

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

11 May 2011

**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director (Operational Services)  
Corporate Manager (Planning and New Communities)

---

### **S/1631/10 - SWAVESEY**

**Continued and permanent use of land as gypsy caravan site (8 pitches) at  
Scotland Drove Park, Rose And Crown Road  
for W Fuller and Others**

**Recommendation: Approve conditionally**

**Date for Determination: 18 November 2010**

**Notes: This Application has been reported to the Planning Committee for determination because the recommendation of approval is contrary to that of the Parish Council.**

#### **Site and Proposal**

1. Scotland Dove Park lies between Fen Drayton and Swavesey on a bend in Rose and Crown Road. The surrounding area is generally flat agricultural land, although the site is prominent in views from Fen Drayton and from the approach from the village to the north. The site is approximately 700m from the edge of Swavesey village and is accessed off Scotland Drove, a bridleway that lies to the east of the site. The site has been laid out as eight, large pitches in two rows of four either side of a central access road. Planting has been undertaken both inside and outside the site to supplement an existing roadside hedge. The site lies in area of low flood risk.
2. The site is currently occupied by eight gypsy families, each having between two and six mobile homes/caravans along with a variety of demountable sheds and small utility buildings. With the exception of the occupants of plot 1, the other families have resided here for some time, most recently with the benefit of a temporary planning permission.
3. The full planning application, received 23 September 2010 seeks planning permission for the continued and permanent use of the site as eight gypsy pitches (plots) with a maximum of five caravans on each pitch. In the event that permanent planning permission isn't granted, the applicant requests that consideration be given to a further temporary permission.
4. The application includes a layout plan, a statement outlining the families' personal circumstances and a letter of support from the Drama Group at Swavesey Village College.

## Relevant Planning History

5. The site was originally developed without planning permission in 2002. An enforcement notice (which still remains extant) was issued on 17 September 2002 requiring the use of the site to cease. Separate planning applications for each plot were refused on 22 November 2002 and were dismissed at appeal on 2 July 2004 (following a successful legal challenge against an earlier inspector's decision in 2003). The inspector accepted there was a need for such a site, but concluded this was outweighed by the harm to highway safety and to the character and appearance of the area. He considered there was no case for a temporary consent given the identified harm
6. Despite this decision, the site remained occupied and a further planning application for the eight pitches was submitted in March 2007 (ref: **S/0601/07**). The Planning Committee considered the application at its meeting in July 2007 when it was resolved that temporary planning permission should be granted. This was subject to various conditions designed to overcome the problems highlighted in the earlier appeal. These included limiting the number of caravans on each plot to no more than five; implementation of an agreed landscaping scheme; suitable provision for foul water drainage; works designed to improve highway safety; and a restriction on external lighting.
7. Occupation was restricted to persons defined as gypsies and was for a temporary period only, expiring 1 September 2010. The reason for granting temporary planning permission was to reflect the advice in government guidance pending the preparation of a Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document.
8. Landscaping and highway works were subsequently carried out. As the permission has now expired, the current use of the site is once again unauthorised.

## Planning Policy

9. Paragraph 71 of **PPS3 Housing** states that where local planning authorities cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites they should consider favourably applications for housing having regard to policies in the PPS.
10. **ODPM Circular 01/2006 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites** aims to increase the number of gypsy and traveller sites in appropriate locations. This will be achieved by a thorough assessment of needs and the identification of sites by local authorities in Development Plan Documents. Each local authority should have a realistic criteria-based policy to assess other sites that come forward as planning applications. Paragraph 44 of the Circular advises that local planning authorities should take account of a number of factors before refusing a planning application for a Gypsy and Traveller site. This includes an assessment of need, the number of unauthorised encampments, the numbers and outcomes of planning applications and appeals, occupancy of public sites, the status of authorised sites and the bi-annual Caravan Count.
11. Paragraphs 45 and 46 provide advice on the desirability of temporary planning permissions. Where there is unmet need but no available,

alternative gypsy and traveller site provision in an area but there is a reasonable expectation that new sites are likely to become available at the end of that period in the area, which will meet that need, local planning authorities should give consideration to granting a temporary permission. Such circumstances may arise in a case where a local planning authority is preparing its site allocations DPD. In such circumstances, local planning authorities are expected to give substantial weight to the unmet need in considering whether a temporary planning permission is justified. The fact that temporary permission has been granted on this basis should not be regarded as setting a precedent for the determination of any future applications for full permission for the use of the land as a caravan site.

