None.
19273 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Such an approach is consistent with the Core Strategy approach, which would allow up to 30 dwellings in a minor rural centre and so maximises opportunities for provision in sustainable locations.	Support noted, however option GT15B would restrict search areas within the district and exclude many rural and semi-rural locations. This would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and it is therefore recommended that option GT15C be taken forward as it would allow for a more flexible search of suitable sites in areas where a range of local amenities would be expected.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Decision on GT15B: Access to Local Amenities ? Option B				
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.				
<i>GT15C: Access to Local Amenities ? Option C</i>				
18856 - Estate Management and Building Service		Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centres and better served Group Villages contain many of the services listed in paragraph 4.27 and are sustainable locations for Gypsy and Travellers sites. It is important that sites are not limited to locations in Cambridge, Northstowe and Rural Centres.	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT15C is taken forward as it allows for a flexible approach to allowing sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in areas of the district where it can be reasonably assumed a range of amenities will be available, thereby meeting the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19469 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed.	None.
19654 - Longstanton Parish Council 19495 - Foxton Parish Council 18674 19015 18613 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Object	Object to Option C. There are insufficient services, facilities and infrastructure to support Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	Objection noted. Option C is however consistent with Circular 01/2006 requiring SCDC to consider suitable sites within or adjoining settlements and on land in rural and semi-rural locations.	None.
19115 - cambourne parish Council	Object	As the siting of pitches close to the larger settlements although close to the required infrastructure, Gypsy and Traveller communities would find it harder to integrate and there would be greater chance of conflict.	Objection noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider all areas of the district, including settlements, land adjoining settlements, rural and semi-rural locations. Option GT15C would allow for a flexible search of suitable sites in areas of the district where it can be reasonably assumed that a range of local amenities would be available to the Gypsy/Traveller community and therefore it is recommended that this option is taken forward.	None.
18888 - MCA Developments Ltd	Object	The Core Strategy identifies a settlement hierarchy which is heavily predicated upon development at Cambridge and Northstowe and the majority of new service provision is planned at these locations. Given the conscious effort of the Examination Inspector to limit further development in the rural area, it logically follows that there needs to be a synergy of policy response in relation to appropriate settlement locations for the travelling community.	SCDC does not propose a deviation from the settlement hierarchy identified in the Core Strategy. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites in all areas of the district, which include areas within and adjoining settlements as well as areas in rural and semi-rural locations. GT15C allows for the greatest flexibility in searching for suitable sites in areas where it can be reasonably assumed a range of local amenities will be available, therefore meeting the needs of Circular 01/2006.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18645 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 18722 - Impington Parish Council	Object	The burden needs to be spread across the whole of the community, not just around Cambridge and Northstowe, and therefore the only equitable option is D. Option C may preclude some sites that would otherwise satisfy the criteria.	Objection noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider a range of potential sites, which may include rural and semi-rural locations and therefore agree Option D would provide the widest possible flexibility in finding suitable sites.	That Option D be considered as the Council's proposed approach.
19204 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18937 - Histon Parish Council 19147 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19274 - Cambridge City Council 19545 - Peterborough City Council 19403 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Support for Option C as it allows for greater flexibility in finding sites in or near settlements with access to local services, which is consistent with national guidance. Such an approach is consistent with the Core Strategy approach, which would allow up to 15 dwellings in a Group Village on a brownfield site and so maximises opportunities for provision in sustainable locations. Some Group Villages could easily support a small site.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT15C is taken forward as it best fulfils the requirements of Circular 01/2006 for a flexible search in suitable areas of the district where it can be reasonably assumed that a range of amenities would be available to the Gypsy/Traveller community.	None.
18873 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council supports this option with the following comment. To some extent, the same criteria used to select 'Rural Centres' are the same as those used to assess local amenities in this DPD. Several villages (Cottenham and Willingham) that currently support authorised traveller sites fail these criteria. Equally the comment 'better served Group Villages' this will need to be assessed on a case by case basis.	Support noted. Access to Local Amenities will form part of SCDC's proposed criteria-based three-tier approach to site selection. Potential sites will not be ruled out if they perform below minimum requirements for local amenities if they meet other key requirements which would make that site suitable for Gypsy/Traveller use. It is recommended that option GT15C be taken forward as it allows for a flexible search of the district in areas where it can be reasonably assumed a range of local amenities would be available, thereby meeting the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19345 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT15C - Option C. CCC has recommend overarching site selection criteria to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review process that preference be given to the allocation of new Traveller and Gypsy sites in sustainable locations within or adjoining settlements with access to services (e.g. close to shops, schools and doctors). Option C would retain greater flexibility to assess new pitches both within and outside of settlements in accordance with Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 54).	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT15C be taken forward as it best fulfils the requirements of Circular 01/2006 for a flexible search in suitable locations within or adjoining settlements with access to local amenities.	None.

Decision on GT15C: Access to Local Amenities ? Option C

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT15D: Access to Local Amenities ? Option D</i>				
19608 - West Wrating Parish Council		Option D may not provide a sustainable solution unless all such villages have an appropriate range of services. Para 4.27 - this is a relatively exhaustive list of amenities many of which do not need to be present for day to day requirements and would often only be access on a weekly or less frequent basis.	It is proposed that a minimum number (at least 5) of the listed services are within 1000m via a safe walking route. This is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for conventional housing and the requirements of Circular 01/2006. It is recommended that option GT15C be carried forward as it allows for the most flexible search of localities where it can be reasonably assumed that a range of services are available, meeting the needs of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19350 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT15D - Option D. "Infill villages" typically have a relatively poor range of facilities and services. Therefore, while there may be exceptions, such locations are unlikely to perform well in terms of CCC's recommended preference for new Traveller and Gypsy sites in sustainable locations within or adjoining settlements with access to services (e.g. close to shops, schools and doctors).	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT15C be carried forward as it offers the most flexibility in terms of searching for suitable sites in areas where a range of services are available to the Gypsy/Traveller community and best meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19148 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		This stance is unlikely to be sustainable as small villages would probably not have local shops etc.	Agreed. As there is likely to be a greater range of amenities available in larger settlements, it is recommended that option GT15C is carried forward as this option is flexible enough to meet the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19470 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed, however it is proposed that option GT15C be carried forward as it with narrow the search to localities where a range of local amenities are more likely to be found, whilst also meeting the needs of Circular 01/2006	
18647 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		4.27 Some of the listed requirements are wide open to interpretation and so need to be clarified.	Noted. The final GTDPD document will clearly outline what is meant by each of the services listed.	None.
18903 - Girton Parish Council		What of these does each group demand/need?	Circular 01/2006 requires that sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches be located within reasonable distance of a range of local amenities/services. It is reasonable to assume that the Gypsy/Traveller community require the same services the settled community demand and therefore access to these services should be provided.	None.
18889 - MCA Developments Ltd	Object	The Core Strategy identifies a settlement hierarchy which is heavily predicated upon development at Cambridge and Northstowe and the majority of new service provision is planned at these locations. Given the conscious effort of the Examination Inspector to limit further development in the rural area, it logically follows that there needs to be a synergy of policy response in relation to appropriate settlement locations for the travelling community.	Objection noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider suitable sites in all areas of the district which include areas within and adjoining settlements, along with suitable locations in rural and semi-rural areas.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19655 - Longstanton Parish Council 19496 - Foxton Parish Council 18575 18675 19275 - Cambridge City Council 18504 - Croydon Parish Council 18614 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Object	Object to Option D as there are insufficient services/facilities in smaller settlements. This option should be rejected on grounds of sustainability both environmental and social as many of the smaller villages have few local amenities.	Objection noted. Although option GT15D provides the widest search parameters for finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, it is recommended that option GT15C be carried forward as it is reasonable to assume a wider range of services would be available in these localities whilst being flexible enough to meet the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19116 - cambourne parish Council	Object	As the siting of pitches close to the larger settlements although close to the required infrastructure, Gypsy and Traveller communities would find it harder to integrate and there would be greater chance of conflict.	Objection noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires that SCDC consider suitable areas within and adjoining settlements along with areas in rural and semi-rural locations for potential Gypsy/Traveller use. It is recommended that option GT15C be carried forward as it allows for the most reasonable and flexible search parameters, meeting ODPM guidance.	None.
19587 - FFT Planning	Support	A full range of scenarios will our view be necessary and option D is the most preferable giving the most chance to find sites. Issues of sustainability (based on reducing reliance on private transport) should be realistic in view of the very small impact, relative to bricks and mortar development, on sustainability which site development will involve. Somewhat more than hundred or so pitches is very small in comparison with the 20,000 houses which are planned for the district.	Support noted. Although option GT15D provides the widest search parameters for finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, it is recommended that option GT15C be carried forward as it is reasonable to assume a wider range of services would be available in these localities whilst being flexible enough to meet the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19436 - Great Shelford Parish Council 18646 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 19330 - Swavesey Parish Council 18723 - Impington Parish Council	Support	Support for Option D as the most flexible allowing for the widest possible locations for consideration. Unrealistic to believe all sites needed could be placed within 1000m of Cambridge or Northstowe. Allows for greater distribution of sites throughout the District, consistent with GT2. If all other criteria are met then there is no justifiable reason why any village should be excluded from potential selection.	Support noted. Although option GT15D provides the widest search parameters for finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, it is recommended that option GT15C is taken forward as it is reasonable to assume a wider range of services would be available in these localities whilst being flexible enough to meet the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.

Decision on GT15D: Access to Local Amenities ? Option D

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT16A: Access to Public Transport: Distance ? Option A</i>				
18648 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		The very essence of the way of life of the travelling community is to move around from place to place as and when they choose. Accordingly, regardless of availability of public transport they will more than likely continue to do as they please, when they please and in the manner/speed of their own choosing, public transport being the lowest on their priority list!	SCDC is committed to promoting sustainable forms of transport. By allowing sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches with safe access to frequent public transport will ideally encourage Gypsy/Travellers to make use of this service and reduce their reliance on private vehicles.	None.
19471 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed.	None.
19609 - West Wrattling Parish Council		GT16 and GT17 are poorly defined as one indicates distance but not frequency of service and the other frequency and not distance.	GT16A/B and GT17A/B offer what SCDC believe are the best options available regarding distance and frequency of public transport. SCDC adopted an approach to allow representations to be made separately on each options relating to frequency and distance as it would allow for greater independent views on each option. It is recommended that option GT16A and GT17A be taken forward as they allow for greater flexibility in identifying suitable sites whilst still promoting sustainable locations for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and meeting the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18890 - MCA Developments Ltd	Object	The option as currently worded is too generic in terms of broad location and is not consistent with the settlement priorities of the adopted Core Strategy. Furthermore, 1000m from a public transport node is too far a walking distance to realistically encourage modal shift. Accordingly, the policy should be reworded such that Gypsy and Traveller pitches would 'ideally be located within 400 m (via a safe walking route) of a transport node providing a frequent service to either Northstowe town centre or a Cambridge Local Centre'.	Objection noted, however the suggested changes to the option would result in a policy that would be too restrictive in terms of finding suitable sites within all areas of the district and therefore would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006. The Circular requires SCDC to consider sites not only in larger settlements, but areas within and adjoining all settlements, including rural and semi-rural locations. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT16A is taken forward as it allows for the most flexibility in finding suitable sites with access to public transport, thereby meeting the needs of Circular 01/2006 and the principles of PPG13.	None.
19205 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18724 - Impington Parish Council 18743 - Longstowe Parish Council	Object	Objection to Option A as being the least likely to reduce car travel. Criteria are inconsistent with SCDC's criteria for standard housing. Preference for Option B where sites are within 400m of a public transport node.	Objection noted.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19497 - Foxton Parish Council 18540 - Meldreth Parish Council 18938 - Histon Parish Council 19149 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19276 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Support for Option A in the interest of sustainable development.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT16A is taken forward as it allows the greatest flexibility in searching for suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and is consistent with the principles set out in PPG13.	None.
19356 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT16A. CCC has recommended overarching site selection criteria to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review process that preference be given to new pitches in sustainable locations as well as Structure Plan Policy P1/3.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT16A be carried forward as it is consistent with sustainability principles outlined in PPG14, Structure Plan Policy P1/3 and BRE guidelines.	None.
19405 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher would support the approach promoted by GT16 Option A in relation to the locating of sites within 1000m of a transport node. This approach is consistent with the aims and objectives of national planning policy in relation to sustainable development and guidance contained within the Building Research Establishment (BRE) on sustainable residential development.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT16A be carried forward as it is consistent with sustainability principles outlined in PPG14, Structure Plan Policy P1/3 and BRE guidelines.	None.
18874 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council supports this option with the comment that whilst it might be more desirable to have more immediate access, this would eliminate many other, more suitable locations	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT16A is taken forward as it reflects the principles set out in PPG13 and BRE guidance. This option provides for greater flexibility in searching for suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, whilst also allowing for sustainable forms of development where convenient access to public transport is provided.	None.
19588 - FFT Planning	Support	The approach taken seems excessive and the BRE itself recognises that 20% of developments will not be within 1000m of transport nodes. Again we are concerned that tight criteria developed here will restrict locations for consideration as sites. Other things being equal permission should not be refused because of difficulties in finding a site close to public transport. There may be an argument for different approaches being taken with RSL as opposed to private sites. If preferred option choices have to be made here then GT16A and GT17A give the most flexibility in site location.	Support noted. SCDC wishes to promote sustainable forms of development and convenient access to frequent public transport is essential to this objective. It is recommended that GT16A is taken forward as it reflects the principles set out in PPG13 and allows for greater flexibility in searching for suitable sites compared to GT16B.	None.

Decision on GT16A: Access to Public Transport: Distance ? Option A

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT16B: Access to Public Transport: Distance ? Option B</i>				
19472 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed, however if option GT16B is taken forward it could result in an overly restrictive policy where suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would be excluded if falling outside 400m of a transport node. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT16A is taken forward as it allows for greater flexibility in identifying suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and is consistent with the principles of PPG13.	None.
19610 - West Wrattling Parish Council		GT16 and GT17 are poorly defined as one indicates distance but not frequency of service and the other frequency and not distance.	GT16A/B and GT17A/B offer what SCDC believe are the best options available regarding distance and frequency of public transport. SCDC adopted an approach to allow representations to be made separately on each options relating to frequency and distance as it would allow for greater independent views on each option. It is recommended that option GT16A and GT17A be taken forward as they allow for greater flexibility in identifying suitable sites whilst still promoting sustainable locations for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and meeting the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19357 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT16B - Option B as worded. CCC has recommended overarching site selection criteria to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review process that preference is given to new pitches in sustainable locations as well as Structure Plan Policy P1/3. But, it might be unrealistic to expect new sites to be within 400 metres of a transport node given the degree of flexibility in location advocated by Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 54).	Agreed. Circular 01/2006 advocates flexibility in identifying suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Option GT16B could result in an overly restrictive policy and therefore it is recommended that option GT16A is taken forward as it allows for a wider consideration of potential sites throughout a larger area of the district, thereby meeting the requirements of Circular 01/2006 whilst still being consistent with the principles of sustainable development set out in PPG13.	None
18689 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	Amend the wording: providing a frequent service to and from the nearest town or major rural centre. Bus services in remote rural areas might provide an inward service but fail to allow sufficient time before the return journey.	Objection noted, however the suggested wording would result in an overly restrictive policy that would limit the availability of suitable sites. This would be contrary to the requirement of Circular 01/2006 where SCDC must consider potential sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in all areas of the district, including rural and semi-rural locations. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT16A is taken forward.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19498 - Foxton Parish Council 18939 - Histon Parish Council 19150 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19277 - Cambridge City Council	Object	This policy stance is too restrictive, and unlikely to apply to many proposed sites. The Option GT16A (1000m) is thought to be more appropriate.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT16A is taken forward in favour of option GT16B as it would allow for the greatest flexibility in searching for suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and would be consistent with the principles set out in PPG13. Although option GT16B is consistent with the standards set out by SCDC for conventional housing, it is felt 400m would be too restrictive and therefore be against the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19207 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19332 - Swavesey Parish Council 18836 - Gamlingay Parish Council 18725 - Impington Parish Council 18744 - Longstowe Parish Council 18505 - Croydon Parish Council	Support	Option B most likely to reduce car travel. Both 16B and 17B frequency and distance close to transport nodes are essential to encourage alternative transport options rather than personal vehicle movements. These criteria are consistent with SCDC's criteria for standard housing.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT16A be taken forward in favour of GT16B as this would allow for the greatest flexibility in finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Although option GT16B is consistent with the standards set out by SCDC for conventional housing, it is felt 400m would be too restrictive and therefore be against the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19546 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Option B would ideally be the preferred option, but this may cut provision of possible sites significantly. Sites within 1,000 metres of a transport node should still be considered.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT16A is carried forward in favour of option GT16B as it would provide greater flexibility in finding suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.

Decision on GT16B: Access to Public Transport: Distance ? Option B

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.

GT17A: Access to Public Transport: Frequency ? Option A

19151 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		Is an hourly service really necessary? Many people need a bus to get to work in the morning and then home again in the evening.	Similar to the employment characteristics of the settled community, the employment hours of the Gypsy/Traveller community vary. Access to public transport is required to meet other needs, such as access to shopping, education and health services. Therefore, a frequent public transport service is preferred. It is recommended that option GT17A is taken forward for those reasons.	None.
--	--	---	---	-------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18905 - Girton Parish Council		Is there any hope at all that whatever service is provided it would be significantly used? We need analysis of previous usage to decide a policy here.	The approach proposed in option GT17A is consistent with the principles of sustainable development outlined in PPG13 and reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006. The approach is similar to that taken by SCDC for conventional housing. It would be reasonable to assume that the need for public transport links are just as relevant to the Gypsy/Traveller community as it is for the settled community. 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.scambs.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/Equality/	None.
19473 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed.	None.
19611 - West Wratting Parish Council		GT16 and GT17 are poorly defined as one indicates distance but not frequency of service and the other frequency and not distance.	GT16A/B and GT17A/B offer what SCDC believe are the best options available regarding distance and frequency of public transport. SCDC adopted an approach to allow representations to be made separately on each options relating to frequency and distance as it would allow for greater independent views on each option. It is recommended that option GT16A and GT17A be taken forward as they allow for greater flexibility in identifying suitable sites whilst still promoting sustainable locations for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and meeting the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19206 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19499 - Foxton Parish Council 18726 - Impington Parish Council 18745 - Longstowe Parish Council	Object	Object to Option A as it is inconsistent with SCDC's criteria for standard housing and option is least likely to promote use of public transport. Half hourly service (Option B) preferred.	Objection noted. PPG13 promotes development which is located close to frequent public transport - no specific requirement for frequency or distance is provided for Gypsy/Traveller sites. SCDC will wherever possible apply the same criteria for public transport for Gypsy/Traveller pitches as for conventional residential development identified in its Development Control Policies DPD. However, where a potential site performs well against other criteria identified by SCDC, it may be necessary to allow for some flexibility in the frequency of public transport service available at that site.	None.
19358 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT17A. CCC has recommended overarching site selection criteria to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review process that preference is given to new pitches in sustainable locations as well as Structure Plan Policy P1/3.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT17A is taken forward as it allows for flexibility in possible areas of the district where sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would be suitable whilst still promoting sustainable forms of transport.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19589 - FFT Planning	Support	The approach taken seems excessive and the BRE itself recognises that 20% of developments will not be within 1000m of transport nodes. Again we are concerned that tight criteria developed here will restrict locations for consideration as sites. Other things being equal permission should not be refused because of difficulties in finding a site close to public transport. There may be an argument for different approaches being taken with RSL as opposed to private sites. If preferred option choices have to be made here then GT16A and GT17A give the most flexibility in site location.	BRE standards aim for 80% of a new residential development to be within at least 1000m of a public transport node. It does not imply that 20% of all residential development will not be within 1000m, but that 20% of that particular new residential development will be outside this 1000m limit. BRE awards a score for new residential development depending its distance from that node - i.e. a site that is 500m from public transport node will be awarded a higher score than a site which is within 1000m of a public transport node. SCDC proposed the use of a similar scoring approach in its three-tier approach to site assessment. The fact a site performs poorly against one criteria does not automatically discount it from consideration as it may perform well against a majority of the other criteria. As with SCDC's approach to identifying new sites for conventional residential housing, a minimum threshold will be identified whereby a site will deemed unsuitable or suitable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
19334 - Swavesey Parish Council 18940 - Histon Parish Council 19278 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Support for Option A. An hourly service is all that most villages receive by way of public transport.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT17A be taken forward as it allows for the greatest consideration of potential sites across all areas of the district, including rural and semi-rural locations where half-hourly services are not readily available, therefore meeting the requirement of Circular 01/2006 for a flexible approach to site identification.	None.

Decision on GT17A: Access to Public Transport: Frequency ? Option A

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 transport node providing half hourly service or better to the nearest local centre or town.

GT17B: Access to Public Transport: Frequency ? Option B

19359 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT17B - Option B. CCC has recommended overarching site selection criteria to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review process that preference is given to new pitches in sustainable locations as well as Structure Plan Policy P1/3. But, it might be unrealistic to expect new sites to be located close to a transport node providing a half hourly service of a transport node given the degree of flexibility in location advocated by Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 54).	Agreed. It is recommended that GT17B is not taken forward as GT17A allows for greater flexibility in identifying suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which is consistent with the approach advocated by Circular 01/2006.	None.
---------------------------------------	--	--	---	-------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19474 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed, however it is recommended that option GT17A is taken forward over option GT17B as it would allow for greater flexibility in identifying suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, thereby meeting the requirements of Circular 01/2006 that all areas of the district are considered.	None.
19612 - West Wrating Parish Council		GT16 and GT17 are poorly defined as one indicates distance but not frequency of service and the other frequency and not distance.	GT16A/B and GT17A/B offer what SCDC believe are the best options available regarding distance and frequency of public transport. SCDC adopted an approach to allow representations to be made separately on each options relating to frequency and distance as it would allow for greater independent views on each option. It is recommended that option GT16A and GT17A be taken forward as they allow for greater flexibility in identifying suitable sites whilst still promoting sustainable locations for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and meeting the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18904 - Girton Parish Council		Is there any hope at all that whatever service is provided it would be significantly used? We need analysis of previous usage to decide a policy here.	The approach proposed in option GT17A is consistent with the principles of sustainable development outlined in PPG13 and reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006. The approach is similar to that taken by SCDC for conventional housing. It would be reasonable to assume that the need for public transport links are just as relevant to the Gypsy/Traveller community as it is for the settled community. 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.scambs.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/Equality/	None.
18941 - Histon Parish Council 19152 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19279 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Objection to Option B. Would seem unrealistic in most rural settlements. Such a limitation whilst intrinsically worthy of support may prove too limiting and so reduce the scope for suitable sites to come forward.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT17B is not taken forward as it may result in an overly restrictive policy excluding rural locations of the district, which would be contrary to ODPM guidance. Circular 01/2006 requires flexibility in the identification of potential sites and therefore it is recommended that option GT17A is taken forward as it promotes sustainable modes of transport whilst meeting the requirements of Circular 01/2006 to consider rural and semi-rural locations where half-hourly services are not abundant.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18875 - Cottenham Parish Council 19208 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18837 - Gamlingay Parish Council 19500 - Foxton Parish Council 18541 - Meldreth Parish Council 18727 - Impington Parish Council 18746 - Longstowe Parish Council 18506 - Croydon Parish Council 19547 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support Option B as it is most likely to promote use of public transport and rely less on private vehicles. Site should not be discounted because public transport only runs hourly. Criteria is consistent with SCDC criteria for standard housing.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT17B is not taken forward as it may result in an overly restrictive policy excluding rural locations of the district and could result in the concentration of Gypsy/Traveller pitches in areas of the district where frequent public transport is more readily available. This would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 requiring SCDC to adopt a flexible approach to site identification where all areas of the district are considered. It is therefore recommended that option GT17A is taken forward as it promotes the principles of PPG13 promoting sustainable modes of transport and meets the requirement of Circular 01/2006 to consider rural and semi-rural locations, where half-hourly services may not abundant.	None.
Decision on GT17B: Access to Public Transport: Frequency ? Option B				
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 transport node providing half hourly service or better to the nearest local centre or town.				
<i>GT18: Re-use of Brownfield Sites ? Proposed Approach</i>				
19639 - Natural England 18507 - Croydon Parish Council		Some brownfield sites may have developed wildlife interest, and this aspect should be assessed on a site-by-site basis, and mitigation provided as appropriate.	As with proposals for conventional forms of development where evidence of biodiversity exist the Council will request that the appropriate studies are undertaken to assess any potential impact on species present on the site.	None.
19590 - FFT Planning		Whilst Brownfield sites should be included within locations that might be suitable for sites we are concerned that prioritising them in this fashion runs counter to 01/2006 which merely says that such sites may be suitable in some cases. 20,000 houses are being built in the district - presumably on Greenfield sites. A Brownfield site is merely a bonus in planning terms.	Agreed.	None.
19117 - cambourne parish Council		Where they do not conflict with existing Community needs.	Noted.	None.
19475 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed and therefore it is recommended that option GT18 is taken forward.	None.
19016		This could conflict with contaminated land policy.	Sites will only be considered where contamination issues can be addressed. It is recommended that option GT18 be taken forward as it is consistent with SCDC's policies for conventional housing outlined in the Development Control Policies DPD. Brownfield sites will therefore only be suitable options for development if they are in sustainable locations. It also meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 for a flexible approach to identifying suitable sites.	Clarify that brownfield sites will only be suitable options for development if they are in sustainable locations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19613 - West Wrattling Parish Council		This is not strong enough. The policy should point to the use of Brownfield sites only, other than in exceptional circumstances.	The Council will encourage, where suitable, the re-use of previously developed (brownfield) sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. This approach is consistent with the advice provided in Circular 01/2006 and it is therefore recommended that option GT18 is taken forward. It would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 to restrict all Gypsy/Traveller pitches to brownfield sites only. ODPM guidance requires SCDC to consider all areas, which may include greenfield sites.	None.
18576	Object	Usually too close to settlements e.g. Cowley Road park and ride site - very unsuitable and unfair for locals.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT18 is taken forward. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider all potential sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which include areas adjoining settlements. Circular 01/2006 also advocates the consideration of previously developed (brownfield) land.	None.
18891 - MCA Developments Ltd	Support	The reuse of brownfield sites as a suitable location for the siting of Gypsy and Traveller pitches is supported in principle. Such sites can be found proximate in, or adjacent to, the new town of Northstowe and at the Cambridge Urban Fringe, which is compatible both with the settlement hierarchy and the currently adopted spatial strategy for the settled community.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT18 be taken forward as it is consistent with Circular 01/2006 which advocates the consideration of previously developed land for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
19360 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT18. The approach is consistent with Structure Plan policy P1/1 and P5/2.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT18 be taken forward as it is consistent with SCDC's policies for conventional housing outlined in the Development Control Policies DPD. Brownfield sites will therefore only be suitable options for development if they are in sustainable locations. It also meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 which advocates the use of previously developed land for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	Clarify that brownfield sites will only be suitable options for development if they are in sustainable locations.
18876 - Cottenham Parish Council 19501 - Foxton Parish Council 18728 - Impington Parish Council 18747 - Longstowe Parish Council 18942 - Histon Parish Council 19074 - Hatley Parish Council 19280 - Cambridge City Council 19548 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support option GT18 where the re-use of brownfield sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches will be encouraged.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT18 be taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006 to for a flexible approach to identifying potential sites, where all suitable sites within the district are considered.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19209 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19153 - East Cambridgeshire District Council	Support	Support for option GT18 as it is standard planning policy and reflects the approach taken for other housing developments.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT18 be taken forward as it is consistent with SCDC's policies for conventional housing outlined in the Development Control Policies DPD. Brownfield sites will therefore only be suitable options for development if they are in sustainable locations. It also meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 which advocates the use of previously developed land for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	Clarify that brownfield sites will only be suitable options for development if they are in sustainable locations.

Decision on GT18: Re-use of Brownfield Sites ? Proposed Approach

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.

GT19: Major New Developments ? Proposed Approach

18649 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		The stated option is open to interpretation and possible abuse and therefore needs to be clarified. We would support such a requirement if it meant that if it was judged that an encampment needs to be provided to support a new development, then this provision shall be placed wholly within the development and not be an added, unfair burden on the adjoining community.	Noted. It is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward. 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.	None.
---	--	--	--	-------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19154 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		The term 'major' needs further definition.	Noted.	Ensure the relevant GTDPD policy provides further clarification as to what would constitute a 'major' new development.
19410 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	It is inappropriate for any preference to be indicated for major development sites in light of the intention to adopt a criteria based approach and the evidence in support of provision being ideally located outside centres. It is important also that just as sites for pitches should show respect for neighbouring uses, settled communities and their amenities, very careful consideration should also be given to the impact on emerging communities in new developments needing to be brought forward.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward. 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18508 - Croydon Parish Council	Object	Why?	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward. 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.	None.
18868 - Estate Management and Building Service	Object	Land between Madingley and Huntingdon Roads is being released from the Green Belt as an exception to provide for the needs of the University of Cambridge, including affordable, key worker housing for University and College staff. The development of this housing will satisfy the requirement for the provision of affordable housing at the site and other types of affordable housing are not required. Market housing is proposed in the development mix in order to make the development viable. The provision of Gypsy/Traveller pitches should not be considered here either as part of the affordable or market housing provision.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward. 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. SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to consider all areas of the district that could reasonably accommodate a site for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. It can be reasonably assumed, subject to fulfilling other suitability and sustainability criteria, that sites within major new development would be appropriate for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18577	Object	There is no reason why traveller sites need to be close to settlements. They are as able to shop then drive like everyone else.	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. SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to consider all areas of the district that could reasonably accommodate a site for Gypsy/Traveller pitches - this includes areas within and adjoining settlements. The Council is committed to sustainable development where there is less reliance on private vehicles. Therefore, sites should be located within convenient access of local services/amenities. It can be reasonably assumed, subject to fulfilling other suitability and sustainability criteria, that sites within major new development would be appropriate for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
19656 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	Providing such sites for major new developments only makes sense where those developments will be able to provide the required facilities within the required timescale. Northstowe will not be able to achieve that requirement.	Objection noted, however it is proposed that option GT19 is taken forward because 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. This approach is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006. The GTDPD would set the policy framework for up to 2021 and it can be reasonably assumed that significant advances would have been made to Northstow by that time.	None.
18813 - CPRE	Object	Major new developments should be considered as they should become highly sustainable locations in the future. In such a dispersed settlement pattern as South Cams, they are rightly close to the top of the sustainability hierarchy.	Agreed.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18962 - David Wilson Estates	Object	Disagree - there are no examples, advocated by the travelling community, local authorities or Central government of where this approach has been adopted as good practice. Focussing provision to within major development proposals ignores the needs of the gypsy and traveller communities which are of paramount importance when considering how to address any identified need.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward. 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19075 - Hatley Parish Council	Object	The options 19 and 20 are the two extremes. Given this choice we opt for gt20. However there are intermediate options.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward. 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. Circular 01/2006 requires that SCDC to consider all suitable sites which could reasonably meet the housing needs of Gypsy/Traveller pitches. It is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward as it better reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18877 - Cottenham Parish Council 19281 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Support the approach however clarification required on what constitutes 'major' new development (number of houses).	Support Noted. The Council would assess the opportunity/feasibility for new Gypsy/Traveller sites against the proposed three-tier site assessment approach outlined in GT46. Circular 01/2006 suggests, like affordable housing, provision should be made within new major developments allowing for improved access to local services and infrastructure promoting more sustainable development. This could for example include the major new settlements proposed in the LDF.	Ensure the relevant GTDPD policy provides further clarification as to what would constitute a 'major' new development.
18583 - Milton Parish Council	Support	We support GT19 and SCDC's rejection of GT20. GT19 makes good sense and we would suggest that a condition of planning be that the pitches be the first part of the development to be completed by developers to avoid later conflicts.	Support noted and it is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward. 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19361 - Cambridgeshire County Council 18542 - Meldreth Parish Council 18690 - Steeple Morden Parish Council 19591 - FFT Planning	Support	Support the proposed approach GT19 of considering the provision of new Gypsy/Traveller pitches at major new developments. Approach would provide sustainable locations close to the local community and services and create the opportunity to design-in Gypsy/Traveller sites creating suitable access, screening, etc. Like affordable housing, provision must be made to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsy/Traveller within major new developments. Circular 01/2006 advocates the consideration of such sites to meet Gypsy/Traveller accommodation needs.	Support Noted. It is recommended that option GT19 be taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19502 - Foxton Parish Council 18894 - Over parish council 18729 - Impington Parish Council 18748 - Longstowe Parish Council 18943 - Histon Parish Council	Support	Support for option G19.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT19 be taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19133 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Support	The Travelling Community comprises the biggest minority ethnic group in South Cambridgeshire and as such, their particular accommodation needs should be taken into account when planning new developments.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward. 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.	None.
19549 - Peterborough City Council	Support	The use of the word "considered" may not be strong enough.	At this stage SDCD will be assessing the appropriateness of all areas in the district for their suitability to accommodate Gypsy/Traveller pitches. It is therefore felt the term 'considered' is appropriate.	None.
19210 - Cottenham Village Design Group	Support	Major new developments have the capability to design-in traveller sites from the outset, e.g. by providing suitable access, services and screening.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward. 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. This approach is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.

Decision on GT19: Major New Developments ? Proposed Approach

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT20: Major New Developments ? Rejected Option</i>			
18730 - Impington Parish Council	Impington Parish Council agree with the rejection of this option.	Noted and it is recommended that option GT20 remain a rejection option as it would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19363 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT20. CCC has recommend to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review process that preference be given to the allocation of new Traveller and Gypsy sites in sustainable locations within or adjoining settlements with access to services (e.g. close to shops, schools and doctors). This Option would prevent any consideration being given to the potential suitability or otherwise of new pitches in major new development areas. New development areas are one option to be considered alongside other location options.	Agreed and it is recommended that GT20 remain a rejected option as the option would reduce the scope for suitable sites to come forward and therefore would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19440 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	it is inappropriate for any preference to be indicated for major development sites in light of the intention to adopt a criteria based approach and the evidence in support of provision being ideally located outside centres. It is important also that just as sites for pitches should show respect for neighbouring uses, settled communities and their amenities, very careful consideration should also be given to the impact on emerging communities in new developments needing to be brought forward.	It is recommended that option GT20 remain a rejected option. 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. The introduction of a Gypsy/Traveller pitches at the development stage of a major new development would allow for these 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, safe and convenient access local services/facilities. Circular 01/2006 requires that SCDC to consider all suitable sites which could reasonably meet the housing needs of Gypsy/Traveller pitches, including areas within, adjoining settlements and rural and semi-rural locations - major new developments would be one of the many potential areas where suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches could be found. Potential sites in major new development would only be allowed where they perform well against sustainability and suitability criteria outlined in the Council's proposed three-tier approach. This approach is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006 to consider all areas of the district.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19027 - David Wilson Estates	This approach enables gypsy and traveller provision to be secured in relation to need, part of which is a locational need for accommodation, rather than to prescribe to a particular part of the local community where they should locate to.	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. It is therefore recommended that option GT20 remain rejected and that option GT19 is taken forward as it is consistent with this requirement. Potential sites in major new development would only be allowed where they perform well against sustainability and suitability criteria outlined in the Council's proposed three-tier approach.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18917 - Marshall Group of Companies	Object	The urban extensions to Cambridge must meet the very high standards required to ensure they are pleasing, vibrant additions to the historic city, in community and physical terms. Dense urban form is already set as a requirement. Gypsy/traveller sites are fundamentally incompatible with the establishment of a new community in the type of urban extension being brought forward around Cambridge. Separation of 1,000 metres or more, which is essential, cannot be achieved. Citizens who generally adhere to accepted and acceptable behaviour patterns will not buy homes anywhere near gypsy/traveller sites, when choice is available.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT20 remain a rejected option. 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. The introduction of a Gypsy/Traveller pitches at the development stage of a major new development would allow for these 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, safe and convenient access local services/facilities. There is no evidence to suggest that a well designed and managed site would have an adverse impact on the "modern, high quality, vibrant and attractive" objectives of major new developments. Circular 01/2006 requires that SCDC to consider all suitable sites which could reasonably meet the housing needs of Gypsy/Traveller pitches. The suggested 1000m separation would be contrary to Circular 01/2006, which requires SCDC to consider suitable sites in areas within and adjoining settlements. Therefore GT20 should not be taken forward as it would be contrary to ODPM guidance.	None.
19076 - Hatley Parish Council	Support	The options 19 and 20 are the two extremes. Given this choice we opt for GT20. However there are intermediate options.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT20 remain rejected. 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. Circular 01/2006 requires that SCDC to consider all suitable sites which could reasonably meet the housing needs of Gypsy/Traveller pitches. It is recommended that option GT19 is taken forward as it better reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19211 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19667 - Ickleton Parish Council 18584 - Milton Parish Council 19282 - Cambridge City Council 19550 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for rejection of this option. Option would reduce the scope for suitable sites to come forward. Implementation of Gypsy/Traveller sites at the first stage of major new developments would help to ease tensions.	Support Noted. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider all areas of the district for suitable sites capable of supporting Gypsy/Traveller pitches. It is recommended that option GT20 remain rejected as it is inconsistent with ODMP guidance.	None.
Decision on GT20: Major New Developments ? Rejected Option				
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.				
<i>GT21: Green Belt ? Proposed Approach</i>				
19156 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		Perhaps this policy area should be expanded to include more of the ODPM text - after exceptional circumstance insert after all alternatives have been fully exhausted".	Agreed.	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."
19365 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC reiterate the comment provided to EERA. This stated that, "New Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Green Belt are normally inappropriate development. Alternatives should be explored before Green Belt locations are considered. An exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt could be considered for allocated sites within the Green Belt to meet specific and identified needs for a Gypsy and Traveller site as part of the plan making process."	Noted. Although the Council maintains that the Green Belt is a location where in principle development is not permitted, SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to consider Green Belt locations for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in very exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward.	None.
19438 - Great Shelford Parish Council		There is considerable pressure on the green belt in S. Cambs and therefore while we in principle favour option GT21 more clarification needs to be given as to what makes a site suitable and sustainable.	This report has identified a number of criteria which would form part of the Council's proposed three-tier approach to site identification and assessment. The GTDPD will clearly identify what criteria would need to be fulfilled for a proposed site to be deemed suitable and sustainable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
18651 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Every effort must be made to preserve the Cambridge Green Belt and therefore there it is more than likely that once one encampment has been allowed in the green belt others will quickly seize the opportunity to use this to justify more and more until by default it becomes accepted as the norm. GT 21 sows the seed that could lead to this and we are therefore most strongly opposed to this and think that GT 22, strengthened by the omission of the word "generally" is the only sustainable choice.	Objection noted, however SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to consider locations in the Green Belt for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in very exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. It is therefore recommended that option GT21 is taken forward. The Council maintains the principle that development in the Green Belt is generally not appropriate. Where consideration must be given for a site within the Green Belt, this will be done on a case-by-case basis and each proposal determined on its merits, not by any precedent set through a previous consent for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18585 - Milton Parish Council	Object	We support GT22 and SCDC's rejection of GT23 but object to GT21. Development of sites in the Green Belt has already been a problem in the parish of Milton. Moreover allowing development for travellers in the Green Belt when development by the settled community in the Green Belt is very difficult will lead to resentment and hence conflict between the communities. In fact we would like GT22 to be strengthened to remove the word "generally".	Objection noted. The Council maintains that the Green Belt is a location where in principle development is not appropriate, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the Green Belt in very exceptional circumstances where all other reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward.	None.
18691 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	Sites of the gypsy and travellers should be provided in the area action plans. However, if this proves insufficient then a joint review of greenbelt boundaries should be instigated with Cambridge city council. The provision of pitches the gypsy and travellers is accepted as part of the future housing requirements for the district and therefore should be incorporated where possible in the current proposals.	Objection noted. The Council maintains that the Green Belt is a location where in principle development is not appropriate, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the Green Belt in very exceptional circumstances where all other reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward.	None.
18814 - CPRE	Object	Sites of the gypsies and travellers should be provided in the area action plans. The provision of pitches for gypsies and travellers is accepted as part of the future housing requirements for the district and therefore should be incorporated where possible in the current proposals.	Objection noted. The Council maintains that the Green Belt is a location where in principle development is not appropriate, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the Green Belt in very exceptional circumstances where all other reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward.	None.
18770 - Impington Parish Council	Object	Impington Parish Council reject this approach. The green belt around Cambridge and its necklace villages is key to their amenity and the setting. It is what keeps at bay the urban sprawl. If settled dwellings are prevented from being developed in the green belt then traveller sites must also be prohibited.	Objection noted. The Council maintains that the Green Belt is a location where in principle development is not appropriate, however Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the Green Belt in very exceptional circumstances where all other reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward.	None.
19164 - Comberton Parish Council 19118 - cambourne parish Council 19657 - Longstanton Parish Council 19212 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19503 - Foxton Parish Council 18578 18749 - Longstowe Parish Council 19017 19077 - Hatley Parish Council 18509 - Croydon Parish Council 18615 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Object	Object to option GT21. The Green Belt must be protect against any forms of development. No exception should be made for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	Objections noted. Although the Council maintains the Green Belt is a location where in principle development is not permitted, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances where all other reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19614 - West Wratting Parish Council	Object	This is inappropriate. If a site cannot be provided where minerals might at some future time be worked (GT12) it shows and intended permanency to the Gypsy and Traveller accommodation as it cannot then be moved to allows for the future mineral working if required. Hence it would be wrong to put permanent residential accommodation for the Gypsy and Traveller community in Green Belt, as it is wrong in policy terms to build housing estates in Green Belt. Hence GT22 is the only reasonable option to select.	Objection noted. 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. Therefore it is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward.	None.
19413 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher would recommend the adoption of the approach outlined in GT21 as a preferred policy. The allocation of sites within the Green Belt if they conform to suitability and sustainability criteria is consistent with national planning advice contained within Circular 01/2006 and PPG2. As stated in paragraph 4.41 it may be reasonable to consider whether limited Green Belt release on sites around Cambridge and other Rural Centres would be a sustainable option.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT21 is carried forward as it meets the requirement of Circular 01/2006 whereby in exceptional circumstances sites within the Green Belt can be considered for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
19592 - FFT Planning	Support	FFT is of view that in many districts, like South Cambridgeshire that Green belt does have to be considered for development for limited number of Traveller sites to meet demand where most land is Green belt. GT21 seems to be a reasonable option balancing the needs of Travellers and of protecting Green belt, however where there is no other option then Green Belt in our view will have to be considered as a suitable location.	Support noted. It is proposed that option GT21 is taken forward as it meets the requirement of Circular 01/2006 to consider Green Belt land for the siting of Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
19551 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for the proposed approach.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward as it meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18878 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council agree in principal to this proposal, but 'very exceptional circumstances' needs amplification to avoid future legal arguments.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward as it meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006. It is proposed that the GTDPD Green Belt policy is expanded to emphasises only in very exceptional circumstances, when all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted, will a site in the Green Belt be considered for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	Ensure that the final policy amplifies what would constitute 'very exceptional circumstances'.
19338 - Swavesey Parish Council	Support	Of the three options, Swavesey Parish Council would support GT21 to give as wide a choice of sites as possible. However use of green belt land is generally opposed and the Council would wish to see replacement greenbelt land provided if land is taken for Traveller sites, particularly around Rural Centres.	Support Noted. 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. Therefore it is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18989 - David Wilson Estates	Support	Agree. In view of the need to assess a persons' locational need for accommodation, a Green Belt location may be the necessary result.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT21 is carried forward as it meets the requirement of Circular 01/2006 whereby in exceptional circumstances sites within the Green Belt can be considered for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
18838 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	Gamlingay Parish Council support the use of sites within the green belt, especially if they are in proximity to Cambridge, with regard to support services identified in comments relating to GT15A, GT16B and GT17B, so long as the sites are not specially protected landscape sites.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward as it is consistent with Circular 01/2006 requiring SCDC to consider sites within the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances.	None.
18676	Support	So long as there are suitable services available.	Support noted. Although the Council maintains that the Green Belt is a location where in principle development is not appropriate, SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to consider Green Belt locations for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in very exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. In such a scenario, preference would be given to site options in the Green Belt located close to Cambridge, Northstowe or a Rural Centre where a range of services/facilities is available. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward.	None.
18944 - Histon Parish Council	Support	Histon Parish Council only support this approach because it defines exceptional circumstances i.e. specific / tight guide lines.	Support noted. Although the Council maintains that the Green Belt is a location where in principle development is not permitted, SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to consider Green Belt locations for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in very exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward.	None.
19283 - Cambridge City Council	Support	This approach would be consistent with ODPM Circular 01/2006 but it does not go far enough, as there is a missing reasonable alternative.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT21 is taken forward and it is proposed that the GTDPD policy reflects Circular 01/2006 advice that only in exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted will a site in the Green Belt be considered for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.