12. **Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the East of England-A Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England. July 2009 (RSS)**  
H3 Provision for Gypsies and Travellers
13. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2007**  
ST/6 Group Villages
14. **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies 2007**  
DP/1 Sustainable Development  
DP/2 Design of New Development  
DP/3 Development Criteria  
DP/7 Development Frameworks  
NE/4 Landscape Character Areas  
NE/10 Foul Drainage
15. **District Design Guide SPD - Adopted March 2010**
16. **South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (Saved Policies)**  
CNF6 Chesterton Fen
17. **Gypsy and Traveller DPD (GTDPD)**  
Since the date of the previous temporary planning permission, the "GTDPD Issues and Options 2 Consultation July 2009" has identified the site as an appropriate site option for consultation. In view of the pending revocation of the RSS, the Council is now awaiting the outcome of an updated Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTAA) that is currently in preparation by the County Council and revised government guidance on planning for the needs of Gypsies and Travellers. This assessment will assist in identifying what level of local provision should be planned for in South Cambridgeshire, This will then form the basis for further consultation.
18. The Council's **Race Equality Scheme 2008-2011** recognises Gypsies and Travellers as the largest ethnic minority in the district (around 1% of the population). The Scheme gives priority to actions relating to travellers.
19. **Circular 11/95 (The use of Conditions in Planning Permissions)**  
Advises that planning conditions should be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

20. **Circular 05/2005**  
Advises that planning obligations must relevant to planning, necessary, directly related to the proposed development to be permitted, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and reasonable in all other respects.  
**Consultations**
21. **Swavesey Parish Council** raises objections to the application on the following grounds:
22. The Parish Council is not aware that planning laws have changed since the original application in 2002. Since then application for permanent use of the land has been refused and appeals have been dismissed. The site is considered harmful to the character and appearance of the area and to highway safety.
23. The Parish Council also raises strong concerns over the arrangements for foul sewage disposal from the site. Currently each site has its own cess pit/treatment plant and foul sewage is leaking into the land drains around the site. We have informed the Council's Environmental Health Dept and Land Drainage Manager and we understand the Environment Agency is aware. Despite visits to the site by both authorities the problem persists. The Parish Council also raised objections to the use of individual treatment plants when they were first installed. If either further temporary or permanent planning permission is granted, serious consideration must be given to connecting the site to the mains sewage system, which already runs down Rose and Crown Road almost up to the site. The Parish Council also asks that immediate action is taken to find out which treatment plants(s) is causing the current leak and for action to be taken to ensure the problem is rectified and does not occur again.
24. Further comments received from the Parish Council require immediate attention be given to providing a footpath to the village to ensure highway safety. There is no footpath at along Rose and Crown Road and it does not have streetlights.
25. Although it has not been formally consulted on the application, **Fen Drayton Parish Council** responded to the recent GTDPD consultation exercise by stating that it disapproves of the way the site has been handled. No planning permission was sought nor given and if the situation is allowed to continue, the Parish Council feels it gives the Gypsy and Traveller community the green light to do this again whenever they wish to do so. The site should be made a legal site with the proviso that no further planning permission is given for expansion and any such attempt will be dealt with immediately via regular enforcement procedures.
26. **Local Highway Authority.** As part of the application under reference S/0601/07 the Highway Authority required works to the access and surrounding area to provide suitable inter-vehicle visibility to Rose and Crown road. At the time of the original application I inspected the site and these works had been completed to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority. In the intervening period the hedges may have grown and may require cutting back, but this would not be a sustainable reason for refusal.
27. The **Environment Agency** states that as the site lies within an area of environmental concern conditions are recommended for a scheme and

implementation of foul water drainage. Where a connection to the public foul water sewer is not available, the suitability of any non-mains sewerage system must be effectively demonstrated to the local planning authority.