Decision on GT21: Green Belt ? Proposed Approach

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT22: Green Belt ? Alternative Option</i>				
19165 - Comberton Parish Council 18906 - Girton Parish Council 19019		Support option GT22 whereby the Green Belt would be protected against Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	Noted, however it is recommended that option GT22 not be taken forward as this would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006. SCDC is required to consider potential areas of the Green Belt for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in very exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted.	None.
19367 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT22. Such an approach does not accord with CCC's response to EERA (see response to GT21)	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT22 not be taken forward as this would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006.2. SCDC is required to consider potential areas of the Green Belt for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in very exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted.	None
19658 - Longstanton Parish Council 18946 - Histon Parish Council 18616 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Object	Green Belt should not be used for any development. Recommend the removal of the word 'generally' from GT22.	Objections Noted. It is recommended that option GT22 not be taken forward as it would be contrary to the requirement of Circular 01/2006 to consider sites within the Green Belt for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in very exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. Removal of 'generally' from option GT22 is therefore not required.	None.
19285 - Cambridge City Council 19552 - Peterborough City Council 18990 - David Wilson Estates	Object	Object to option GT22 where the Council will generally not allow Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the Green Belt. The approach would not be consistent with Circular 01/2006. Option GT21 is more prescriptive.	Objection noted. The Council acknowledges the importance of the Green Belt and remains committed to the principle of limiting development in the Green Belt. However, SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to explore all options for Gypsy/Traveller sites, including the Green Belt. It is therefore recommended that GT21 remain the preferred approach where only in very exceptional circumstances will sites in the Green Belt be considered for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Removal of the word 'generally' is not considered an issue as option GT22 is recommended not to be taken forward.	None
19119 - cambourne parish Council 18652 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 18586 - Milton Parish Council 19615 - West Wratting Parish Council 18771 - Impington Parish Council 18510 - Croydon Parish Council	Support	Support for option GT22 where Gypsy/Traveller pitches would generally not be permitted in the Green Belt. The settled community and the Gypsy/Traveller community should be treated equally. If Gypsy/Traveller pitches cannot be permitted in areas of mineral workings, then they should also not be permitted in the Green Belt. Recommendation that the word 'generally' be removed from the option to express the need to limit all development in the Green Belt.	Support Noted. The Council acknowledges the importance of the Green Belt and remains committed to the principle of limiting development in the Green Belt. However, SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to explore all options for Gypsy/Traveller sites, including the Green Belt. It is therefore recommended that GT21 remain the preferred approach where only in very exceptional circumstances will sites in the Green Belt be considered for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Removal of the word 'generally' is not considered an issue as option GT22 is recommended not to be taken forward.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18879 - Cottenham Parish Council 19213 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19504 - Foxton Parish Council 19668 - Ickleton Parish Council 18899 - Over parish council 18750 - Longstowe Parish Council 19078 - Hatley Parish Council	Support	Support this approach not allowing Gypsy/Traveller sites in the Green Belt. The Green Belt must be protected against development.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT22 not be taken forward as this would be contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006. SCDC is required to consider potential areas of the Green Belt for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in very exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted.	None.

Decision on GT22: Green Belt ? Alternative Option

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.

GT23: Green Belt ? Rejected Option

18772 - Impington Parish Council		Impington Parish Council support the rejection of this option.	Agreed.	None.
19286 - Cambridge City Council 18511 - Croydon Parish Council 18991 - David Wilson Estates	Object	Object to the Council's decision to reject an option which would generally accept Gypsy/Traveller pitches in the Green Belt.	Objection Noted. Circular 01/2002 states the Green Belt can accommodate new Gypsy/Traveller pitches in exceptional circumstances when all other reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. The Council remains committed to limiting unnecessary development within the Green Belt however will consider sites where appropriate should the need arise. It is therefore recommended that option GT23 remain rejected.	None.
19079 - Hatley Parish Council	Object	There is no case for breaching the green belt.	Objection noted, however SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to consider areas of the Green Belt for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in very exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. Therefore, it is recommended that GT23 remain a rejected option.	None.
19166 - Comberton Parish Council 19120 - Cambourne parish Council 19369 - Cambridgeshire County Council 19214 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18587 - Milton Parish Council 19018 19553 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support the Council's decision to reject this option whereby Gypsy/Traveller pitches would generally be permitted. Respondents stress the importance of the Green Belt and wish there to be no new development within it.	Support noted, however SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to consider sites within the Green Belt for Gypsy/Traveller pitches in very exceptional circumstances where all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT23 remain rejected.	None.

Decision on GT23: Green Belt ? Rejected Option

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT24: Nationally Recognised Designations ? Proposed Approach</i>			
19158 - East Cambridgeshire District Council	Suggest the text to this approach be expanded to say "unless it is demonstrated that there is no adverse impact...."	The Council maintains the importance of protecting nationally/internationally designated areas against development as outlined by PPS7. The proposed approach in option GT24 is consistent with that taken by SCDC for conventional housing. Where it can be demonstrated that the development would not result in any adverse impact to the objectives of the designation, Gypsy/Traveller pitches could be permitted.	Consider the additional of the suggested text to the relevant GTDPD policy.
19377 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Recommend that CCC support GT24 but add International designations such as SACs.	Agreed.	Ensure relevant policy within the GTDPD reflect 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).
19616 - West Wrattling Parish Council	The word 'normally' should be removed. We should seek to actively protect nationally recognised locations. There is no case for a 'watered down' wording which could see a designated area lost to Gypsy and Traveller accommodation due to poor clarity of wording.	The removal of 'normally' could result in an overly restrictive policy where suitable sites meeting other criteria identified by the Council's proposed three-tier approach could be excluded from consideration. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to have a flexible approach to assessing potential sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and therefore it is recommended that GT24 is taken forward as worded.	None.
18840 - Gamlingay Parish Council	All local and nationally designated heritage and landscape sites should be excluded from this consultation document. The wording should exclude such areas.	Disagree. The Council is required to outline where development can and cannot take place. The Council is committed to the protection of internationally or Nationally Recognised Designations within the District, as supported by PPS7. It is therefore recommended that option GT24 is taken forward as it is consistent with the approach taken by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.
18907 - Girton Parish Council 19021 18992 - David Wilson Estates	Like all forms of development, Gypsy/Traveller sites should not be permitted in areas with Nationally Recognised Designations.	Agreed. It is therefore recommended that option GT24 be taken forward as it reflects the principles set out in PPS7 and is consistent with SCDC's approach for conventional housing.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18692 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	This policy is confusing. Could we have examples of nationally recognized designations which are not given some form of protection? Surely that is why they have been identified. If this policy is seeking to protect important areas and features that do not have a national statutory designation but locally designated. Then we would support this. Equally we would support a policy that seeks to designate more areas and features that need protection. But our reading of PPS7 suggest that such designations must be criteria based. If so what are the criteria?	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. The identification and designation of areas/features which require protection is outside the remit of the Gypsy & Traveller Development Plan Document.	None.
19641 - Natural England	Object	Policy GT24 should also make reference to European sites as below; 'Gypsy and 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 and Nationally Recognised Designations...'	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT24 be taken forward, however reference to European and other international designated sties is to be added to the proposed approach.	Ensure that relevant GTDPD policies makes 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).
19340 - Swavesey Parish Council	Object	The word 'normally' to be removed from this policy statement.	The removal of 'normally' could result in an overly restrictive policy where suitable sites meeting other criteria identified by the Council's proposed three-tier approach could be excluded from consideration. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to have a flexible approach to assessing potential sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and therefore it is recommended that GT24 is taken forward as worded.	None.
19167 - Comberton Parish Council 19121 - cambourne parish Council 18880 - Cottenham Parish Council 19216 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19505 - Foxton Parish Council 19669 - Ickleton Parish Council 18773 - Impington Parish Council 18947 - Histon Parish Council 19080 - Hatley Parish Council 19287 - Cambridge City Council 18512 - Croydon Parish Council 18617 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Support	Support for the approach as it protects important sites and is consistent with national policy/guidance.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT24 is taken forward as it reflects the principles set out in PPS7 and it is consistent with the approach taken by SCDC for conventional housing outlined in the Development Control Policies DPD.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19554 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Any type of development that would have an adverse impact nationally recognised designations should not be allowed. The word normally should be replaced with "should" . This is confirmed by the criteria in section 5, as nationally/locally designated areas are to be avoided.	The removal of 'normally' could result in an overly restrictive policy where suitable sites meeting other criteria identified by the Council's proposed three-tier approach could be excluded from consideration. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to have a flexible approach to assessing potential sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and therefore it is recommended that GT24 is taken forward as worded.	None.
Decision on GT24: Nationally Recognised Designations ? Proposed Approach				
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.				
<i>GT25: Conservation Areas ? Proposed Approach</i>				
18908 - Girton Parish Council		It would make a mockery of the idea to allow any such settlement.	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. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT26 is taken forward as it is meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and PPG15, and is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.
18653 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		As far as the Conservations Areas in our village are concerned, we cannot imagine any situation where a travellers site could possibly preserve or enhance the character or appearance. We would also be very surprised if the same is not true for all other villages and towns in our area.	The Council will generally not permit development within Conservation Areas unless it would preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area or its setting. This approach, which is consistent with that used for conventional housing, is consistent with the requirement of Circular 01/2006 not to rule out these areas for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. It is feasible that a sensitively designed and landscaped site for Gypsy/Traveller pitches could enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area. It is therefore recommended that option GT25 is taken forward.	None.
19452 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed. It is therefore recommended that option GT25 is taken forward.	None.
19378 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC support GT25 but add reference to listed buildings for completeness.	Agreed.	Ensure GTDPD policy makes reference to listed buildings.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19417 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The proposed policy approach adopts a general presumption against gypsy and traveller sites within Conservation Areas which is inappropriate. National planning guidance contained with PPG15 and within Circular 01/2006 does not preclude development within Conservation Areas completely. Paragraph 4.16 of PPG15 stipulates that while conservation of character is an important consideration it cannot take the form of preventing all new development. Paragraph 52 of Circular 01/2006 clearly states that planning permission for gypsy and traveller sites may be granted where it can be demonstrated that the objectives of the designation will not be compromised by the development	Objection noted. The proposed approach does not preclude development from Conservation Areas. Proposals which would "preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or its setting" would be considered by the Council. This is consistent with the approach proposed by SCDC in the Development Control Policies DPD for conventional housing and also meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and the principles set out in PPG15.	None.
19168 - Comberton Parish Council 19659 - Longstanton Parish Council 19342 - Swavesey Parish Council 18839 - Gamlingay Parish Council 18543 - Meldreth Parish Council 19022 18513 - Croydon Parish Council 18618 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Object	Object to GT25. Development should not be permitted in conservation areas, or where the development could affect a conservation area. Recommendation that Conservation Areas be excluded from the search area. How can Gypsy/Traveller sites enhance a conservation area?	Objections noted, however PPG15 and Circular 01/2006 do not exclude the possibility of locating Gypsy/Traveller pitches on sites within or adjoining Conservation Areas. The Council would only allow such development to take place provided that "the objectives of the designation will not be compromised by the development", which is consistent with Circular 01/2006, national planning policy, and the approach applied to other conventional development. It is therefore recommended that option GT25 is taken forward.	None.
19122 - cambourne parish Council 18881 - Cottenham Parish Council 19217 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19506 - Foxton Parish Council 19670 - Ickleton Parish Council 18774 - Impington Parish Council 18948 - Histon Parish Council 19081 - Hatley Parish Council 19288 - Cambridge City Council 19555 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support GT25. 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. The approach is consistent with national planning policy.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT25 is taken forward as it is consistent with the principles set out in PPG15 and the requirement of Circular 01/2006 where Gypsy/Traveller pitches will not be completely ruled out from Conservation Areas.	None.
Decision on GT25: Conservation Areas ? Proposed Approach				
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.				
GT26: Locally Recognised Designations ? Proposed Approach				
19453 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed, it is therefore recommended that option GT26 is taken forward as it reflects the same approach used by SCDC for conventional housing as proposed in the Development Control Policies DPD.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19593 - FFT Planning		It should be recognised that all development has some sort of adverse effect and this is framed too narrowly. It should simply state that locally recognised designations do not rule out the possibility of site development.	Noted. Option GT26 as worded does not rule out development, in locally recognised designation areas and therefore is consistent with Circular 01/2006. It is recommended that option GT26 is taken forward as it is similar to the approached used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.
18654 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		This section neglects to recognise the importance of public footpaths and bridleways which are equally valued features; that, lamentably, we are very short of in our village.	Agreed.	Ensure the relevant GTDPD policy makes specific reference to public footpaths and bridleways.
18909 - Girton Parish Council		It would make a mockery of the idea to allow any such settlement.	Circular 01/2006 does not rule out development in locally recognised designated areas provided the development does not have an adverse impact on the objectives of the designation. Therefore, it is recommended that option GT26 is taken forward as it meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.
18841 - Gamlingay Parish Council		All local and nationally designated heritage and landscape sites should be excluded from this consultation document. These areas should be excluded.	Disagree. The Council is required to outline where development can and cannot take place. The Council is committed to the protection of Nationally Recognised Designations within the District, as supported by PPS7. It is therefore recommended that option GT24 is taken forward as it is consistent with the approach taken by SCDC for conventional housing.	None
19196 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		As text box states 'It is not reasonable to rule out development in a locally recognised designation area if there is no harmful impact.' Suggest a less negative stance to text of proposed area would be to add 'unless it is demonstrated that there would be no harmful impact.'	Agreed.	Consider the use of more positive approach to 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.
19344 - Swavesey Parish Council	Object	The word 'normally' to be removed from this policy statement.	Objection noted. 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19123 - cambourne parish Council 19381 - Cambridgeshire County Council 18882 - Cottenham Parish Council 19218 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19507 - Foxton Parish Council 18775 - Impington Parish Council 18950 - Histon Parish Council 19082 - Hatley Parish Council 18514 - Croydon Parish Council 18619 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Support	Support for proposed approach GT26.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT26 is taken forward as it reflects the requirement of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18588 - Milton Parish Council	Support	Allowing such development will lead to resentment and hence conflict between the communities.	Support noted, however Circular 01/2006 does not rule out development in these locally recognised designated areas if no harmful impact would result. It is recommended that option GT26 is taken forward.	None.
19169 - Comberton Parish Council 19556 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for proposed approach however recommend removal of the word 'normally' from GT26.	Support noted. 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.	None.
Decision on GT26: Locally Recognised Designations ? Proposed Approach				
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 importa areas and features of Locally Recognised Designations.				
GT27: Impact on the Nearest Settlement ? Proposed Approach				
19594 - FFT Planning		This again repeats 1/2006.	The proposed approach is consistent with Circular 01/2006 and it is therefore recommended that option GT27 is taken forward.	None.
19093		Hauxton has no facilities such as shops, post office, pubs or health facilites to support a settlement.	Noted. Nevertheless, the Council can not exclude Hauxton at this stage from its search for potential site as Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider all areas of the district for suitable sites, including areas in rural and semi-rural locations.	None.
19454 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	As the approach is consistent with that used by SCDC for conventional housing and the proposed approach meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006, it is recommended that option GT27 is taken forward.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18883 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council supports this proposal but ask how the 'nearest settlement' is to be defined. It should not be automatically assumed to be the settlement providing the 'access to amenities' described in GT15. A local settlement of a few houses can be totally dominated by a large traveller site. The 'local physical and social infrastructure' is a different issue and should be considered separately.	Support noted. 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 Development Control Policies DPD.	Ensure the relevant policy of the GTDPD clarify what constitutes 'nearest settlement'
18776 - Impington Parish Council	Support	Impington Parish Council support this approach for the reasons given. Guidelines need to be given in terms of ration/percentage of pitches (size of site) related to number of settled dwellings. Definition needed for 'undue' w ith examples.	Support noted. Proposals for Gypsy/Traveller pitches will be assess on a case-by-case basis and through consultation with the local community and relevant service providers any potential pressures will be identified and addressed. The Council does not feel it would be appropriate to identified ratios of pitches related to the number of settled dwellings as this could result in an overly prescriptive policy, contrary to the requirements of Circular 01/2006 for a flexible approach to site identification.	None.
19170 - Comberton Parish Council 19124 - cambourne parish Council 19508 - Foxton Parish Council 18544 - Meldreth Parish Council 18677 18952 - Histon Parish Council 19083 - Hatley Parish Council 19199 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19289 - Cambridge City Council 18515 - Croydon Parish Council 18620 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19557 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for GT27 as it allows existing settlements to be protected against inappropriate development, which could cause un-necessary conflict. Physical and social infrastructure must be able to support Gypsy/Traveller development.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT27 is taken forward as it meets the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
19220 - Cottenham Village Design Group	Support	The recent experiences with an enlarged traveller site at Smithy Fen have demonstrated the problems that result when the numbers of pitches exceeds the capabilities of the local infrastructure.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT27 is taken forward as it reflects Circular 01/2006 requirement that the scale of the nearest settled community must be respected and no undue pressures must be placed on local infrastructure.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19386 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT27. The G&TDPD needs 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. This approach is consistent with ODPM Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 54).	Support noted and it is recommended that option GT27 is taken forward as it meets the requirements of ODPM Circular 01/2006 and it is also consistent with SCDC's approach for conventional housing.	None.
19024	Support	The needs of existing residents should be paramount. Extensive consultation should occur before a site is given permission. If there will be a negative impact on the amenity of local residents permission should be refused.	All proposed sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches which are to be included in the GTDPD will form of the Issues & Options Report 2, which will again be open to a further consultation period later this year. All planning applications for Gypsy/Traveller pitches are subject to a period of public consultation. It is recommended that option GT27 is taken forward as it is consistent with Circular 01/2006 and the approach taken by SDCD for conventional housing proposals.	None.
19346 - Swavesey Parish Council	Support	However, how is it possible to determine the pressure on the local school, etc, until the site is occupied which will then be too late?	Support noted. Consultation with local service providers, including schools and utility providers, will be undertaken before allowing Gypsy/Traveller pitches to assess the capacity of local infrastructure.	None.

Decision on GT27: Impact on the Nearest Settlement ? Proposed Approach

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.

GT28: Local Character and Appearance ? Proposed Approach

19455 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed and it is therefore recommended that option GT28 is taken forward as it is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and the approach used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.
19595 - FFT Planning		This seems to be using the good practice criteria to enable sites to be ruled out, another of a long list of criteria which unduly restrict choice of location. Circular 1/2006 does state that rural exceptions site policies for Gypsies and Travellers should operate in the same way as rural exceptions sites policies for housing.	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. 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. It is therefore recommended that option GT28 is taken forward.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18693 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	We consider that the use of the word sensitivity in this policy could be open to misinterpretation. We would add the following wording: sites would be landscaped in keeping with the local character and setting using indigenous species. If such treatment was incapable of providing sufficient screening within five years, then the location will be deemed unsuitable.	The inclusion of the recommended changes would provide greater clarity in specifying what would be appropriate on proposed sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Option GT28 clearly states that any impact on the local character and appearance of the locality would be avoided and that sensitive screening would be required where appropriate. It is recommended that option GT28 is taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach taken by SCDC for conventional housing.	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.
19290 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The wording used lacks clarity and gives too wide a discretion to the decision maker on a planning application, which could result in proposals being rejected unnecessarily. Any policy arising from GT28 must spell out in greater detail what is meant by the term 'significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the locality'. The option should also expressly consider any impact on the setting of Cambridge as a historic city and as evidenced in various studies including the Cambridge Green Belt Study 2002 by LDA.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option G28 is carried forward as it reflects the Council's desire to not allow development which would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of a locality. The proposed approach is consistent with Structure Plan Policy P1/3 and the requirements of ODPM Circular 01/2006. SCDC is required to adopt a flexible approach to site identification and assessment, which the proposed approach allows for. The merits of each proposal will be determined on a case-by-case basis. The approach is also consistent with that used for conventional housing proposals, which allows for the same level of discretion.	None.
18545 - Meldreth Parish Council	Object	Meldreth Parish Council, from local experience with the sites in Kneesworth Road, Meldreth, has major reservations that the proposed approach can be successfully implemented. In the flat and open areas of South Cambridgeshire it is not possible to successfully screen pitches particularly with the amount of hard landscaping incorporated into our local sites and the sizes of the mobile homes.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT28 is taken forward as it reflects the same approach used by SCDC for conventional housing and reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006. The proposed approach would address any concern of visual impacts a proposal for Gypsy/Traveller pitches could have on the landscape of a locality where screening would not prove effective.	None.
18815 - CPRE	Object	We consider that the use of the word sensitivity in this policy could be open to misinterpretation. We would add the following wording: sites would be landscaped in keeping with the local character and setting using indigenous species. If such treatment was incapable of providing sufficient screening within five years, then the location will be deemed unsuitable.	The inclusion of the recommended changes would provide greater clarity in specifying what would be appropriate on proposed sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Option GT28 clearly states that any impact on the local character and appearance of the locality would be avoided and that sensitive screening would be required where appropriate. It is recommended that option GT28 is taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach taken by SCDC for conventional housing.	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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18955 - Histon Parish Council	Support	This position should not be used as a get-out for communities claiming 1) not in our back-yard, Traveller site would not look nice here or 2) North of SCDC already has travellers site so it should go there.	Support noted. The aim of the approach is to promote proposals that are well integrated with the existing local character and appearance of a locality. It is recommended that option GT28 is taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.
19388 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT28. The approach with CCC suggested criteria vii (Impact on Character and Appearance of the Locality), Structure Plan Policy P1/3 and ODPM Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 54).	Support noted and it is recommended that option GT28 is taken forward.	None.
19221 - Cottenham Village Design Group	Support	Much of the opposition to travellers sites from local communities is due to the expected negative visual impact. This is especially true when the sites are in open countryside (as they are likely to be when outside of the settlement framework).	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT28 is taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for conventional housing.	
19171 - Comberton Parish Council 19126 - cambourne parish Council 18884 - Cottenham Parish Council 19509 - Foxton Parish Council 19672 - Ickleton Parish Council 18589 - Milton Parish Council 18777 - Impington Parish Council 18751 - Longstowe Parish Council 19084 - Hatley Parish Council 18516 - Croydon Parish Council 19558 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support GT28 as it helps to maintain the character and appearance of the locality.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT28 is taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.

Decision on GT28: Local Character and Appearance ? Proposed Approach

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT29: Impact on Local Amenity ? Proposed Approach</i>			
19215 - East Cambridgeshire District Council	Much of this proposed approach seems to be covered by GT 27. Suggest it is better to refer to avoiding adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses' as 'show respect for' appears incongruous.	Agreed. Although the wording "show respect for neighbouring uses" is consistent with Circular 01/2006, it is recommended that the relevant policy of the GTDPD not make reference to this terminology as it could lead to an ambiguous policy. It is recommended that the text of the relevant policy state that Gypsy/Traveller pitches would be permitted where they "avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses." Although at this stage it was necessary to provide GT27 and GT29 as separate options to offer the greatest level of consultation, it is recommended that the combination of GT27 and GT29 is considered as both options are closely related to the impact Gypsy/Traveller pitches could have on neighbouring areas/settlements and the impact on local services/infrastructure.	Ensure relevant GTDPD policy removes reference to "respect for neighbouring uses" in favour of "avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses". Consider the combination of GT27 and GT29 into a single policy.
18910 - Girton Parish Council	This is a completely muddled sentence. If "they" means the residents rather than the sites, then the answer is that we could never tell until too late.	It has been acknowledged that the wording of option GT29, although consistent with the wording of Circular 01/2006, could result in an ambiguous planning policy. It has therefore been suggested that the relevant policy of the GTDPD not make reference to the wording "respect for" in favour of "avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on".	None.
19456 - David Wilson Estates	These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed and it is therefore recommended that option GT29 is taken forward.	None.
19096	Hauxton does not have these local services.	Noted.	None.
19596 - FFT Planning	We are concerned that harm to local residents/land uses is translated in GT29 to 'respect'. We would refer you to the good practice criteria.	Agreed. It has been suggested through other representations (see rep 19215) that although the wording "show respect for neighbouring uses" is consistent with Circular 01/2006, this terminology could result in an ambiguous planning policy. It is recommended that the text of the relevant policy of the GTDPD state that Gypsy/Traveller pitches would be permitted where they "avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses."	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19291 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The option mixes two separate considerations. It is reasonable for considerations of the adequacy of local services and infrastructure to meet needs to be assessed and so guide decision making. However the term 'show respect for neighbouring uses' is imprecise and gives too wide a discretion to the decision maker on a planning application, which could result in proposals being rejected unnecessarily.	Objection noted. The terminology "respect for neighbouring uses" is consistent with the wording in Circular 01/2006, it is recommended that the GTDPD 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.	Ensure relevant GTDPD policy removes reference to "respect for neighbouring uses" in favour of "avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses".
18842 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Object	Gamlingay Parish Council object to the wording of this policy. Areas with existing pressures from existing sites need to be protected from additional undue pressure, as with any new proposed sites. A definition of 'to show respect' is required, as this is not a measurable statement and means different things to different communities. Certainly reference should be made to the settled communities human rights, together with abiding by the law, in addition to human rights of the gypsy/travelling community.	Objection noted. Although the wording "show respect for neighbouring uses" is consistent with Circular 01/2006, it is recommended that the relevant policy of the GTDPD not make reference to this terminology as it could lead to an ambiguous policy. It is recommended that the text of the relevant policy state that Gypsy/Traveller pitches would be permitted where they "avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses."	Ensure relevant GTDPD policy removes reference to "respect for neighbouring uses" in favour of "avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses".
19393	Object	The needs should be considered for both communities, and this proposed approach would be hard to determine.	Objection noted. The wording "respect for", although consistent with Circular 01/2006, could result in an ambiguous planning policy. Therefore, it is recommended to replace this wording with "avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on". Taking option GT29 forward with the recommended consideration would address this objection.	None.
19390 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT29. The G&TDPD needs 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. This approach is consistent with CCC suggested criteria vi (amenity) and ODPM Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites".	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT29 is taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19172 - Comberton Parish Council 19125 - cambourne parish Council 19222 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19510 - Foxton Parish Council 18546 - Meldreth Parish Council 18778 - Impington Parish Council 18752 - Longstowe Parish Council 18957 - Histon Parish Council 19085 - Hatley Parish Council 18517 - Croydon Parish Council 18621 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19559 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for GT29 as this allows existing settlements to be protected against inappropriate development, which could cause un-necessary conflict. However, it may be difficult to enforce.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT29 is taken forward as it reflects the requirements of ODPM Circular 01/2006 that the siting of Gypsy/Traveller pitches respect neighbouring uses. The approach is also consistent with that used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.
18885 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council agrees, in principal, to this proposal but like GT27, this contains mixed references to 'respect for local users' and 'infrastructure' which are separate considerations. Also of concern is how this will be measured/quantified.	Support noted. It is recommended that the relevant GTDPD policy removes reference to "respect for local users" in favour of "avoid any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses". Although the terminology used in option GT29 is consistent with the wording of Circular 01/2006, it is felt the use of "respect for" could lead to an ambiguous planning policy. Therefore it is recommended that option GT29 be taken forward with the suggested change. Local amenity refers to both the amenity of local residents and adjoining land users, and also to local services/facilities. It is therefore reasonable to refer to both 'local users' and 'infrastructure' within the same option.	None.

Decision on GT29: Impact on Local Amenity ? Proposed Approach

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.