28. The **Drainage Manager** has commented that serious drainage problems exist with regard to the foul water system for this site. Partially treated sewage is flowing towards the Council's award drain and threatening pollution of the watercourse. The cesspool system used for the collection of sewage is not suitable for this site. Is it possible to insist on a mini treatment works (Klargester) or other similar for the future?
29. The **Landscape Officer** has visited the site (February 2011) and comments that the landscape scheme implemented as part of planning application S/0607/01 has been largely removed. The main elements missing are approximately 120m of bund and new hedgerow planted to replace the former hedge that was removed to improve sight lines. The bund has been flattened and the hedge removed; the (proposed) post and rail fence has been replaced by a close board fence; and the boundary trees and those marking plots. New sheds (which house the electricity supply for the site) appear to have been erected outside the boundary fence.
30. The site is highly visible over wide areas and now has a very stark appearance. The landscape scheme should be replaced as per the agreed scheme.
31. **Traveller's Liaison Officer.** No comments received.

### **Representations**

32. The **adjoining landowner** comments that due to the site's elevated position, the caravans and mobile homes are clearly visible from a large surrounding area. This severely detracts from its previous agricultural use with a pleasant rural open outlook. He is also extremely concerned that the foul drainage system is unsatisfactory with effluent being discharged into the adjoining watercourse. All units should discharge to the mains system.

### **Planning Comments**

33. Having regard to the Council's determination of the previous planning application and the definition of Gypsies and Travellers as set out in paragraph 15 of ODPM Circular 01/2006, the applicant and the other site occupants are considered to be Gypsies for the purposes of planning policy. The application therefore falls to be considered against planning policies regarding Gypsy and Traveller sites.
34. I consider that the main issues in this case are:
  - The extent to which the application accords with the provisions of the development plan,
  - The general need for, and availability of, additional gypsy sites;
  - The site occupants' personal needs and circumstances;
  - The case for a temporary permission; and
  - Human Rights Issues

## The Development Plan

35. The requirement of RSS Policy H3 to significantly meet demand and provide at least 69 additional (permanent) pitches in the district by 2011 will not be met. However, while RSS Policy H3 remains part of the development plan, the Secretary of State's intention to revoke this and Circular 01/2006, which underpins it, is clearly a material consideration to be taken into account.
36. Since the loss of Policy HG23 from the 2004 Local Plan, the development plan does not contain any specific criteria-based policies against which to assess the impact of proposals for gypsy sites. While saved policy CNF6 allocates land for use as gypsy sites at Chesterton Fen, a number of previous appeal decisions have ruled out the possibility that there is still land that is suitable, available and affordable. That certainly appears to be the case for the number of families involved in this application.
37. The Council therefore primarily relies upon the general principles policies DP/1 - DP/3, although these need to be utilised in accordance with the advice in Circular 01/2006 and numerous appeal decisions that gypsy sites are often located in the countryside and that issues of sustainability should be seen in the round with a more relaxed approach be taken given gypsies' normal lifestyle.
38. The principle concerns in this case are the impact on the character and appearance of the area, highway safety and the ability to provide an adequate means of foul water drainage.
39. The site lies in the Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands Landscape Character Area as defined in Policy NE/4, although the District Design Guide SPD classifies the area as 'Fen Edge'. The area is characterised by a generally low-lying, open landscape with large agricultural fields and long-distant views. The land is not otherwise designated or protected. While parts of the site are clearly visible from the public bridleway that passes the site, it is generally well screened from the east and south and does not detract significantly from the enjoyment of those who may use the bridleway. Nonetheless, the relatively isolated nature of the site means that many of the mobile homes on it are highly visible in the landscape, especially when seen from the approaches from the west and north. Its prominence has been exacerbated by the removal of the previous frontage hedge. The overall effect is that in the main, the site appears as an 'island' in an otherwise open landscape.
40. As the Landscape Officer has pointed out, the original landscape scheme along the frontage has failed. This is for a variety of reasons, though it appears mainly due to a lack of proper maintenance. In response, the site occupants have since employed a local landscape contractor. He has replanted the hedge along the front boundary and planted other trees (ash, maple and oak) in accordance with the previously approved landscaping scheme. There are still two main differences to that scheme in that a group of trees have been planted at the front entrance in front of the boundary to plot 1, rather than behind the fence and the roadside hedge now sits in front of the roadside boundary fence rather than behind it. The fence is also of a close boarded type (to assist security and privacy), rather than post and rail. These changes are not seen as being so prejudicial to warrant them unacceptable. While the bund has not been replaced, the planting of the new hedge in front