GT30: Size of Sites ? Proposed Option

19560 - Peterborough City Council		GT30 and GT31 are generally saying the same thing. Although there is an idea of size in Option A, it still says that all sites will be considered regardless of size.	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward rather than GT31 as it would allow for flexibility in allowing consideration of all proposals, but would identify what the Council believe to be a manageable number of pitches for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
-----------------------------------	--	---	--	-------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19617 - West Wrattling Parish Council	This needs lightening. Size is of paramount importance as referred to in paragraph 6 in our notes. A low maximum size ensures no concentration, avoids a ghetto and assists the dissemination of the new community within the existing community. There are also instances of sites where police fear to enter, this would apply more to large sites than small sites, and hence small sites are preferable. Police and other enforcement officers need to advise on the maximum size, which may be lower than 15 pitches.	Circular 01/2006 does not advocate setting a limit on number of pitches and therefore to do so in the relevant policy of the GTDPD would be unsound and contrary to the Circular. Whilst identifying what the Council believes is an appropriate number of pitches for each site, option GT30 allows for a degree of flexibility required by Circular 01/2006. As with the consultation period associated with this report, the police services will be invited to make comments on the proposed sites brought forward in the Issues & Options Report 2: Site Options.	None.
18993 - David Wilson Estates	The criteria relating to 15 pitches stems from the Designated status of local authorities through the Caravans Sites Act 1968 and has no basis in relation to the creation of sites of an optimal pitch number for management purposes. There are nationwide examples of sites having a larger number and a smaller number of pitches and whether they succeed or not is reflected in how they are managed.	It is recommended that option GT31 is not taken forward. Option GT30 allows for the flexibility to consider all proposals stipulated in Circular 01/2006 whilst at the same time sets an upper limit of what the Council believes would be a manageable number of pitches for a site. The Council would generally allocate sites of no more than 15 pitches, however all applications would be considered on their own merits regardless of size.	None.
19439 - Great Shelford Parish Council	As size obviously creates problems GT 30 needs to be expanded to explain what factors will make a site acceptable.	The factors/criteria that make a site for Gypsy/Traveller pitches suitable and sustainable are addressed through the proposed three-tier site approach to site assessment (GT46).	None.
19025	Sites should be limited to ten plots. A wider consultation area should be required if a site exceeds ten plots.	Objection noted. The Council believes the 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. Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site. SCDC must therefore 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 and reflects public opinion.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19627 - Meldreth Residents Association		We would like the following to be adopted into the policy. The Group Village criteria to be used as a means of evaluating 'proportional size of traveller sites' for example, Meldreth has been identified in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan as a Group Village, where residential development and redevelopment is only allowed up to a maximum scheme of 8 dwellings within the village framework. It would therefore be reasonable to suggest that the maximum size of a traveller site in a Group Village should be 8 pitches. We would also like to ask that you add an additional note that where more than one site is located in the near vicinity to another or where there are a number of sites in a village, then the cumulative impact on the village is considered as if it was one site.	The 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 could also be appropriate for identifying an appropriate number of Gypsy/Traveller pitches for each settlement category. 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. 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.	Consider the use of a similar approach identified in the Core Strategy for conventional housing whereby an appropriate number of pitches is identified for each category of settlement. It would be reasonable to apply a consistent approach to both conventional housing and Gypsy/Traveller accommodation.
18959 - Histon Parish Council	Object	Although this implies sites no greater than 15, the use of generally or planning should consider site size on their own merit, means that there is no limit to size. Histon Parish Council consider there should be a limit to the size with no get-out and this should be 15. Therefore object to GT30 and support GT32 which is an option rejected in the report.	Objection noted. The Council believes the 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. Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site. SCDC must therefore allow for a degree of 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 and reflects public opinion. It is recommended that option GT32 remain rejected as it would result in an overly restrictive policy, contrary to Circular 01/2006 which does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum number of pitches for a site.	None.
18816 - CPRE	Object	The size of sites should be determined by the number of permitted caravans not the number of pitches. The needs survey has identified that there could be up to three static vans per pitch with additional mobile vans.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward whereby the Council will allocate new sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches that are no more than 15 pitches, however all planning applications regardless of size will be considered on their own merits. This approach is consistent with the degree of flexibility required by Circular 01/2006. A Gypsy/Traveller pitch can normally accommodate 1 mobile caravan, 1 static caravan and 1 brick amenity block. This has been the approach used by SCDC in the past and is consistent with the guidance provided in Circular 01/2006.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19661 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	The second sentence means that this policy is identical to GT31. The second sentence should be deleted and replaced by "Sites larger than 15 pitches will only be considered in exceptional circumstances, where such a site is desirable both for the applicants and for the nearby community. Any site must be at least 5km away from any other site." The last sentence will ensure that multiple small sites do not coalesce into one large one.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward. The Council believes the 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. Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site. SCDC must therefore allow for a degree of 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 and reflects public opinion. Setting a distance limit where Gypsy/Traveller pitches can be located in relation to other pitches would also be contrary to Circular 01/2006 as it would result in an overly restrictive policy. Any concerns of concentration of sites and the potential impact new pitches have on local physical and social infrastructure are addressed through options GT27, GT28 and GT29.	None.
18694 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	The size of sites should be determined by the number of permitted caravans not the number of pitches. The needs survey has identified that there could be up to three static vans per pitch with additional mobile vans. The settled community will consider that it's been seriously misled, if references to pitches rather than vans continues. This could have a detrimental effect on harmony between communities. Being economic with the truth only plays into the hands of those seeking to disrupt social integration and the debases wise counsel.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward whereby the Council will allocate new sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches that are no more than 15 pitches, however all planning applications regardless of size will be considered on their own merits. This approach is consistent with the degree of flexibility required by Circular 01/2006. The needs assessment identified a need for between 110 to 130 pitches. The approach used by SCDC in the past has been that a Gypsy/Traveller pitch can normally accommodate 1 mobile caravan, 1 static caravan and 1 brick amenity block. The use of 'pitch' is valid since it is consistent with Circular 01/2006 and with the approach used by the Council in the past.	
19528 - Highways Agency	Object	The Highways Agency support Policy GT31. However, 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.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward. The Council believes the 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. Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site. SCDC must therefore 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 and reflects public opinion.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19387	Object	Has it been considered exactly how big this proposed site would be? A pitch = ? + a site ?	This is defined in the Appendix to the Issues & Options Report 1. A Gypsy/Traveller pitch can normally accommodate 1 mobile caravan, 1 static caravan and 1 brick amenity block. A Gypsy/Traveller site is a specific area containing a varying number of pitches for Gypsies and Travellers. The size of each site would vary depending on several factors, such as natural enclosure and relationship with nearby settlements. The Circular 01/2006 does not advocate setting restrictions on size of sites or number of pitches.	None.
18547 - Meldreth Parish Council	Object	Meldreth Parish Council believes, from local experience, that small sites are preferable, particularly when occupied by a single family or a larger family group and that planning applications for sites containing more than 15 pitches should not be accepted.	Objection noted. Circular 01/2006 does not advocate setting a limit on number of pitches and therefore to do so in the relevant policy of the GTDPD would be unsound and contrary to the Circular. Whilst identifying what the Council believes is an optimal number of pitches for each site, option GT30 allows for a degree of flexibility required by Circular 01/2006.	None.
18590 - Milton Parish Council	Object	We think 15 is far too high. At the last travellers' liaison meeting at Cambourne there was general agreement from all sides that six was the right number. We support that.	Objection noted. The Council believes the 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. Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site. SCDC must therefore 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 and reflects public opinion.	None.
18678	Object	All sites should be no more than 15 pitches.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward. The Council believes the 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. Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site. SCDC must therefore allow for a degree of 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.	None.
19173 - Comberton Parish Council	Object	The size of the site should always be considered.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward because, whilst setting what the Council believes is an optimal number of pitches, it provides the degree of flexibility required by Circular 01/2006 where all planning applications for Gypsy/Traveller pitches should be considered regardless of size.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19127 - cambourne parish Council 18655 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 19223 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19511 - Foxton Parish Council 18753 - Longstowe Parish Council 19086 - Hatley Parish Council 19219 - East Cambridgehire District Council	Support	Support for option GT30 as it allows flexibility. Sites need to be manageable - 15 appears appropriate.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006 to consider all proposals for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, whilst also setting what the Council views as an appropriate number of pitches for a site.	None.
19394 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT30. While a degree of flexibility is required, the G&TDPD needs 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. It would also avoid an over concentration of pitches in certain areas. This approach is consistent with ODPM Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites".	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward rather than option GT31. The approach, whereby new sites allocated for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would generally be no more than 15 pitches, take account of what the Council believes is a manageable number of pitches for sites. All planning applications will however be considered regardless of size. This approach is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18622 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Support	Fully support this option. Although there is no commitment to ensure pitches are kept to under 15. Effectively there is very little difference between this and the alternative option.	Circular 01/2006 does not recommend a Government standard for site sites. Nevertheless, it states, "cases should be considered in context, and in relation to the local infrastructure and population size and density." SCDC has therefore left a level of flexibility in its proposed approach. Nevertheless, through initial community consultation SCDC has determined that sites should contain no more than 15 pitches, and has therefore identified this limit in its proposed option.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19009 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council support this proposal but feels that there needs to be an annex to explain the criteria for maximising the size of the site in any given area at 5, 10, 15 plots because without an 'acid test' which conforms to 1/2006 principals, restrictions to the size of site may be deemed unlawful and the intentions of GT27 may be seriously undermined. The statement in 4.53 that sites may have to be expanded to allow for family expansion and/or visitors is discriminatory against the settled community, that enjoys no such privilege.	Circular 01/2006 requires a level of flexibility in assessing sites, and the inclusion of an 'acid test' could result in an overly prescriptive policy which would be contrary to this advice. The Circular does not advocate a standard site size, however does require that proposals for new pitches take account of any potential impacts on local physical and social infrastructure so as to not place any undue pressures on local services/facilities. All planning applications for Gypsy/Traveller pitches will be considered on their merits and assessed through the Council's proposed three-tier approach to site selection. As with proposals for conventional residential development, the Council is free to place planning conditions restricting the number of pitches permitted on site, having taken account of all suitability and sustainability criteria. The size of a site can be limited by several factors, such as physical constraints and the capacity of local physical and social infrastructure of a locality. The district is expected to grow by an estimated 20,000 housing units. It would be unreasonable to assume that the Gypsy/Traveller population is not expected to grow also. Provision must therefore be made for this expected growth in population. The provision for visitors could avoid the occurrence of illegal encampments. Circular 01/2006 suggests planning conditions can be placed limiting the number of days a site can be occupied by more than the allowed number of caravans, to permit visitors and allow attendance at family/community events.	None.
18779 - Impington Parish Council	Support	Impington Parish Council support this approach for the reasons given. Need to define under what conditions a site would be allowed to exceed 15 pitches. A site of 15 pitches should include any affordable pitches and any transit pitches if deemed necessary at a particular site.	Support noted. The Council believes the 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. Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site. SCDC must therefore 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. Affordable accommodation and transit pitches are addressed in options GT42/43 and GT44 respectively.	None.
18754 - Longstowe Parish Council 18756 - Longstowe Parish Council	Support	Size of site should be limited to 15 but 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.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006 to consider all proposals for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, whilst also setting what the Council views as an appropriate number of pitches for a site.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18843 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	Gamlingay Parish Council supports the policy which limits new sites to a maximum of 15 pitches. However, the Council needs to define pitches, as encampment by one caravan. Sites should hold no more than 15 caravans on each site (multiple use of single pitches should not be allowed). Council needs to address this issue in developing this policy further.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward whereby the Council will allocate new sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches that are no more than 15 pitches, however all planning applications regardless of size will be considered on their own merits. This approach is consistent with the degree of flexibility required by Circular 01/2006. A Gypsy/Traveller pitch can normally accommodate 1 mobile caravan, 1 static caravan and 1 brick amenity block. This has been the approach used by SCDC in the past and is consistent with the guidance provided in Circular 01/2006.	None.
19347 - Swavesey Parish Council	Support	Swavesey Parish Council would agree that sites should be less than 15 pitches. It was also stated by Travellers attending a recent SCDC forum meeting that they prefer smaller sites, of around 8 pitches max. The Parish Council would not like to see sites expand once granted initial permission.	Support noted. The Council believes the 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. Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site. SCDC must therefore 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.	None.
Decision on GT30: Size of Sites ? Proposed Option				
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 will be considered on their own merits regardless of site size.				
GT31: Size of Sites ? Alternative Option				
19561 - Peterborough City Council		GT30 and GT31 are generally saying the same thing. Although there is an idea of size in Option A, it still says that all sites will be considered regardless of size.	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward rather than GT31 as it would allow for flexibility in allowing consideration of all proposals, but would identify what the Council believe to be a manageable number of pitches for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
19395 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC does not endorse GT31 as worded. The G&TDPD needs 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. This approach is consistent with ODPM Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites".	It is recommended that option GT30 is taken forward rather than option GT31. The approach, whereby new sites allocated for Gypsy/Traveller pitches would generally be no more than 15 pitches, take account of what the Council believes is a manageable number of pitches for sites. All planning applications will however be considered regardless of size. This approach is consistent with the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19450 - David Wilson Estates		The criteria relating to 15 pitches stems from the Designated status of local authorities through the Caravans Sites Act 1968 and has no basis in relation to the creation of sites of an optimal pitch number for management purposes. There are nationwide examples of sites having a larger number and a smaller number of pitches and whether they succeed. or not is reflected in how they are managed.	It is recommended that option GT31 is not taken forward. Option GT30 allows for the flexibility to consider all proposals stipulated in Circular 01/2006 whilst at the same time sets an upper limit of what the Council believes would be a manageable number of pitches for a site. The Council would generally allocate sites of no more than 15 pitches, however all applications would be considered on their own merits regardless of size.	None.
19128 - cambourne parish Council	Object	An indication of expected size should be made so greater control can be exercised, and to protect existing settlements minimising potential un-necessary conflict.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT31 is not taken forward. Option GT30 allows for the flexibility to consider all proposals stipulated in Circular 01/2006 whilst at the same time sets an upper limit of what the Council believes would be a manageable number of pitches for a site. The Council would generally allocate sites of no more than 15 pitches, however all applications would be considered on their own merits regardless of size.	None.
18695 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	There is an upper limit for development of housing, according to the designation of the settlement (for example in group villages a development of not more than eight houses is permitted). This approach should be mirrored in this policy. In addition, Caravan density should follow the government guidelines for housing of a minimum of 30 per hectare.	Objection noted. The Council believes the appropriate size of sites should be more than 15 pitches. At consultation exercises in 2006 there was particular interest for small Gypsy-owned sites of between 5 and 10 pitches. Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site. SCDC must therefore 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 and reflects public opinion. Sustainable use of land will be promoted and national guidelines for housing density will be adhered to. It should be noted that historically density of sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches is consistent and often exceeds that conventional housing.	
19174 - Comberton Parish Council 19663 - Longstanton Parish Council 19225 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19512 - Foxton Parish Council 18780 - Impington Parish Council 18960 - Histon Parish Council 19087 - Hatley Parish Council	Object	Object to alternative option as it does not set a limit on the number of pitches.	Objection noted. It is recommended that GT31 is not taken forward. Option GT30 allows for the flexibility to consider all proposals stipulated in Circular 01/2006 whilst at the same time sets an upper limit of what the Council believes would be a manageable number of pitches for a site. The Council would generally allocate sites of no more than 15 pitches, however all applications would be considered on their own merits regardless of size.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18591 - Milton Parish Council	Object	We think 15 is far too high. At the last travellers' liaison meeting at Cambourne there was general agreement from all sides that six was the right number. We support that.	Objection noted. The Council believes the appropriate size of sites should be more than 15 pitches. At consultation exercises in 2006 there was particular interest for small Gypsy-owned sites of between 5 and 10 pitches. Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site. SCDC must therefore 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 and reflects public opinion.	None.
18755 - Longstowe Parish Council	Object	Size no bigger than 15. Integration with the settled community could only come when gypsy/travellers are not found to be the recipients of special favours; one set of rules for the settled community and one set of rules for the gypsies/travellers.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT31 is not taken forward. Option GT30 allows for the flexibility to consider all proposals stipulated in Circular 01/2006 whilst at the same time sets an upper limit of what the Council believes would be a manageable number of pitches for a site. The Council would generally allocate sites of no more than 15 pitches, however all applications would be considered on their own merits regardless of size.	
19292 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Planning authorities cannot refuse to consider any properly made planning application.	It is recommended that option GT30 would result in a clearer policy which would outline what the Council believes to be a manageable number of pitches for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, but also allow for flexibility in not ruling out other proposals.	None.
19597 - FFT Planning	Support	The alternative option is preferred since the good practice criteria of 1/2006 says that setting a maximum size as a blanket policy is arbitrary. All applications should be judged on their merits and there is no need to set optimum sizes if all sites are to be considered.	Support noted, however it is recommended that GT31 is not taken forward. Option GT30 allows for the flexibility to consider all proposals stipulated in Circular 01/2006 whilst at the same time sets an upper limit of what the Council believes would be a manageable number of pitches for a site. The Council would generally allocate sites of no more than 15 pitches, however all applications would be considered on their own merits regardless of size.	None.
19529 - Highways Agency	Support	The Highways Agency support Policy GT31. However, 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.	Support noted. The Council believes the appropriate size of sites should be more than 15 pitches. At consultation exercises in 2006 there was particular interest for small Gypsy-owned sites of between 5 and 10 pitches. Circular 01/2006 does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum size for a site. SCDC must therefore 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 and reflects public opinion.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19011 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council supports this proposal if GT30 is not sustainable.	Support noted, however it is recommended that GT31 is not taken forward. Option GT30 allows for the flexibility to consider all proposals stipulated in Circular 01/2006 whilst at the same time sets an upper limit of what the Council believes would be a manageable number of pitches for a site. The Council would generally allocate sites of no more than 15 pitches, however all applications would be considered on their own merits regardless of size.	None.
Decision on GT31: Size of Sites ? Alternative Option				
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.				
<i>GT32: Size of Sites ? Rejected Option</i>				
18781 - Impington Parish Council		Impington Parish Council support the rejection of this option.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT32 remain rejected as it would result in an overly restrictive policy, contrary to Circular 01/2006.	None.
19451 - David Wilson Estates		The criteria relating to 15 pitches stems from the Designated status of local authorities through the Caravans Sites Act 1968 and has no basis in relation to the creation of sites of an optimal pitch number for management purposes. There are nationwide examples of sites having a larger number and a smaller number of pitches and whether they succeed or not is reflected in how they are managed.	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT32 remain rejected as it would result in an overly restrictive policy, contrary to Circular 01/2006.	None.
19175 - Comberton Parish Council	Object	We object to the rejection of this option. Sites should not be permitted if the site exceeds 15 pitches.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT32 remain rejected as it would result in an overly restrictive policy, contrary to Circular 01/2006 which does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum number of pitches for a site.	None.
19618 - West Wrattling Parish Council	Support	This is supported for the reasons given in paragraph 6 and our response to GT30 in our notes, however the figure of 15 needs to be agreed by the appropriate persons hence may be lower or higher than 15.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT32 is not taken forward as it would result in an overly prescriptive policy that would be contrary to Circular 01/2006.	None.
19397 - Cambridgeshire County Council 19673 - Ickleton Parish Council 19088 - Hatley Parish Council 19293 - Cambridge City Council 18518 - Croydon Parish Council 19562 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for rejection of option GT32. The approach is too prescriptive, inflexible and does not allow for site and family circumstances to be taken into account.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT32 remain rejected as it would result in an overly restrictive policy, contrary to Circular 01/2006.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18964 - Histon Parish Council	Support	Histon Parish Council do not consider this option should be rejected and believe that a specific maximum limit should be set with no option to override the principle. Option GT32 should be the report position.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT32 remain rejected as it would result in an overly restrictive policy, contrary to Circular 01/2006 which does not consider it appropriate to set a maximum number of pitches for a site.	None.
Decision on GT32: Size of Sites ? Rejected Option				
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.				
<i>GT33: Provision for Business Uses ? Proposed Approach</i>				
19441 - Great Shelford Parish Council		As the advice from the ODPM suggests that sites should be suitable for mixed residential and business uses, is this something the G and T community want? Therefore should this be the rule and not the exception and site locations should have the business element factored into them? Then the use can be carefully controlled.	Consultation exercises held with the Gypsy/Traveller community in 2006 determined a desire to have business uses available on site. SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to make provision for such sites where suitable. It is therefore recommended that option GT33 is taken forward.	None.
18994 - David Wilson Estates		These options identify site selection criteria which apply to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed. It is recommended that option GT33 is taken forward as it reflects the requirements of Circular 01/2006.	None.
18844 - Gamlingay Parish Council		Gamlingay Parish Council propose that the definition of 'significant impact' needs clarification. If proof of harm to an operation/profit to an existing company/business or property, this should be classified as 'a significant impact'- a further definition is required for a robust, fair approach.	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/	None
18592 - Milton Parish Council	Object	In this regard sites should be treated in the same way as all other homes and subjected to the same planning regime.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT33 is taken forward as it fulfils SCDC's requirement in Circular 01/2006 to identify sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of occupants and neighbouring residents.	None.
19513 - Foxton Parish Council	Object	Support for GT33 with the proviso that the phrase 'significant impact' is replaced by 'any adverse impact'.	The suggested wording is valid, however there would be no material change in the weight of the policy resulting from the suggested change.	None.
19026	Object	Business use should be prohibited.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT33 is taken forward as it fulfils SCDC's requirement in Circular 01/2006 to identify sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of occupants and neighbouring residents.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19392	Object	Would / Could this contradict , the fact that the entrance to a proposed traveller site , should not be near to an industrial site?	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT33 is taken forward as it fulfils SCDC's requirement in Circular 01/2006 to identify sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of occupants and neighbouring residents.	None.
19176 - Comberton Parish Council 18782 - Impington Parish Council 18757 - Longstowe Parish Council 18965 - Histon Parish Council 19294 - Cambridge City Council 18623 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19563 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support GT33. The proposed approach is a sensible safeguard that accords with normal best planning practice. Criteria/guidelines regarding traffic generation arising from any business use should be set.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT33 is taken forward as it fulfils SCDC's requirement in Circular 01/2006 to identify sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of occupants and neighbouring residents.	None.
18548 - Meldreth Parish Council	Support	Meldreth Parish Council supports GT 33. However it is important that these Business Uses should be subject to the same monitoring and control regimes as those in the settled community.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT33 is taken forward as it fulfils SCDC's requirement in Circular 01/2006 to identify sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of occupants and neighbouring residents. 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.scambs.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/Equality/	None.
19399 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT33 provided any such business use does not materially conflict with any other site selection criteria.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT33 is taken forward as it fulfils SCDC's requirement in Circular 01/2006 to identify sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of occupants and neighbouring residents.	None.
19013 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council supports this proposal but would propose an extension to 4.55 aimed at making it perfectly clear that normal business rates applicable to businesses x, y, or z, and as charged to the settled community, will be applied over and above normal council taxes.	Support noted. The payment of business rates is outside the remit of the Local Development Framework and all Development Plan Documents, including those proposing new housing developments. 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.scambs.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/Equality/	None.
19226 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19224 - East Cambridgeshire District Council	Support	Business should be encouraged in appropriate locations as it adds to sustainability objectives. However appropriate environmental controls are needed.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT33 is taken forward as it conforms to the requirement in Circular 01/2006 where SCDC must identify sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of occupants and neighbouring residents.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19089 - Hatley Parish Council	Support	Should not let non-permanent gypsies affect established businesses.	Support noted. 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.scambs.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/Equality/	None.
Decision on GT33: Provision for Business Uses ? Proposed Approach				
It is recommended that option GT33 is taken forward where businesses uses on Gypsy/Traveller sites would only be permitted if appropriate for their location and where they would not result a significant impact on neighbouring properties or land uses. These uses would be subject to EA regulations and requirements for disposal of waste.				
<i>GT34: Provision for Stables ? Proposed Approach</i>				
19389	Object	How is it looked at for someone in a house trying to obtain planning permission for a stable?	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT34 is taken forward as it 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.	None.
19400 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT34 provided there is no material conflict with any other site selection criteria.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT34 is taken forward as it 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.	None.
18656 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Support	We support this proposal, but only if the stabling is limited to the provision of facilities to meet the personal needs of horse owners living within the encampment, and that they are not to be used to support any other personal or business activity, including riding schools or horse riding services being provided for members of the general public. Equally, there needs to be a Section 106 in place to ensure that the structures are not converted nor used for any other purpose than for the stabling of horses.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT34 is taken forward as it 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. 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. 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18593 - Milton Parish Council	Support	Support: so as long as they are of an appropriate scale for that use and are not later to be turned into houses. We have already seen an instance of this happening in Chesterton Fen. Failure to do this will lead to resentment and hence conflict between the communities.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT34 is taken forward as it 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.	None.
18758 - Longstowe Parish Council 18624 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Support	Support this proposal but only where local Parish and District Councils are consulted.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT34 is taken forward as it 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. All suitable sites brought forward through the GTDPD process will be subject to public consultation and where planning applications are made for such proposals this too will be subject to a period of consultation where comments can be made.	None.
19014 - Cottenham Parish Council 19227 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19514 - Foxton Parish Council 18783 - Impington Parish Council 18966 - Histon Parish Council 19090 - Hatley Parish Council 19231 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19564 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Stabling should be considered positively provided there is no harmful impact to the site or surrounding area. Appropriate waste disposal must be identified.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT34 is taken forward as it 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.	None.
Decision on GT34: Provision for Stables ? Proposed Approach				
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.				
GT35: Traditional Gypsy Settlement Areas ? Proposed Approach				
19235 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		This appears to be a re-visit of policy areas GT27 and 29.	Options GT27 and GT29 relate to the district as a whole, whereas option GT35 relates to the settlement areas traditionally used by Gypsy/Travellers.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18995 - David Wilson Estates		What are traditional gypsy settlement areas? How are these defined? This is considered an unnecessary complication to the policy as the site selection criteria will deal with locational needs.	Circular 01/2006 requires that the settlement pattern of the Gypsy/Traveller community is reflected in any policy document put forward by SCDC. Therefore, the preference of Gypsy/Traveller to be located close to relatives and friends can not be ignored.	
19295 - Cambridge City Council	Object	It is unclear what a traditional gypsy settlement area is. The intention expressed in paragraph 4.57 that there should be no negative impact on the amenity, character and social and physical infrastructure of nearby settlements is setting an impossibly difficult policy objective.	Objection noted, however Circular 01/2006 requires that the settlement pattern of the Gypsy/Traveller community is reflected in any policy document put forward by SCDC. Therefore, the preference of Gypsy/Traveller to be located close to relatives and friends can not be ignored. The aim of restricting development which would have a negative impact on the amenity, character and social/physical infrastructure of nearby settlements is consistent with the proposed approach in option GT27/GT29 and is consistent with the approach taken by SCDC for conventional development. It is therefore recommended that option GT35 is taken forward.	None.
19666 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	It is not good enough to say that sites must not "dominate" the nearby community. This policy must say that sites must be of a scale that they are not significant in relation to nearby communities.	The term 'dominate' in itself would exclude any development that at a scale which would be disproportionate to the nearest settled community, thereby having a significant impact on local infrastructure. No change is therefore recommended. As option GT35 is consistent with Circular 01/2006, it is recommended that it is taken forward.	None.
19402 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT35. The G&TDPD needs 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. This approach is consistent with ODPM Circular 01/2006 "Planning For Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" (See paragraph 54).	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT35 is taken forward as it is consistent with Circular 01/2006.	None.
19177 - Comberton Parish Council 19228 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18845 - Gamlingay Parish Council 19515 - Foxton Parish Council 18594 - Milton Parish Council 18549 - Meldreth Parish Council 18784 - Impington Parish Council 18967 - Histon Parish Council 19091 - Hatley Parish Council 18625 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19565 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for option GT35. Failure to do this will lead to resentment and hence conflict between the communities.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT25 is taken forward as it reflects the requirement of Circular 01/2006.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19020 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council supports this proposal but feel that 4.57 needs to be amended, the "desire of Gypsies and Travellers to be close to relatives and friends" should not be a planning consideration any more than it is to the settled community.	Support noted. Circular 01/2006 requires that the settlement pattern of the Gypsy/Traveller community is reflected in any policy document put forward by SCDC. Therefore, the preference of Gypsy/Traveller to be located close to relative and friends can not be ignored.	None.
Decision on GT35: Traditional Gypsy Settlement Areas ? Proposed Approach				
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.				
GT36: Traditional Gypsy Settlement Areas ? Rejected Option				
18785 - Impington Parish Council		Impington Parish Council support the rejection of this approach.	Support noted and it is recommended that option GT36 remain rejected as it would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 which recognises that Gypsy/Traveller developments must respect the scale of existing settlements.	none
19296 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Support rejection of this option which ignores the guidance set out in ODPM Circular 01/2006.	Support noted and it is recommended that option GT36 remain rejected as it would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 which recognises that Gypsy/Traveller developments must respect the scale of existing settlements.	None.
19178 - Comberton Parish Council 19229 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18968 - Histon Parish Council 19566 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support rejection of option GT36.	Support noted and it is recommended that option GT36 remain rejected as it would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 which recognises that Gypsy/Traveller developments must respect the scale of existing settlements.	None.
18595 - Milton Parish Council	Support	Support SCDC's rejection of this option - accepting this option would lead to resentment and hence conflict between the communities.	Support noted and it is recommended that option GT36 remain rejected as it would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 which recognises that Gypsy/Traveller developments must respect the scale of existing settlements.	None.
19404 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support the rejection of GT36. Such an approach would have placed unacceptable pressure on local infrastructure and potentially dominate communities.	Support noted and it is recommended that option GT36 remain rejected as it would be contrary to Circular 01/2006 which recognises that Gypsy/Traveller developments must respect the scale of existing settlements.	None.

Decision on GT36: Traditional Gypsy Settlement Areas ? Rejected Option

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT37: Play Areas ? Proposed Approach</i>				
19134 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust		A safe play area is very important as this promotes opportunities for socialising, learning, skill development and physical activity. Careful consideration will have to be given as to how this area/equipment is maintained, protected for play and kept safe. Consideration could also be given for flexible use of the area for other community activities.	Noted.	None.
18996 - David Wilson Estates		This option identifies a site selection criteria which applies to all forms of development, whether for travellers and gypsies or for other forms of residential development.	Agreed.	None.
19241 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		If this refers to equipped play areas then size of site will be key to on-site provision.	It will not be feasible to locate play areas on all sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Where appropriate, it would be acceptable if a site was within a reasonable and safe walking distance of a play area. The size of a site will of course be a consideration where an area of play is proposed.	None.
18911 - Girton Parish Council		What facilities do they want/need?	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. It is recommended that option GT37 is taken forward as it reflects the objectives of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach taken for conventional housing.	None.
18846 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Object	Play areas-'reasonable distance' is classified within 400m or 1000m? Any of the existing population in villages are not served by a play area within these parameters. Play areas should be considered on site as with any new permanent housing site, with open space allocation/provision on the new site itself.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT37 is taken forward. The option already states that preference would be given to pitches within a reasonable and safe walking distance of local recreational facilities, which include play areas. The availability of play areas near potential sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches is one of the criteria in SCDC's proposed three-tier approach to site identification and assessment. The proposed approach would not automatically exclude a site from consideration should there be no area for play available as it may perform well against a range of other key criteria. The approach is consistent with that used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.
18969 - Histon Parish Council	Object	Histon Parish Council believe this proposal would limit the potential of integration of the Travellers into the community by creating separate facilities.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT37 is taken forward as it reflects the objectives of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach taken for conventional housing where there is a requirement for play areas. The intention of the policy is not to limit integration as any open space would ideally be open to any members of the public.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18696 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	The wording of this policy should be changed to reflect that a play area should be available either on site or within a reasonable safe walking distance.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT37 is taken forward. The option already states that preference would be given to pitches within a reasonable and safe walking distance of local recreational facilities, which include play areas.	None.
19230 - Cottenham Village Design Group	Object	Whilst there should generally be children's play facilities within or close to traveller sites, the proposed approach would appear to reject sites that only have facilities nearby.	The availability of play areas near potential sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches is one of the criteria of SCDC's proposed three-tier approach to site identification and assessment. The proposed approach would not automatically exclude a site from consideration should there be no area for play available as it may perform well against a range of other key criteria. The approach is consistent with that used by SCDC for conventional housing.	None.
19406 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Recommend that CCC support GT37. CCC has recommend to EERA as part of the Single Issue Review process that preference be given to the allocation of new Traveller and Gypsy sites in sustainable locations within or adjoining settlements with access to services (e.g. close to shops, schools and doctors).	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT37 is taken forward as it reflects the objectives of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach taken for conventional housing.	None.
19129 - cambourne parish Council 19516 - Foxton Parish Council 18786 - Impington Parish Council 19297 - Cambridge City Council 19598 - FFT Planning 19567 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support GT37 as this is a sensible safeguard in the interests of creating a better standard of residential amenity on sites.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT37 is taken forward as it reflects the objectives of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach taken for conventional housing.	None
19619 - West Wratting Parish Council	Support	Whilst an area for play for children is appropriate it should be for local residents to fund the play facilities. They will then be more inclined to treat them with respect and look after them rather than vandalise them.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT37 is taken forward as it reflects the objectives of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach taken for conventional housing. Similar to conventional forms of residential development, costs and contributions towards basic infrastructure and site facilities/services are generally borne by an applicant/developer, and we expect this to be no different with the Gypsy/Traveller community.	None.
19023 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council supports this proposal but 4.60 needs to state strongly that these "open play areas" can never be used to accommodate caravans or other vehicles, no matter what the reason and no matter how short the duration.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT37 is taken forward as it reflects the objectives of Circular 01/2006 and is consistent with the approach taken for conventional housing. Planning controls would restrict the number of pitches permitted on a particular site; therefore play areas would be protected against other uses.	None.

Decision on GT37: Play Areas ? Proposed Approach

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT38A: Site Availability ? Option A</i>				
19180 - Comberton Parish Council		We can only support this if it included "where such land met the agreed selection criteria".	Noted. Only sites which perform well against the Council's proposed sustainability and suitability criteria will be brought forward.	None.
18787 - Impington Parish Council		Impington Parish Council make no recommendation here. However the land for traveller sites is identified and obtained it is important that they are managed by SCDC.	Noted, however it should be noted that the Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Therefore, other reasonable alternatives must be considered.	None.
19248 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 18997 - David Wilson Estates		At this stage all three options should be considered to provide sufficient suitable sites if private landowners do not come forward with land.	Agreed.	None.
19423 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd		An alternative hierarchy approach to the identification of sites is proposed; Option A - District Council or other public body owned land capable of being brought forward by such bodies; Option B - Secure land through exercising Compulsory Purchase Powers; Option C - Promotion of privately owned sites.	It is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership, where the hierarchy suggest could be applied. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
18697 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	We would not be opposed to the use of compulsory purchase to secure sites. However this power should also be used to provide land for the settled community in affordable housing need. To provide one section of the community and not the other would be divisive and would harm social cohesion.	Objection noted. 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 should 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.	None.
19249 - English Partnerships	Object	Firstly, English Partnerships would like to highlight that the Circular makes no reference to local landowners offering sites to the local authority as a preferred (or any) option. Secondly, when identifying sites for gypsy pitches or other uses, the compulsory purchase route should always be the final option after all other options have been thoroughly tested. It is the view of English Partnerships that the sequential approach as set out in the DPD should be amended to reflect the options set out in Circular 01/2006, with the CPO option as the final, last resort option.	It is not unreasonable to assume some sites will come forward from private landowners. Rather than using Compulsory Purchase Powers to acquire this land, a more pragmatic approach should be adopted where, for example, Gypsies/Travellers could acquire privately owned land and bring it forward for consideration by the Council or through the consultation process of the GTDPD privately owned sites are brought forward by landowners. SCDC is not a significant land owner and much of what is in its ownership are public amenity areas which are not suitable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. As option C is not expected to yield suitable sites for consideration, the majority of sites for consideration are likely to come from private ownership (Option A). The sequential search outlined in Circular 01/2006 will of course be reflected in the relevant policy of the GTDPD.	Ensure the relevant GTDPD policy reflects the sequential search outlined in ODPM 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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18759 - Longstowe Parish Council	Object	In favour of GT38C.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
19621 - West Wratting Parish Council	Support	Compulsory Purchase Powers are very seldom used for residential accommodation as a norm and should not be employed specifically and in isolation for the Gypsy and Traveller community. Options A and C are satisfactory and must provide the way forward. Nobody should be forced to sell his/her own land, possibly close to their residence for this purpose.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
19034 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council believe all three options should be adopted. The statement 4.64, the suggestion that the Council is not financially able to purchase land seems a strange statement for if a public site is required then rental income should be sufficient to cover any borrowing.	Support noted. It is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers. The suggestion of using rental income to cover the cost of borrowing could be considered further if a situation arises where SCDC will have no other alternative but to make use of a CPO.	Consider the use of rental income to cover the cost of borrowing associated with any use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.
18657 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Support	We strongly support option A, because we do not want to get into the position where our Council Taxes are being spent to unfairly support those who choose to adopt a way of life that is alien to that of the settled community.	Support noted. It is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
19298 - Cambridge City Council	Support	But, GT38 A/B/C are not really alternative options, all three may be needed in some circumstances.	Support noted. It is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership.	None.
19130 - cambourne parish Council 19407 - Cambridgeshire County Council 19232 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19351 - Swavesey Parish Council 18847 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	Support option GT38A.	Support noted. It is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Decision on GT38A: Site Availability ? Option A				
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.				
GT38B: Site Availability ? Option B				
18788 - Impington Parish Council		Impington Parish Council make no recommendation here. However the land for traveller sites is identified and obtained it is important that they are managed by SCDC.	Noted, however it should be noted that the Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Therefore, other reasonable alternatives must be considered.	None.
19250 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		This is probably the most likely option as the Council has little suitable land in its ownership.	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.	None.
19448 - David Wilson Estates		All options should be considered at this stage for delivery.	Agreed.	None.
19179 - Comberton Parish Council 19131 - Cambourne parish Council 19234 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19348 - Swavesey Parish Council 18596 - Milton Parish Council 19028 18519 - Croydon Parish Council	Object	Opposition to option GT38B. Accepting this option will lead to resentment and hence conflict between the communities, preventing successful integration of both communities.	Objections noted, however it is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
18760 - Longstowe Parish Council	Object	In favour of GT38C.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
18895 - Over parish council 18626 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Object	Object to option GT38B. The use of compulsory purchase powers could lead to conflict.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that all three options are taken forward as they allow for a more flexible approach to site selection. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18658 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	We strongly support option A, because we do not want to get into the position where our Council Taxes are being spent to unfairly support those who choose to adopt a way of life that is alien to that of the settled community.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
19620 - West Wratting Parish Council	Object	This is not favoured. Compulsory Purchase Powers are very seldom used for residential accommodation as a norm and should not be employed specifically and in isolation for the Gypsy and Traveller community. Options A and C are satisfactory and must provide the way forward. Nobody should be forced to sell his/her own land, possibly close to their residence for this purpose.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
19428 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	An alternative hierarchy approach to the identification of sites is proposed; Option A - District Council or other public body owned land capable of being brought forward by such bodies; Option B - Secure land through exercising Compulsory Purchase Powers; Option C - Promotion of privately owned sites.	Objection noted. It is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership, where the hierarchy suggest could be applied. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
19035 - Cottenham Parish Council 19299 - Cambridge City Council	Support	GT38 A/B/C are not really alternative options, all three may be needed in some circumstances.	Support noted. It is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership.	None.
19408 - Cambridgeshire County Council 19568 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support option GT38B. The use of compulsory purchase powers will allow the best chance of gaining sufficient sites	Circular 01/2006 indicates the Council should consider the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers to acquire appropriate sites. The use of these powers often has consequences associated with financial cost and community conflict and should therefore be avoided where possible. The Council is currently not financially able to purchase land and therefore other sources for suitable sites must be considered. It is therefore recommended that all three options are taken forward to allow for a more flexible approach to site selection. If this situation changes it may be possible to use Compulsory Purchase Powers if there are problems in finding sufficient available sites for additional gypsy pitches in the District.	None.

Decision on GT38B: Site Availability ? Option B

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT38C: Site Availability ? Option C</i>				
19409 - Cambridgeshire County Council		It is unclear whether "Council-owned" land includes County Council owned land. Nevertheless, the County Council welcomes the opportunity to be involved in the site selection process. The Authority 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.	SCDC will consider all suitable land in public ownership which would be suitable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which could include land in the ownership of the County Council.	None.
18789 - Impington Parish Council		Impington Parish Council make no recommendation here. However the land for traveller sites is identified and obtained it is important that they are managed by SCDC.	Noted, however it should be noted that the Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Therefore, other reasonable alternatives must be considered.	None.
18912 - Girton Parish Council 19251 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19449 - David Wilson Estates		The Council owns very little land. At this stage all three options should be considered.	Agreed.	None.
19430 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	An alternative hierarchy approach to the identification of sites is proposed; Option A - District Council or other public body owned land capable of being brought forward by such bodies; Option B - Secure land through exercising Compulsory Purchase Powers; Option C - Promotion of privately owned sites.	Objection noted. It is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership, where the hierarchy suggest could be applied. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
18659 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	We strongly support option A, because we do not want to get into the position where our Council Taxes are being spent to unfairly support those who choose to adopt a way of life that is alien to that of the settled community.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
19622 - West Wratting Parish Council	Support	Compulsory Purchase Powers are very seldom used for residential accommodation as a norm and should not be employed specifically and in isolation for the Gypsy and Traveller community. Options A and C are satisfactory and must provide the way forward. Nobody should be forced to sell his/her own land, possibly close to their residence for this purpose.	Support noted. It is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
19036 - Cottenham Parish Council 19300 - Cambridge City Council	Support	GT38 A/B/C are not really alternative options, all three may be needed in some circumstances.	Support noted. It is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19233 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18761 - Longstowe Parish Council 18627 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Support	Support option GT38C as a sensible and less contentious approach provided Parish/District Councils agree.	Support noted. It is recommended that all three options are taken forward as it will be necessary to consider all suitable sites which may come forward from private and public ownership. Although the Council is not financially able to purchase land, Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC not to rule out the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers.	None.
Decision on GT38C: Site Availability ? Option C				
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.				
GTQ1:				
19362 - Swavesey Parish Council 18790 - Impington Parish Council 19092 - Hatley Parish Council 18998 - David Wilson Estates		No site identified.	Noted.	None.
18660 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		We know of no such sites, but we are aware that individuals are keen to purchase land that does become available in order to guard against possible take up by persons seeking to exploit such opportunities.	Comments noted.	None.
18650		A site is available for allocation in Chesterton Fen Road. It serves no beneficial purpose and is derelict and, if rejected for comprehensive development, has little potential, despite being in a sustainable location. It is in an area attractive to travellers, who are likely to require further sites in the vicinity in the future. A planning permission can be conditioned to ensure appropriate development. If allocated, the site could make a much needed contribution to the shortfall in travellers' sites.	Comments noted. The site will be considered during the next stage, Issues and Options Report 2: Site Options.	None.
19411 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Not at this stage. Nevertheless, the County Council welcomes the opportunity to be involved in the site selection process. The Authority 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.	Noted. SCDC will seek the co-operation of neighbouring authorities in identifying suitable sites to meet the accommodation needs of the Gypsy/Traveller community through the DPD process and development of the RSS.	None.
18597 - Milton Parish Council		Add Sandy Park in Chesterton Fen if City Council owned allocation is removed.	Noted. The site will be considered during the next stage, Issues & Options Report 2: Site Options.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19632 - Great and Little Chishill Parish Council		We have studied your GTDPD with interest and generally agree with your options and needs assessment. However, we are writing to express our doubts as to hosting a suitable travellers site for about 10 families in our Parish that will adequately meet their needs. Chishill is a small and comparatively isolated village of about 600 people situated on the southern extremity of the County. The nearest large village is 4 to 6 miles away and there is no regular public transport. There is no village shop or school and virtually no local employment. Policing in the village is almost non-existent and our nearest hospital is Adeenbrookes which is 15 miles away. Therefore in conclusion, we strongly advocate that locating a traveller's site within the Parish of Great & Little Chishill would be completely inappropriate.	Comments noted.	None.
19039 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	It is accepted that the District Council has limited land holdings. 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.	SCDC will undertake consider all land in its ownership, however limited, as outlined in option GT38C. The Council will also encourage co-operation with neighbouring authorities to identify any potential sites suitable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
<i>GT39: Site Ownership and Management ? Option A</i>				
19364 - Swavesey Parish Council 19252 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		This option will be appropriate for some sites, but depends on private gypsy finding which may not be available. Suggest combination of options GT39 and GT40 is more realistic providing a wider choice.	Agreed. In order to allow for a more flexible planning policy framework where all options for site ownership and management are considered, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward.	Ensure options GT39 and GT40 are reflected in the relevant GTDPD policy.
19412 - Cambridgeshire County Council		No comment at this stage.	None.	None.
18661 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	There is no justification in treating the travelling community any differently to the settled community and therefore GT 40 has to be the preferred option.	Objection noted. 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. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19623 - West Wrattling Parish Council	Object	Although the supporting text is noted there is a concern at the site management being left to those on the site as the incoming owners of the accommodation. If they fail to provide maintenance there is a serious problem which could affect infrastructure such as roadways and drainage as well as visual appearance. Hence GT40 is preferred unless there is a drawback clause enabling a professional business to do the work and re-charge owners if proper maintenance failed to occur. GT40 also ensures those with the professional skills and experiences are in control.	Objection noted. The Council believes that small family sites owned and managed by Gypsies/Travellers will be more effective at dealing with anti-social behaviour. This view is supported by a number of successful family-run sites that exist in the district. A sense of pride and respect for sites is also 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. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management.	None.
18791 - Impington Parish Council 18970 - Histon Parish Council 19030	Object	Object to option GT39 and favour option GT41 where SCDC is responsible for site ownership and management.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT40 is taken forward. The Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative.	None.
18762 - Longstowe Parish Council	Object	This would have potentially damaging implications to the local community as anecdotally many sites fall rapidly into disrepair. Ownership retention by local authorities would be preferable. Phased ownership over a number of years might be an option. We should have grave reservations about wholesale private ownership of sites in the early years as this will lead to a total loss of control and flexibility in the system.	Objection noted, however the Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative. The Council also believes that small family sites owned and managed by Gypsies/Travellers will be more effective at dealing with anti-social behaviour. This view is supported by a number of successful family-run sites that exist in the district. A sense of pride and respect for sites is also 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. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19236 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18550 - Meldreth Parish Council 19569 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for option GT39 because this is the preferred option for the gypsy and traveller community (rep 19569), the ownership of sites by the travellers is more likely to result in good maintenance and behaviour (rep 19236), and the travelling community should be subject to the same market pressures on land prices as those people in the settled community (rep 18550).	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT39 is taken forward as it reflects the desires of the Gypsy/Traveller community. However, not all members of the Gypsy/Traveller community are in a position to purchase their pitches and undertake all development costs. The release of sites to private developers or Housing Associations may be necessary to oversee the development and management of a site and provide affordable accommodation to members of the community not able to purchase pitches. It is therefore recommended that option GT40 is also taken forward as this would allow for greater flexibility in site ownership and management of Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
19040 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council supports this proposal along with option GT40. A third option might be to allow Gypsies and Travellers to identify their own land (as they do now) but on the strict understanding that the Council determines the suitability of the land for the purpose intended.	Support noted. The suggested third option is addressed through the normal planning application process where the Council would consider proposals for Gypsy/Traveller pitches on privately owned land. Option GT39 relates more specifically to the sites put forward by the GTDPD for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
19444 - Cambridge City Council	Support	GT39 and GT40 are not mutually exclusive and it is likely that both approaches will be needed.	Support noted. In order to allow for a more flexible planning policy framework where all options for site ownership and management are considered, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward.	Ensure options GT39 and GT40 are reflected in the relevant GTDPD policy.

Decision on GT39: Site Ownership and Management ? Option A

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 pit to Gypsies and Travellers.

GT40: Site Ownership and Management ? Option B

19041 - Cottenham Parish Council		Cottenham Parish Council supports this proposal along with option GT39. A third option might be to allow Gypsies and Travellers to identify their own land (as they do now) but on the strict understanding that the Council determines the suitability of the land for the purpose intended.	The suggested third option is addressed through the normal planning application process where the Council would consider proposals for Gypsy/Traveller pitches on privately owned land. Option GT40 relates more specifically to the sites put forward by the GTDPD for Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	None.
19366 - Swavesey Parish Council 19443 - Swavesey Parish Council 19253 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		This option will be appropriate for some sites, but gypsies prefer to be managed by themselves in the main. Suggest combination of options GT39 and GT40 is more realistic providing a wider choice.	Agreed. In order to allow for a more flexible planning policy framework where all options for site ownership and management are considered, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward.	Ensure options GT39 and GT40 are reflected in the relevant GTDPD policy.
19414 - Cambridgeshire County Council		No comment at this stage.	None.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18848 - Gamlingay Parish Council		Why should the District Council dispose of the potential sites? Gamlingay Parish Council would prefer that the sites were owned and managed by Housing Associations, and are against individual ownership/management of sites.	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. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management.	None.
18763 - Longstowe Parish Council	Object	If gypsy/travellers really wish to drift into the settled community and live permanently in houses then the first step on that ladder would be through rental from a Housing Association. Support GT41	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT40 is taken forward. Option GT41 has been rejected because the Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative. This does not indicate a shift of the Gypsy/Traveller community towards permanent settled communities - the traditional way of life and freedom to travel would still be possible.	None.
18792 - Impington Parish Council 18971 - Histon Parish Council 19031	Object	Object to option GT40 and favour option GT41 where SCDC is responsible for site ownership and management.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT40 is taken forward. The Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative.	None.
18662 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Support	There is no justification in treating the travelling community any differently to the settled community and therefore GT 40 has to be the preferred option.	Support noted. 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. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19624 - West Wratting Parish Council	Support	Although the supporting text is noted there is a concern at the site management being left to those on the site as the incoming owners of the accommodation. If they fail to provide maintenance there is a serious problem which could affect infrastructure such as roadways and drainage as well as visual appearance. Hence GT40 is preferred unless there is a drawback clause enabling a professional business to do the work and re-charge owners if proper maintenance failed to occur. GT40 also ensures those with the professional skills and experiences are in control.	Support noted. The Council believes that small family sites owned and managed by Gypsies/Travellers will be more effective at dealing with anti-social behaviour. This view is supported by a number of successful family-run sites that exist in the district. A sense of pride and respect for sites is also 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. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management.	None.
19181 - Comberton Parish Council 19442 - Great Shelford Parish Council 19237 - Cottenham Village Design Group	Support	Support option GT40 because it would provide accountability (rep 19181), some sites are required for travellers who are not in a position to buy their own sites (rep 19237), and housing associations have access to additional resources (rep 19442)	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT40 is taken forward. The Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative. It may be unrealistic to expect that the ownership and management of all sites identified in the GTDPD would be undertaken by Housing Associations. However, 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. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management.	None.
19302 - Cambridge City Council	Support	GT39 and GT40 are not mutually exclusive and it is likely that both approaches will be needed.	Support noted. In order to allow for a more flexible planning policy framework where all options for site ownership and management are considered, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward.	Ensure options GT39 and GT40 are reflected in the relevant GTDPD policy.

Decision on GT40: Site Ownership and Management ? Option B

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 pit to Gypsies and Travellers.

GT41: Site Ownership and Management ? Rejected Option

19415 - Cambridgeshire County Council

No comment at this stage.

None.