of the fence will help to soften the appearance of the fence. The site occupants have stated that the hedge was removed when the grass verge was cut. This will now be prevented by clearly marking the hedge as being retained and employing the landscape contractor to undertake the necessary maintenance.

41. The new and replacement planting is to be welcomed and shows a commitment from the site occupants to improving the appearance of the site. Its retention can be appropriately conditioned. Nonetheless, the site still remains prominent in the landscape and contrary to the prevailing landscape character. While the advice in Circular 01/2006 is that gypsy and traveller sites can be located in the countryside, officers are not persuaded, particularly in the absence of meaningful existing planting, that the use of the site with its inherent domestic paraphernalia would not be contrary to Policies DP/2, DP/3 and NE/4 that seek to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the local area and countryside and to protect landscape character.
42. It is also the case that plot 4 has been used to store a considerable amount of building materials. The plot is situated on the bend in the road and is thus perhaps the most visible. The openness of the plot has been further reduced by the siting of a lorry body and makeshift storage buildings. Following a site visit in early March, much, but not all, of the open storage and structures had been cleared at the officer's request. The boundary fencing to this plot is also in need of improvement, which it is understood will now be done.
43. Highway safety issues have been addressed to the satisfaction of the local highway authority. There is now reasonably good visibility for drivers using the main road. While the Parish Council has requested a footpath link along Rose and Crown Road, the road is relatively lightly trafficked and there is no evidence to suggest that this would be necessary (as opposed to desirable) in order that the site continues to be used for residential purposes. The site provides appropriate access from the highway network in accordance with Policy DP/3.
44. Foul drainage from the site has undoubtedly caused problems as highlighted in the consultation responses. In response to these concerns, the Acting Environmental Health Officer has been in discussions with those on the site to try and resolve the issue. Letters have been sent to the residents seeking their co-operation and it seems that the problems have arisen from one or two of the plots rather than from the use of the site as a whole. These concerns arose from the use of septic tanks/cess pits rather than from individual treatment plants.
45. The various occupiers have since got together and as a result, all of them have now (early March) installed individual treatment plants on each plot. If these are properly maintained, it should ensure that the problem of sewage leaking into the adjoining land drains will cease. The Council's Drainage Manager has verbally confirmed that drainage to the mains sewer (approximately 680 m away) is not practical and that the current arrangement is an acceptable solution.
46. In the circumstances, I am satisfied that the problems with foul drainage can be overcome and need not pose an unacceptable risk to the quality of ground

or surface water or the pollution of ditches around the site. The development complies with the requirements of Policy NE/10.

47. The other sustainability issues surrounding the use of the site have already been assessed as part of the background work for the emerging DPD. That has concluded the site is relatively close to the edge of Swavesey and is sufficiently close to enable pedestrian access to the services and facilities in the village, including health and education and access to public transport. I am therefore satisfied that the location of site is therefore suitable on wider sustainability grounds and meets the requirements of the development plan.

#### **The general need for, and availability of, additional gypsy sites**

48. In South Cambridgeshire, the number of caravans with either permanent or temporary planning permission has remained relatively static between January 2009 and January 2011. The number of caravans (11 in total) without any form of planning permission has also remained unchanged. For some considerable time now, the two public sites at Milton and Whaddon have remained full with waiting lists of at least a year for Milton and considerably longer at Whaddon. The results of the latest January 2011 bi-annual count identified 126 caravans on sites with temporary planning permission and the count continues to show there remains a shortage of permanent gypsy sites in the district. The results of the current GTAA are awaited before an accurate up-to-date assessment of current needs can be made. Nonetheless, should this application be refused and the Council decides to enforce against the existing use, the eight families (approximately 25 caravans) on the site would have nowhere to go as there are no other vacant sites in the district.
49. In the most recent appeal decision involving a Traveller family at Cottenham, the inspector found there remains a “substantial unmet general need for additional pitches in the district” and that this “attracts significant weight” in the decision-making process. While there may be some dispute as to whether the demand is “substantial”, it is the fact that unmet need is a material consideration that weighs in favour of this proposal. In coming to a decision the Inspector gave considerable weight to the personal circumstances of the applicants and weighed them against the harm from the proposal before coming to the conclusion to permit the proposal. The key issues were the applicants' poor health and the lack of any alternative accommodation.

#### **The site occupants' personal needs and circumstances**

50. Plots 2-7 continue to be occupied as before. Plot 1 is the one exception and most of the sites are occupied by extended families. In total, the application states there are 10 people of pensionable age and 16 children of school age living on the site. Some of the occupants have serious health problems and Mrs Sally Ann Moss on plot 3 is paralysed from the chest down and dependant on carers. Others state they receive treatment at the surgery in Willingham. The details submitted with the application state that some of the children are in school locally, as has always been the case.
51. The letter of support from students at the Village College praises the site occupants for their commitment to being part of the local community and for observing a peaceful family orientated lifestyle.

52. The families on plots 2-7 all have local connections. In accordance with the advice in Circular 01/2006, this is a consideration that carries some weight, particularly the educational and health needs. They have mostly occupied the site since 2002 (albeit unlawfully in part) and have pointed out that they have already invested a good deal of money in trying to make the site acceptable. There is little motivation in continually doing this if planning permission is ultimately going to be refused. The continued uncertainty about the site is also stressful and frustrating for them.

### **Conclusions on the desirability of granting permanent planning permission**

53. I consider that the continued use of the site continues to be harmful to the existing distinctive landscape character. This could be ameliorated by suitable planting, although previous attempts have failed and this will still not disguise the prominence of the site in certain views. To this end the proposal is contrary to Policies DP/2, DP/3 and NE/4. The site is in a generally sustainable location and would continue to assist the family with its educational and health needs. Highways and drainage issues can be overcome, albeit it has not yet been demonstrated that the problems with foul drainage have now been completely resolved. Given the severity of the problem that has been caused, this is a matter that justifies some caution, especially as the treatment plants have not been approved as such. In the circumstances, I believe that a permanent permission would be inappropriate. While the lingering requirements of Policy H3; the lack of suitable alternative sites; and the families' general needs carries some weight in favour of the proposal, the occupants' circumstances are not so pressing as to outweigh the perceived harm.
54. Further, if the site is not found to be acceptable through the GTDPD, it will make the families' ability to develop an alternative site (whether individually or collectively) that much harder. I am therefore satisfied that the harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and the uncertainty regarding an adequate means of foul water drainage are sufficient to clearly outweigh any presumption in favour of permanent planning permission at this time.

### **The case for a temporary permission**

55. Circular 11/95 advises against a temporary condition unless the applicant proposes temporary development, or where a trial run is needed to assess the effect of the development on the area (paragraph 109). The imposition of conditions, including a temporary use, would not make the use any more acceptable. The degree of harm would be the same as if permanent permission had been granted. The advice in Circular 11/95 is not only to be read alongside that in paragraphs 45 and 46 of Circular 01/2006, but also it is clearly embraced within it.
56. At the same time, regard must be paid to paragraphs 45 and 46 of Circular 01/2006. As there is unmet need but no available, alternative gypsy and traveller site provision in the area, where there is a reasonable expectation that new sites are likely to become available which will meet that need, local planning authorities should give consideration to granting a temporary

permission. The GTAA and the consequent consultation process will aim to provide the additional sites that are found to be required.