None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19625 - West Wratting Parish Council	Object	Although the supporting text is noted there is a concern at the site management being left to those on the site as the incoming owners of the accommodation. If they fail to provide maintenance there is a serious problem which could affect infrastructure such as roadways and drainage as well as visual appearance. Hence GT40 is preferred unless there is a drawback clause enabling a professional business to do the work and re-charge owners if proper maintenance failed to occur. GT40 also ensures those with the professional skills and experiences are in control.	Objection noted. The Council believes that small family sites owned and managed by Gypsies/Travellers will be more effective at dealing with anti-social behaviour. This view is supported by a number of successful family-run sites that exist in the district. A sense of pride and respect for sites is also 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. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management.	None.
18793 - Impington Parish Council	Object	Impington Parish Council objects strongly to this option. All traveller sites must be managed and preferably owned by SCDC. This will ensure equitable allocate of pitches, allow monitoring and control of the provision of pitches. Regular attendance at a site by an SCDC officer will ensure the continuity of tenants, that transit pitches are used correctly, ensure that planning permissions and conditions are adhered to. Regular monitoring will also ensure that council tax can be collected and other services, such as refuse collection, are carried out in a timely manner.	Objection noted, however the Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative. However, 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. The Council believes that small family sites owned and managed by Gypsies/Travellers will be more effective at dealing with anti-social behaviour. This view is supported by a number of successful family-run sites that exist in the district. A sense of pride and respect for sites is also instilled when they are privately owned. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management. The payment of council tax is outside the remit of the Local Development Framework and all Development Plan Documents, including those proposing new housing developments.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19029	Object	The Council should have full control of the sites. This would allow them to take action against anti-social behaviour at the earliest opportunity. It allows the public to hold the Council and their Councillor(s) to account if a site is mismanaged or causes a nuisance.	Objection noted, however the Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative. However, 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. The Council believes that small family sites owned and managed by Gypsies/Travellers will be more effective at dealing with anti-social behaviour. This view is supported by a number of successful family-run sites that exist in the district. A sense of pride and respect for sites is also instilled when they are privately owned. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management.	None.
18663 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	There is no justification in treating the travelling community any differently to the settled community and therefore GT 40 has to be the preferred option.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT41 remain rejected as the Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative. However, 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. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18764 - Longstowe Parish Council 18972 - Histon Parish Council 18628 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Support	Support for option GT41. The ownership and management of sites should be undertaken by the Council or other official body/organisation in order to live up to the environmental and social goals that the document has trumpeted.	Objection noted, however the Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative. However, 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. The Council believes that small family sites owned and managed by Gypsies/Travellers will be more effective at dealing with anti-social behaviour. This view is supported by a number of successful family-run sites that exist in the district. A sense of pride and respect for sites is also instilled when they are privately owned. Therefore, it is recommended that options GT39 and GT40 are taken forward as they allow the basis for a broad and flexible approach to site ownership and management.	
18664 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Support	4.67 We are very supportive of this, provided that it is properly secured and strenuously enforced by means of a Section 106.	Support noted.	None.
18896 - Over parish council	Support	The Parish Council supports the idea that sites are managed by Travellers or some form of housing associations.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT41 remain rejected as the the Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative.	None.

Decision on GT41: Site Ownership and Management ? Rejected Option

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 pit to Gypsies and Travellers.

GT42: Affordable Accommodation ? Proposed Option

19416 - Cambridgeshire County Council 18999 - David Wilson Estates		No comments made.	None.	None.
---	--	-------------------	-------	-------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19371	Object	Has it been looked at within the settled community if this approach works?	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT42 is taken forward. Housing Associations are involved in the development of conventional affordable housing and has 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.	None.
18794 - Impington Parish Council	Object	Impington Parish Council objects to this option. All traveller sites should be managed and preferably owned by SCDC. This is the only way that they can monitor and control the provision. Impington Parish Council supports the provision of affordable pitches under SCDC ownership and management.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT42 is taken forward. The Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative.	None.
18665 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Support	GT 42 is our preferred option, provided that the word "assist" means facilitation and not contributing financially.	Support noted. The Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative. It is therefore recommended that option GT42 is taken forward.	None.
19042 - Cottenham Parish Council 19517 - Foxton Parish Council 18973 - Histon Parish Council 19303 - Cambridge City Council 19570 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for option GT42. The approach will assist those Gypsies and Travellers who cannot afford to purchase their own pitches.	Support noted. The Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative. It is recommended that option GT42 is taken forward.	None.

Decision on GT42: Affordable Accommodation ? Proposed Option

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.

GT43: Affordable Accommodation ? Alternative Option

19000 - David Wilson Estates		This approach would lead to significant management issues where occupancy would be mixed on any one site.	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. It is therefore recommended that option GT43 is not taken forward in favour of option GT42.	None.
------------------------------	--	---	---	-------

4. IDENTIFYING NEW GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES

GT43: Affordable Accommodation ? Alternative Option

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19418 - Cambridgeshire County Council		No comment at this stage.	None.	None.
18795 - Impington Parish Council	Object	Impington Parish Council objects to this option. All traveller sites should be managed and preferably owned by SCDC. This is the only way that they can monitor and control the provision. Impington Parish Council supports the provision of affordable pitches under SCDC ownership and management. Impington Parish Council supports the requirement for a proportion of affordable pitches on a site.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT43 is not taken forward. The Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative.	None.
18666 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 19368 - Swavesey Parish Council 19571 - Peterborough City Council	Object	Object to option GT43 as it is not practical in all cases. The use of housing associations would be more appropriate.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT43 is not taken forward. 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. Option GT42 is therefore recommended to be taken forward.	None.
18974 - Histon Parish Council 19304 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Support option GT43, however it may be difficult to operate in practice.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT43 is not taken forward. 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. Option GT42 is therefore recommended to be taken forward.	None.

Decision on GT43: Affordable Accommodation ? Alternative Option

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT44A: Transit Sites ? Option A</i>				
18849 - Gamlingay Parish Council		Definition/need for transit sites. The need for transit sites is not fully explained-gypsy/traveller sites are all transitory? Gamlingay Parish Council is against transitory and special event encampments (GT44B and GT45B).	It is recommended that option GT44A is taken forward. 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.	None.
19157 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust		Good quality and adequate provision of transit sites is necessary. It is not acceptable that through lack of provision, Travellers may have to make stop-overs where there are poor or no facilities and basic amenities such as clean water which would have public health consequences	It is recommended that option GT44A is taken forward. 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.	None.
19419 - Cambridgeshire County Council 19001 - David Wilson Estates		No comment made.	None.	None.
19254 - East Cambridgeshire District Council		A joint authority approach to transit site provision would only proceed if there was strong supporting evidence of a need for such provision.	Agreed. The Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment May 2006 has identified a need in Cambridge for the provision of a 15 pitch transit site.	None.
18913 - Girton Parish Council		We need flexibility.	Noted.	None.
19373	Object	What has happened with transit sites in the past?	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT44A is taken forward. 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.	None.
19305 - Cambridge City Council	Support	The Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment May 2006 has identified a need in Cambridge for the provision of a 15 pitch transit site.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT44A is taken forward as a need for transit sites has been identified. 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.	None.
19572 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Option A is preferred. Gypsies and travellers are by their very nature nomadic. Transit sites are necessary to maintain their way of life. It is expected Peterborough City Council will be allocating transit sites in our LDF to allow for a greater degree of movement in the gypsy and traveller community.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT44A is taken forward. 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19182 - Comberton Parish Council 19043 - Cottenham Parish Council 19238 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19518 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support for option GT44A. There is a need for transit sites to address the issue of illegal sites. The sites of these sites should be restricted.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT44A is taken forward. 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.	None.
19370 - Swavesey Parish Council	Support	Swavesey Parish Council considers that transit sites will always be required in this area and therefore some provision has to be made, otherwise the present situation regarding transit sites will continue.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT44A is taken forward. 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.	None.
18796 - Impington Parish Council	Support	Impington Parish Council supports this option. Transit sites should be provided to prevent illegal encampments. It should be possible to have sites where the all the pitches are reserved for travellers in transit. In addition each non-transit site should have a number of transit-only pitches to allow visitors to be colocated.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT44A is taken forward. 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. The allocation of additional space within authorised sites for visiting Gypsies/Travellers for transit-only pitches (i.e. for visiting family/friends) is a relevant proposal which could address the issue of illegal encampments and should therefore be considered further.	Within the GTDPD consideration should be given to the provision of transit-only pitches within authorised sites.
18975 - Histon Parish Council	Support	Histon Parish Council question why there is no third option SCDC could provide.	No further options were present as it is not reasonable for the Council to provide transit sites in isolation of other local authorities since their provision needs to be county wide in order to meet demand. GT44A and GT44B therefore represent the only reasonable options available.	None.

Decision on GT44A: Transit Sites ? Option A

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.

GT44B: Transit Sites ? Option B

19420 - Cambridgeshire County Council 19447 - David Wilson Estates		No Comment Made.	None.	None.
18850 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Object	Definition/need for transit sites. The need for transit sites is not fully explained-gypsy/traveller sites are all transitory? Gamlingay Parish Council is against transitory and special event encampments.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT44B is not taken forward. The Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment May 2006 has identified a need in Cambridge for the provision of a 15 pitch transit site. A transit site is defined as a temporary stopping place for Gypsies/Travellers passing through the District. 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19044 - Cottenham Parish Council 19239 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19372 - Swavesey Parish Council 19519 - Foxton Parish Council 18797 - Impington Parish Council	Object	Object to option GT44B. Transit sites should be provided across the County as they would reduce illegal encampments. Option GT44A is supported.	Objections noted. It is recommended that option GT44B not be taken forward. The aim of the GTDPD is to find new sites within the District to meet future demand for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and set out a robust strategy for dealing with unauthorised encampments. Although the provision of transit sites is outside the remit of the GTDPD, the significance of the issue requires further discussions with neighbouring authorities to investigate potential solutions.	None.
19306 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment May 2006 has identified a need in Cambridge for the provision of a 15 pitch transit site. However it may prove to be impossible to deliver such a site within the boundary of the City and an alternative provision in South Cambridgeshire would be a suitable alternative.	Objection noted. It is recommended that option GT44B not be taken forward. The aim of the GTDPD is to find new sites within the District to meet future demand for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and set out a robust strategy for dealing with unauthorised encampments. Although the provision of transit sites is outside the remit of the GTDPD, the significance of the issue requires further discussions with neighbouring authorities to investigate potential solutions.	None.
19032	Support	By definition, travellers are not going to be in a single location for long. Therefore all sites should be leased for an appropriate dwell time, before the travellers move elsewhere.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT44B is not taken further. 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.	None.
19674 - Ickleton Parish Council 18551 - Meldreth Parish Council 18897 - Over parish council 18520 - Croydon Parish Council 18629 - Little Gransden Parish Council	Support	Support option GT44B as there is already sufficient provision for Gypsy/Traveller sites in the district. Transit sites in the past have caused problems.	Support noted, however it is recommended that option GT44B not be taken forward. The aim of the GTDPD is to find new sites within the District to meet future demand for Gypsy/Traveller pitches and set out a robust strategy for dealing with unauthorised encampments. Although the provision of transit sites is outside the remit of the GTDPD, the significance of the issue requires further discussions with neighbouring authorities to investigate potential solutions.	None.

Decision on GT44B: Transit Sites ? Option B

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.

GT45A: Temporary Special Event Sites ? Option A

19421 - Cambridgeshire County Council 19002 - David Wilson Estates	No comments made.	None.	None.
---	-------------------	-------	-------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18914 - Girton Parish Council		They will come whether we do anything or not. What is the best way to handle them? What happens at present?	Currently no temporary sites are available for special events. The Council does grant temporary consents for Gypsy/Traveller pitches where an application has been made, however the occurrence of unauthorised encampments increases significantly at these times of years due to the influx of visiting Gypsies/Travellers to the area. It is recommended that further discussions with neighbouring authorities are undertaken to investigate the feasibility of establishing temporary sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches during special events.	None.
19183 - Comberton Parish Council 19045 - Cottenham Parish Council 19240 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19374 - Swavesey Parish Council 19520 - Foxton Parish Council 18598 - Milton Parish Council 18798 - Impington Parish Council 18976 - Histon Parish Council 19307 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Generally there is an acknowledged need for temporary site(s) to accommodate the influx of Gypsies/Travellers during special events within the District and in neighbouring Authorities. The identification of a temporary special event site(s) would help to address the increase in unauthorised encampments during these periods.	Currently no site is identified to accommodate the influx of additional Gypsies/Travellers who come to the District during special events. Given the support for the approach, it is recommended that option GT45A is taken forward and that the Council will cooperate with neighbouring authorities to investigate the feasibility of establishing temporary Gypsy/Traveller sites during these events.	None.

Decision on GT45A: Temporary Special Event Sites ? Option A

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.

GT45B: Temporary Special Event Sites ? Option B

19422 - Cambridgeshire County Council 19446 - David Wilson Estates		No comment made.	None.	None.
19046 - Cottenham Parish Council 19242 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19375 - Swavesey Parish Council 19521 - Foxton Parish Council 18599 - Milton Parish Council 18799 - Impington Parish Council 19308 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Object to the general approach where the Council would not seek to investigate the feasibility of a temporary site for Gypsies/Travellers during special events as the problem of illegal encampments during these periods is widespread.	The lack of a temporary special event site(s) within the District has led 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.	That General Approach GT45B be reclassified as a rejected approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18851 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Object	Definition/need for transit sites. The need for transit sites is not fully explained-gypsy/traveller sites are all transitory? Gamlingay Parish Council is against transitory and special event encampments.	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.	None.
19626 - West Wratting Parish Council	Object	This is an unreasonable option as the benefits of the events are gained by Cambridge City. It therefore should find the necessary sites if the need exists.	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.	None.
19675 - Ickleton Parish Council 18898 - Over parish council 18521 - Croydon Parish Council 18630 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19573 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support the general approach whereby the Council would not seek to investigate the feasibility of establishing a temporary special event site.	The Council believes there is merit in investigating the feasibility of establishing temporary special event site(s) as it could help to reduce the number of illegal encampments in the District during these periods. This would be done in cooperation with neighbouring authorities. It is therefore recommended that GT45B is not taken further.	That Generation Approach GT45B be reclassified as a rejected approach.

Decision on GT45B: Temporary Special Event Sites ? Option B

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.

GTQ2:

18769 - Longstowe Parish Council		The document discounts the concerns of local residents on illegal sites and lack of action by SCDC and cites a robust GTDPD as the answer to all problems. This is absolute nonsense. The consultation documents are yet another example of just going through the motions. There is no plausible mechanism for resolving today's problems which could, by the very nature of increased sites, be even greater in the future. Finally, there is neither indication of the cost of the schemes nor where the funds will be coming from either in the short or long term.	The GTDPD aims to reduce the number of unauthorised encampments and the conflict and controversy they cause through the authorisation of suitable and sustainable sites that conform to the guidance set out in Circular 01/2006. The policy framework set out in the DPD will also make enforcement more effective. It is expected that the majority of sites will be developed privately by Gypsies/Travellers. Therefore it is expected that costs associated with land purchase, development of sites and management of sites will be through private funds. The Council is financially unable to buy and manage its own sites. Facilitating purchases by Housing Associations/Partners is the only reasonable alternative. More detailed information on costs and funding sources are beyond the remit of the Development Plan Document.	None.
----------------------------------	--	---	---	-------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18667 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		Please see full text.	The details relating to Northstowe are outside the remit of the Development Plan Document. SCDC is required by Circular 01/2006 to consider all areas of the district for suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, including the Green Belt in exceptional circumstance when all other reasonable alternatives have been exhausted. The payment of council tax is outside the remit of the Local Development Framework and all Development Plan Documents, including those proposing new housing developments. It is expected that most Gypsy/Traveller sites will be privately-owned family sites, developed and managed with the use of private funds. In some instances a Housing Association may undertake the costs of developing and/or managing a site. Although currently the Council is not financially able to buy and manage its own sites, this could change in the future. Therefore, to place a restriction on ownership would be unsound and contrary to Circular 01/2006. The concern raised over bridleways has been addressed through the Council's response to representation 18654. Development which has a negative impact on public bridleways or footpaths would not be permitted. However, to restrict the use of these public routes by Gypsies/Travellers would be unreasonable and contrary to Circular 01/2006 and the Council's Race Equality Scheme. Such a policy would be unsound.	None.
19424 - Cambridgeshire County Council		No further issues identified.	None.	None.
19376 - Swavesey Parish Council				
18800 - Impington Parish Council				
18852 - Gamlingay Parish Council		1) Existing locations need to be taken into account. 2) Additional consultation requirements on site identification required. 3) Details of consultation with MBDC and Potton TC requested. 4) Existing pressures in Gamlingay, human rights of the settled community also need to be adhered to. 5) No of Caravans per pitch issue- Needs to be stipulated to one caravan per pitch.	Point 1: Noted Point 2: Proposed and rejected sites will be included in the Issues & Options Report 2: Site Options, which will be subject to a 6-week consultation period. Point 3: Details of consultation undertaken by the 8 authorities involved in Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment are not part of this Issues & Options Report 1. Point 4: Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to consider the impact new Gypsy/Traveller pitches might have on local physical and social infrastructure, along with the scale of the nearest settlement. Any undue pressures on a locality will be avoided. The Council is committed to treating everyone fairly and justly and this is core to its Race Equality Scheme. Point 5: The Council defines a pitch as 1 mobile caravan, 1 static caravan and 1 brick building amenity block. This is consistent with national guidance and the approach taken by SCDC in the past.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18768 - Longstowe Parish Council		While it is clear that a village as small as Longstowe which has zero facilities is wholly inappropriate for any gypsy traveller sites, the three goals that the council have flagged up can only be found in quite large settlements, and it is there that the sites must be located, where there is schooling, medical centres, social services, police stations etc. and sufficient economic activity that there are real opportunities for job seekers. If gypsy travellers want to be part of the community then sites on the edge of communities must stop.	Comments noted, however it would be contrary to the guidance in Circular 01/2006 to locate all new sites in the larger settlements of the district as this could result in undue pressures placed on local physical and social infrastructure. SCDC is required by the Circular to consider all suitable areas of the district for new Gypsy/Traveller pitches, which can include areas within and adjoining settlements, along with rural and semi-rural locations.	None.
19628 - Swavesey Parish Council		1. The Parish Council wishes to receive assurance that the relevant assessments are referred to in s1.24 and s1.28 of the Issues and Options 1: General Approach are carried out to the required degree. 2. The Parish Council wishes to state that in general it objects to policies and strategies being imposed by an unselected body - The Regional Assembly. 3. The scoring system for assessing suitability of a site appears difficult to understand and not all items appear to have equal rating. This may mean therefore that some sections rule out others and some sections could override the whole score.	Point 1: Government regulations require that all documents published as part of the Gypsy & Traveller Development Plan Document be subject to an independent sustainability appraisal. If required, an Appropriate Assessment in relation to the European site will be undertaken. Point 2: The policies and strategies have been shaped mainly by the guidance contained in Circular 01/2006 produced by the ODPM. The EERA, a body sanctioned by Government, will review the needs assessment as part of the RSS. Point 3: The approach proposed is similar to the scoring used to assess sites for conventional housing, which do not always conform to all the criteria set out by the Council. It would be unsound to reject a potential site that performs well against the majority of the criteria, but does poorly in 1 or 2 criterion. Circular 01/2006 recommends against an overly prescriptive or restrictive policy framework for identifying sites.	None.
18679		Little consideration seems to have been given to travellers preferences - sites need to be identified which travellers will be willing to use, preferably with local employment options.	In preparation of the Issues & Options Report 1, several consultation exercises were held with the Gypsy/Traveller community to obtain their views on the issues facing their community and to formulate options on how these problems can be tackled. Many of those suggestions have been reflected in this document. Further consultation will be undertaken for the next stage of site identification.	None.
19132 - cambourne parish Council		Only existing physical infrastructure should be taken into account not proposed in case circumstances change and the infrastructure does not come on stream.	This would be inconsistent with the approach taken for conventional housing where future improvements to infrastructure can be a material consideration. The Council is committed to treating everyone fairly and justly and this is core to its Race Equality Scheme.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19033	Ask the travellers what parts of the District they wish their sites to be located in. Then liaise with Parish Councils, and local residents to try to find a mutually acceptable solution. There is no point putting a traveller site in a part of the district that is not desirable to the majority of travellers.	Noted. Although the preference of Gypsies/Travellers is a key consideration, it cannot be the only determining factor of where to locate Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Such an approach would be contrary to the guidance contained in Circular 01/2006. The Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Survey determined Gypsies/Travellers do not have a specific geographic preference for sites, just that they want more sites anywhere.	None.
19630 - Showman's Guild of Great Britain	For all of the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully requested that in the preparation of the Council's emerging Local Development Framework, it takes the accommodation needs of Showpeople into account through the introduction of an appropriate criteria-based policy as outlined on pages 4-5 which provides for Showpeople's sites in suitable locations. The Show people's fraternity are a respectable and thriving group of self-employed business people who are as active today as they have ever been, but unfortunately their needs are all too often overlooked. Please help Showpeople to help themselves by considering the needs of this distinctive group of people and to avoid the problems they face in finding suitable accommodation.	This GTDPD includes Travelling showmen within its remit since they were also included in survey and figures from the Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment and the biannual ODPM caravan count.	None.
18817 - CPRE 18698 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	The definitions and weighting applied to communities should be changed and the list of amenities (para 4.27) be split into two, the necessary and the nice-to-have. The necessary are: food shop, postal facilities, pharmacy, primary school/secondary school, medical centre. A further amenity should be police response time.	Noted. This preference for 'necessary' amenities can be reflected in the scoring of the proposed three-tier approach to site assessment. A greater score would be given to services listed (for example, +2 where the amenity is available, 0 where it is not) and other services would be awarded a lower score (for example, +1 where the amenity is available, 0 where it is not).	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.
19635 - Caxton Parish Council	Caxton Parish Council support the policy and the process for how sites will be identified but ask that the Parish Council is consulted again when the sites have been identified.	Support noted. Further consultation will be undertaken when the Issues & Options Report 2: Site Options is published.	None.
18713 - Linton Parish Council	Travellers should be given more say in where the settlements are sited so as to avoid illegal parking.	Noted.	None.
19638 - GO East	The Government Office suggests that further iterations of the document clearly distinguish between those 'locational' criteria/policies that will guide the identification of suitable sites (GT3-GT29) and those criteria/policies that will be applied to sites once the location has been determined (i.e. site management type policies such as GT30-35, GT37, GT39-43).	Noted. 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.	Ensure a clear distinction between 'locational' criteria and other criteria which are applied once a site location has been selected.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19094 - Hatley Parish Council	1. Consideration should be given to the probability of an influx of east European Gypsies at some stage. 2. Some concern was expressed in the PC about the difficulty of managing relations between the different G&T communities.	Noted.	None.
19155 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	One specific area that we think has been omitted in terms of site provision is that of providing a community space or facility. This is particularly important for promoting social and learning opportunities that promote health and well being. The principle here is that Traveller families should have the same opportunities for community involvement, networking and access to services as the wider population would expect.	The primary objective of the Gypsy & Traveller Development Plan Document is to address accommodation needs and identify new sites for pitches. Nevertheless, the Council acknowledges the need to promote community involvement and will where possible encourage the provision of a new community space or facility.	None.
18681	The travellers need to be consulted to the maximum level and they should help choose the sites.	The next stage of preparation of the GTDPD will involve further consultation with both the Gypsy/Traveller community and the settled community. The Issues & Options Report 2: Site Options will identify proposed and rejected sites which will be open to further public consultation.	None.
18961 - Girton Parish Council	Quantification is needed before policies can be formulated. How much of 1.13 is because of agricultural work, and does this involve both groups? 1.15 contains a non sequitur. But the paragraph points out the need perhaps for a less formal planning procedure. We shall not stop either group from descending on S Cambridgeshire simply by providing inadequate accommodation. There are two notable absences from the aims of the Strategy: quantification of the problem and any attempt to distinguish the needs/wants of the two groups. These must be corrected before policy can be drawn up.	A detailed qualitative and quantitative survey (The Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Assessment) has already been produced and has provided evidence of need within the district for additional pitches for the Gypsy and Traveller community. This needs assessment is currently under review through the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). The Community Strategy has been prepared independently from the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document. The need for additional pitches is evident from the number of unauthorised encampments throughout the district and the findings of the needs assessment. The Gypsy/Traveller community have been and will continue to be consulted throughout the process of the GTDPD.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19634 - East of England Regional Assembly		<p>(1) To endorse the approach the approach of the District Council in seeking to address Gypsy and Traveller needs as soon as possible through progressing this development plan document. (2) That, in advance of the development of a regional policy approach to the allocation of overall pitch provision, it would be premature for the Assembly to endorse individual District allocations that relied on a redistribution to other Districts to meet identified needs.</p> <p>(3) That policies in the draft East of England Plan provide an overall context for consideration of local issues (for example relating to the environment or flooding) and are reflected in the approach to the identification of appropriate sites. No specific comments are made on the detail of the site allocation approach.</p>	Comments noted.	None.
19335 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee		GT13-20 and GT27-34. The policies as proposed do not appear to robustly/objectively provide a policy for sensibly managing subsequent applications for the proliferation or accumulation of additional plots or separate new sites in/around one sustainable settlement. Neither is weight given to locating sites in areas of traditional (or new) employment opportunities.	The criteria-based approach the Council has presented conforms to the guidance in Circular 01/2006 and considers environmental, economic and social factors. It provides details on what factors should be considered to determine the suitability and sustainability of potential sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches, not only at the site identification stage of the GTDPD but also for future consideration of planning applications for sites. Historically Gypsies and Travellers had links to agriculture and horticulture within the district but with changes in those industries these links are no longer that significant. Gypsies and Travellers are now traders in various goods and services and are much less tied to any one geographical place. Access to the trunk road network is now more of a factor than proximity to orchards and farms.	None.
19640 - Natural England	Object	<p>Reference to the wording of section 1.28 on page 6, we would not expect proposed development of this type to be directed to a European site. In addition the name of the European site name is incomplete. For these reasons the wording in section 1.28 should be revised as follows: -</p> <p>'Because of the limited scale of development proposed by the Issues and Options Report, and no development proposed that is likely to impact upon the only European Site in the district (Eversden & Wimpole Woods) or adjoining sites (e.g. Devil's Dyke), it is not considered that any significant impacts will arise. Once...'</p>	Agreed.	Any future document will make note of this recommended change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19629 - Fen Drayton Parish Council	Object	Whilst fully appreciating the need to provide adequate legal sites for the Gypsy and Traveller population, the Fen Drayton Parish Council feels that, with reference to section 4 (1-73 inc), Fen Drayton would not provide adequate accommodation for their needs, particularly regarding provision of local amenities. Since this is such a small community, it is felt that, with the site on Rose and Crown Road to the south of the village, it would not be acceptable to have another site to the north of such a small area.	Noted.	None.
19003 - David Wilson Estates	Object	No.	None.	None.
19633 - Horseheath Parish Council	Object	(1) The Parish Council does not agree with treating gypsies and travellers as a separate group, since it segregates them from the rest of the community. We should all come under the same planning rules and regulations. (2) If they are to be segregated then the Parish Council agrees that they should be in close proximity to schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals, banks, shops and industrial settlements.	Noted.	None.
19631 - Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council	Support	The Council believes that the gypsy and traveller community should be given equal opportunities. The Council notes the options and awaits the results of the consultation with interest. As the Parish is not within the South Cambridgeshire district it does not want to make detailed comments.	Support noted.	None.
19047 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Cottenham Parish Council have had comments from the police and emergency services that all roads within Gypsy and Traveller sites should be public access roads, for ease of access by all emergency vehicles and utility services. Site design should be included as a specific topic. Recent legislation and ODPM circular 1/2006 are intended to establish and/or protect the rights of Gypsies and Travellers. However, if the rights are to have any real meaning then the planning process should include (unless covered elsewhere) an item on "Intergration with the settled community".	The advice of the Highway Authority and Emergencies Services will be taken into consideration at the design stage of each site option. The detailed site design is considered in the third tier of the Council's proposed approach to site assessment (GT46). It is hoped that through the allocation of further authorised pitches, this will facilitate a more settled lifestyle whilst still maintain the traditional Gypsy/Traveller way of life. Proximity to local service and facilities therefore becomes an important factor in facilitating integration with the local community.	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.
19677 - Guilden Morden Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council agree that the process appears appropriate, however at all stages local views should be paramount when a decision is reached.	Noted.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5. METHODOLOGY FOR IDENTIFYING SITES IN SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE				
<i>GT46: Methodology ? Proposed Approach</i>				
19574 - Peterborough City Council		The methodology appears very comprehensive. A tiered approach will allow the most suitable to progress. The items included in the proximity criteria in stage 1 are appropriate, and form a good basis to initially judge a site.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT46 is taken forward whereby the Council will use a three-tier approach to develop a list of site options for consultation.	None.
18853 - Gamlingay Parish Council		Why is 1000m distance used for transport nodes and play areas etc, when document raises distance of 400m in previous draft policies? (para. 5.4).	This has been address through representations made to option GT16A/B. It is felt that the use of 400m as a standard could result in an overly restrictive policy that would concentrate Gypsy/Traveller pitches in particular areas of the district. Building Research Establishment guidance for conventional residential development suggests that distances of 1000m from local amenities would be acceptable. This increased distance would allow for a more flexible approach where rural and semi-rural locations could be considers, which would be consistent with Circular 01/2006 and the principles of sustainable development in PPG13.	None.
19426 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC support GT46 subject to the additional refinements to the criteria outlined in response to GT12 (i.e. waste safeguarding areas etc).	Support Noted. The areas identified in option GT12 would be generally be protected as a valued area under the three-tier approach.	None.
19530 - Highways Agency		Within Tier 2, those sites which provide safe and independent access, and do not put undue stress on local physical infrastructure will be carried over to the third tier of the site selection process. Whether GT31 or GT30 is selected, the Highways Agency request that capacity of the local highway network also be considered within the selection criteria in accordance with HA policy.	Request noted. The Highway Agency will be consulted during second tier of the site selection process to determine the capacity of the local highway network.	Ensure that the capacity of the local highway network is considered within the selection criteria.
19309 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Final bullet point of paragraph 5.3 conflicts with the more measured approach given in GT7.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT46 is taken forward as it encompasses a holistic, robust strategy for identifying suitable sites for Gypsy/Traveller pitches. Generally areas adjoining dual carriageways, railway lines, power lines and water bodies would be avoided, however it would not necessarily exclude a potential site from consideration if it performs well against the other criteria in the three-tier approach.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19435 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher consider that deliverability issues including initially the availability of Council owned and available sites, unauthorised sites and site development costings should be considered at the outset of the site identification process and not at the 3rd Tier. This should ensure that economic impacts including on existing and emerging communities and delivery of new communities (a key consideration) are fully taken into account. It should ensure the more proactive approach in releasing public sites sought in the Circular is better able to be resolved. The need for a tiered approach in its current form is therefore questioned.	Objection noted, however it is recommended that option GT46 is taken forward as it 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 land owner and much of what is in its ownership are public amenity areas which 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 before any details of costing can be ascertained. 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.	None.
19671 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	This approach does nothing to ensure that sites are distributed evenly across the district, as required by GT2. This option should specifically mention GT2.	Circular 01/2006 requires that concentration of sites which could place undue stresses on local social and physical infrastructure does not take place. Therefore the objection raised is valid and it is recommended that an additional criterion be added to the first tier of the site identification process which would assess distances of a potential site to existing authorised Gypsy/Traveller pitches.	In the first tier assessment, it is recommended that the following additional criterion be included: distance from existing authorised site.
19048 - Cottenham Parish Council 19380 - Swavesey Parish Council 19522 - Foxton Parish Council 18552 - Meldreth Parish Council 18801 - Impington Parish Council 18765 - Longstowe Parish Council 18978 - Histon Parish Council 18631 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19004 - David Wilson Estates	Support	Support for the proposed three-tier approach. However, the methodology used must be fair and non-discriminatory to the existing settled population with S Cambs.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT46 is taken forward whereby the Council will use a three-tier approach to develop a list of site options for consultation.	None.
Decision on GT46: Methodology ? Proposed Approach				
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.				
<i>GT47: Potential Sites ? Proposed Approach</i>				
19383 - Swavesey Parish Council		The Council refers you to the comments made for GT2, that current illegal sites should not be granted permission unless they meet the established criteria for current planning permission.	It is the proposed approach under option GT47 that currently unauthorised sites be considered using the three-tier, criteria based approach using measures of sustainability and suitability to determine the appropriateness of the site.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19427 - Cambridgeshire County Council		Recommend that CCC support GT47 subject to the additional refinements to the criteria outlined in response to GT12 (i.e. waste safeguarding areas etc).	Agreed.	None.
19184 - Comberton Parish Council	Object	This is a recipe for disaster. It may encourage unauthorised sites in the hope they would become authorised. A site must be identified first before it is used.	The proposed approach will only be applied to currently unauthorised sites to assess whether or not they should be authorised. Future unauthorised sites will be assessed by the Council using criteria and policies contained in the GTDPD and will be subject to enforcement action should they be deemed inappropriate.	None
19437 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The Sub-Region Needs Assessment identifies a significant number of unauthorised sites within South Cambridgeshire. Gallagher support the preferred approach as outlined in GT47 in seeking to legitimise existing illegal unauthorised sites. Much of the District's needs could indeed be accommodated if this approach were to be adopted. This would be in line with national planning guidance in maximising potential supply from Local Authority owned land and evidence outlined within the Needs Assessment which identified that Gypsies on unauthorised sites would prefer to stay where they are (para. 3.7.4).	Support for option GT47 noted. 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. 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.	None.
18979 - Histon Parish Council	Object	Histon Parish Council object to this option.	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. 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.	
18553 - Meldreth Parish Council	Support	Meldreth Parish Council supports this approach provided unauthorised sites are subject to the same planning controls as those imposed on the settled community.	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. 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.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19049 - Cottenham Parish Council 19243 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19523 - Foxton Parish Council 18802 - Impington Parish Council 18766 - Longstowe Parish Council 19255 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19575 - Peterborough City Council 19005 - David Wilson Estates	Support	Support for the Council's proposed approach whereby the three-tier site selection criteria-based approach will be used to assess currently unauthorised sites.	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. 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.	None.
Decision on GT47: Potential Sites ? Proposed Approach				
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 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:				
19431 - Cambridgeshire County Council 19385 - Swavesey Parish Council 18803 - Impington Parish Council		No further options raised.	None.	None.
19050 - Cottenham Parish Council		Within this document there is no mention of the contentious issue of fly-tipping and littering, both of which cost the Council a great deal of money in terms of clearing it. This issue has often been closely associated with Gypsy and Traveller sites. Rubbish has a real impact on social amenities. Again no mention has been made for a "robust" strategy for illegal encampments and developments.	The micro management of sites is beyond the remit of the GTDPD. The Council recommended that sites be owned and managed by Gypsies and Travellers themselves. Sites owned and managed in this way are perceived as more effective in dealing with anti-social behaviour. A sense of pride and respect for sites is also instilled when they are privately owned. The Council believes the issue of illegal encampments can be addressed through the authorisation of additional privately owned and managed sites to meet existing and expected demand over the next 20 years. More detailed issues of enforcement are beyond the scope of the GTDPD.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19095 - Hatley Parish Council	1. Pitches in nearby counties have not been addressed. 2. Lack of consultation about the need. 3. If more pitches are provided, yet more will be asked for. 4. Lack of consultation with the settled community.	The identification of need has been addressed through the preparation of the Cambridge Sub-Region Traveller Needs Survey. A further assessment and consultation on the need for additional pitches is beyond the remit of the GTDPD. Circular 01/2006 requires SCDC to provide sufficient sites to meet the accommodation needs of the district. The RSS will identify the need for accommodation across the County and what portion of the need must be met by SCDC. The region 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. 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. 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.	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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18668 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council		There needs to be a stated objective that the needs of the travelling community have to be evaluated and judged in a fair and balanced way against the needs and aspirations of the settled community. In this context it needs to be recognised that there is a case to be made for leaning towards the settled community, especially when there is room for doubt.	<p>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 that 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.scambs.gov.uk/CouncilAndDemocracy/Equality/</p> <p>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.</p>	None.
19006 - David Wilson Estates	Object	No.	None.	None.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS				
<i>GT48: Regenerating Existing Sites ? Proposed Approach</i>				
19432 - Cambridgeshire County Council		No comment at this stage.	None.	None.
18522 - Croydon Parish Council		Should be considered like any other site.	Agreed.	None.
19008 - David Wilson Estates		These issues do not relate to land use planning considerations and should not appear in any final document.	The Council has stated that the regeneration of existing SCDC managed Gypsy/Traveller sites is outside the scope of the GTDPD, however welcomed comments made from the public on the issue.	None.
18554 - Meldreth Parish Council 19037		Support for the proposed approach provided the sites are authorised by the Council and subject to the same planning controls as other forms of development.	Comments Noted. The proposed approach only applies to SCDC managed sites.	
19379	Object	What happens if they do not remain?	Objection Noted. 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.	None.
19185 - Comberton Parish Council 19051 - Cottenham Parish Council 19245 - Cottenham Village Design Group 19524 - Foxton Parish Council 18804 - Impington Parish Council 18767 - Longstowe Parish Council 18980 - Histon Parish Council 19256 - East Cambridgeshire District Council 19576 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for option GT48, provided it is extended to only authorised sites. 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.	Support Noted. Although the Council is limited in its resources to undertake regeneration of existing sites on its own, it will encourage and support wherever possible proposals/initiatives which would lead to the overall improvement of the living standards of the District's Gypsy/Traveller community.	None.

Decision on GT48: Regenerating Existing Sites ? Proposed Approach

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.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>GT49: Education Programmes ? Proposed Approach</i>				
19159 - Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust		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.	Comments noted. It is recommended that option GT49 is taken forward whereby the Council 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.	None.
19382		This should be the same for all children.	It is recommended that option GT49 is taken forward whereby the Council 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.	None.
19038		As well as discussing the needs of travellers with local residents, the needs of local residents should be discussed with the travellers. All groups need to be educated about their responsibilities.	Agreed.	None.
18523 - Croydon Parish Council 19445 - David Wilson Estates		That this option is not a priority and does not relate to land use planning and should not form part of the final document.	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 which 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.	None.
19310 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The Council has a duty to promote good race relations. The law states that 'education' (i.e. tackling prejudice, discrimination and conflict) falls within race legislation and therefore extends to all public services, not just schools and communities.	Agreed.	Include reference to not only education programmes in schools and initiatives in the wider community, but also increased awareness and education in all areas of public services.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19186 - Comberton Parish Council 19434 - Cambridgeshire County Council 19052 - Cottenham Parish Council 19246 - Cottenham Village Design Group 18555 - Meldreth Parish Council 18805 - Impington Parish Council 18632 - Little Gransden Parish Council 19577 - Peterborough City Council	Support	Support for proposed approach GT49 encouraging General community education programmes.	Support Noted. It is recommended that option GT49 is taken forward whereby the Council 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.	None.
18981 - Histon Parish Council	Support	This should also be country-wide approach to overcome issues that communities without site close by and who might object to future sites are aware of general issue of the traveller community, reducing potential objections should a site be proposed close by.	Support noted. It is recommended that option GT49 is taken forward whereby the Council 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.	None.

Decision on GT49: Education Programmes ? Proposed Approach

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.

Sustainability Appraisal of the GTDPD Issues and Options Report 1: General Approach

Public Participation Report

Appendix 1

Table 5a: Plans and Programmes Relevant to the South Cambridgeshire LDF

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Appendix 1			
<i>Table 5a: Plans and Programmes Relevant to the South Cambridgeshire LDF</i>			
19644 - Natural England	To the Relevant Plans & Programmes at Appendix 1 under National Level on page 38, could now be added: 'The Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006' (creates a duty for every Public Authority to conserve biodiversity).	Agreed.	Ammend Appendix 1 to include 'The Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006'
Appendix 2			
<i>Table 6: Baseline Information</i>			
19643 - Natural England	We support the assessment in the table 'Avoid damage to designated sites and protected species' on page 44, that the District Council will work with Natural England to ensure proactive management of SSSIs in the District takes place to progress the PSA target.	Support noted.	None.
6. Options Appraisal Findings			
6.3 Options Assessment			
19258 - Arrington Parish Council	GT 44A Transit Sites option A We agree that there should be the provision of transit sites within SCDC however the duration of a stay and the number of pitches must be defined.	Noted. It is recommended that option GT44A is taken forward whereby the Council will seek to investigate, in cooperation with neighbouring authorities, the feasibility of a transit site within the County.	None.
19257 - Arrington Parish Council	GT46 Methodology - Proposed Approach 5.4 in the bound paper document. The identification of the five local services or amenities should state that these are full time and substantial with no imminent risk of closure. This is to ensure stability of services available.	Noted.	Ensure that when identifying local services/amenities, these should be full time and substantial with no risk of closure.

Table 10: Summary Tables of the Options Assessment

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Appendix 6</i>			
<i>Table 10: Summary Tables of the Options Assessment</i>			
19642 - Natural England	The table on page 86 referring to environmental impacts of option GT18 should make reference to mitigation needed to fully and additionally compensate for any potential loss of Brownfield biodiversity. Addition to paragraph: 'Some loss of Brownfield biodiversity may also result from this location although precisely the value cannot be stated at this stage. In such circumstances appropriate mitigation would be required.'	Noted. This has been addressed in the main Issues & Options Report where the biodiversity of brownfield sites will be considered.	None.