57. In such circumstances, local planning authorities are expected to give "substantial weight" to the unmet need in considering whether a temporary planning permission is justified. There is also some additional weight to be attached to the personal accommodation needs of the applicants. In addition, a temporary permission has already been granted for this site in recognition of the advice in Circular 01/2006.
58. Officers therefore conclude that a further temporary planning permission is an appropriate course of action. In considering the recent Cottenham appeal, the inspector noted that the new GTAA is expected this spring. After that the Council will go on to develop its site allocations DPD that will involve public consultation. Following public consultation and the adoption of the DPD there will also have to be planning applications in relation to the allocated sites and they will take a little time to develop. In these circumstances the inspector considered that 5 years is a realistic timeframe to enable sufficient sites to come forward.
59. In reality, this need not be the case. The sites that have previously been considered as possible sites are, for the main, already in use as such and many benefit from temporary consents. The steps to make these sites suitable as permanent sites would be largely insubstantial. As this site has already been selected as an option for consultation, there is no evidence based on the existing number of unauthorised caravans in the district to suggest that it won't come forward. The consultation process will build on what has already been achieved and Members are committed to producing an effective site allocations policy as quickly as possible. There is every possibility that an effective consultation and site selection process could be achieved in a much shorter time and the latest work on taking forward the DPD suggests that it could be adopted by the end of 2013. Following on from this, there may be a requirement for certain sites to obtain planning permission.
60. In this context, I consider that a further three-year consent in this case would be appropriate. This should be subject to conditions that restrict occupation to Gypsies and Travellers, limit the number of caravans and business use on the site, control external lighting and reinforce the landscaping scheme that has been implemented. Should there be renewed problems with foul water drainage, there are separate controls and remedies under other legislation and this is sufficient to offset the need for a further planning condition.

### **Human Rights Issues**

61. Refusal of permanent planning permission would lead to interference with the applicant's rights under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. This must, however, be balanced against the protection of the public interest in seeking to ensure needs arising from a development can be properly met, or that they do not prejudice the needs of others. These are part of the rights and freedoms of others within Article 8 (2). There is no lesser or alternative action that could be taken to secure the public interest, especially as the harm is considered to be significant. Refusal of permanent planning permission would therefore be proportionate and justified within Article 8 (2).

**Recommendation:**

62. Approve subject to the following conditions:

1. The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than gypsies and travellers as defined in paragraph 15 of ODPM Circular 01/2006 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites. (Reason: The site lies in the countryside where residential development will normally be resisted by Policy DP/7 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007).
2. The use hereby permitted shall be for a limited period being the period of 3 years from the date of this decision. At the end of this period the use hereby permitted shall cease, all materials and equipment brought on to the land in connection with the use shall be removed, and the land restored in accordance with a scheme previously submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. (Reason: In accordance with the advice in Circular 01/2006 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites, the Council is preparing a Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan document, and on a without prejudice basis to a permanent consent on this site, a time limited consent will enable the Local Planning Authority to properly assess the needs of gypsies and travellers within the district)
3. No more than five residential caravans as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 shall be stationed on each pitch at any one time and the number of pitches shall not exceed 8. (Reason: To minimise the impact of the development on the surrounding area in accordance with Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
4. No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the external storage of materials. (Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area in accordance with Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
5. No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on any part of the site. (Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area in accordance with Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
6. No external lighting shall be provided or installed within the site other than in accordance with a scheme which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (Reason - To minimise the effects of light pollution on the surrounding area in accordance with Policy NE/14 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)
7. The planting comprised in the approved details of landscaping as shown on drawing no. MM7 05/1 approved under planning application reference S/601/07 shall be retained, and any trees or shrubs that within a period of two years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season

with others of similar size or species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. (Reason: To help minimise the impact of the continued use of the site on the character and appearance of the surrounding area in accordance with Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the adopted Local Development Framework 2007.)

**Background Papers:** The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the East of England – A Revision to the Spatial Strategy for the East of England. July 2009
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework 2007
- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004
- Planning application S/0601/07
- CLG Count of Gypsy and Traveller Caravans

**Contact Officer:** John Koch – Team Leader (West)  
Telephone: (01954) 713268