

Herefordshire Local Plan Travellers' Sites Development Plan Document

Summary of main points raised during
pre-submission consultation

February 2018



Main Issues Statement: General Comments

Representations:

Objections: 1005 1012 1014 1015

Supporting comments: 1002 1011

General comment: 1003 1004 1007 1008 1009 1013 1019 1022 1024 1026 1030 1031 1032 1033

Objections:

1. None of the proposed sites are in close proximity to the administrative boundary of Malvern Hills District. The South Worcestershire Councils (SWC) have no in principle objections to the proposed sites. If new potential sites are proposed in the process of preparing the Travellers' Sites DPD then we would wish to have an opportunity to make representations. Herefordshire Council has engaged constructively with the SWC as part of the Council's Duty to Cooperate. The SWC are committed to further discussions as both Site Allocations DPDs progress in order to comply with on-going requirements associated with the Duty to Co-operate and as part of the Memorandum of Understanding arrangements between Malvern Hills District Council and Herefordshire Council. (1003)
2. Herefordshire is meeting its own needs and has not been asked to assist in meeting Shropshire need, this being informed by discussions to consider mutual issues & joint opportunities. The recently published Shropshire GTAA evidences that the main in migration to Shropshire comes broadly from the West Midlands region of which Herefordshire is part. (1052)
3. Overall the policies have come a long way and together mostly reflect a usable document. Pleased that the emphasis is on traveller sites being associated with larger settlements in recognition of their large scale impact on the smaller settlements of the county.. (1004)
4. Provided historical background to site provision in the county and to the present DPD proposals. (1005, 1015)
5. Traveller sites are a preferred choice for many in line with the European Court's finding that Caravan living is an essential part of the community's ethnic identity. It is a tribute to the current Council management, that sites are again full and with long waiting lists for pitches. The current proposal for an additional 9 pitches is to be welcomed but it is a pity that in its DPD the Council has not been a bit bolder. The government document Circular 1/2006 asked Councils to 'make land available' for Traveller sites. Unfortunately this never happened. However individuals have been able to acquire land and such private sites have been the only way that the number of authorised pitches in the area has increased in recent years. Generally speaking they have been very successful and the overwhelming majority are pleasant well-kept places. They are popular, sustainable and the costs of development are not born by the tax payer and are the preferred choice of many Travellers. The problem is finding affordable land. The land put forward in the preferred options paper, at Sutton St. Nicholas, had planning permission (though lapsed) and had previously been accepted by the government as suitable for 100% grant funding. It would have been/could still be suitable for small private sites and with that background would have had a fair chance of getting planning permission. (1005)

6. The plan is not justified because of the powers to prevent or penalise roadside camping which was the traditional lifestyle of a distinctive minority and there needs to be some elasticity in the system to allow the community to adjust to this change. (1005 1015)
7. It is not effective as it is not deliverable given the cost of new pitches. The DPD was approved before the costings were calculated and site work was undertaken. In a time of severe challenges to Council spending priorities, it is unlikely that there will be a budget for this. If the Homes England application fails there is less likelihood that the pitches will be developed. The Council should have explored cheaper options like supported private provision. Herefordshire Council failed to produce any additional sites since it came into being. (1005 1015)
8. It is not consistent with government policy. The government says its' overarching aim is to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional nomadic way of life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community', and to ensure Local Authoritiesdevelop fair and effective strategies to meet need through its identification of land for sites'. It does not facilitate the traditional nomadic way of life because families will not be able to leave their pitches because they may not be able to find an alternative because the need is not being adequately addressed (1005 1015)
9. Hereford City Council does not wish to make any comments at this stage. (1007)
10. Flood Risk: All built development to be located within Flood Zone 1, the low risk Zone, in the first instance. Flood risk matters are of particular importance for gypsy and travellers sites, permanent or transit, as flooding can present problems and greater risk for caravans and mobile homes. Government advice indicates that sites within Flood Zone 3 should be discounted. Sites within Flood Zone 2 may be considered (subject to suitable warning and evacuation measures), using the Sequential Approach, if it has been demonstrated that there are no suitable sites available at a lower risk of flooding i.e. Flood Zone 1. It is important that the DPD offers robust confirmation that development is not impacted by flooding or increases flooding to third parties. Herefordshire Council should consider how the SFRA update can be fed into the assessment of DPD site allocations. Previously provided comments on DPD site has informed the current submission, screening out a number of sites impacted by fluvial flooding, with all five remaining sites located within Flood Zone 1, the low risk Zone. (1008)
11. Historic England will advise further when received the additional information we have requested. (1009)
12. Criticism of consultation process in relation to the complexity of the forms and supporting information; insufficient publicity to make individuals, local communities and local businesses as well as the travelling community aware of it. (1024,1012,1014)
13. Criticism of Planning Officers in attendance at the exhibition and of senior planning officer for not accepting an invitation to visit the site. (1014)
14. There are no recorded shallow coal mining features on any of the sites identified. (1013)
15. Against any further development of traveller sites within the parish. (1019)
16. Costs of pitch provision could be reduced by using off the shelf pre-constructed buildings meaning more sites could be opened per year. (1022)
17. There is a growing population of Gypsies and Travellers in Herefordshire. It is important, from the perspective of the health and wellbeing of children and families, to

- encourage the development of sufficient culturally/practically suitable accommodation to meet demand. Transit provision is absolutely necessary to alleviate the community tensions caused by unauthorised encampments and to ensure decent temporary accommodation for vulnerable children and adults. (1026)
18. Suggestion of having a site near the cattle market in Ross on Wye or between the Ross and Wye and Walford to avoid impact on the town centre. (1030)
 19. Questions whether travellers will pay towards the sites or will it be paid for by taxes? Concerned that money will be wasted.(1031)
 20. National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.(1032)
 21. The Care Quality Commission is unable to express any opinions regarding the consultation. (1033).
 22. Question why the site between Mortimer's Cross and Shobdon has been omitted from the list of sites.(1028)
 23. Additional monitoring indicators should be included to assess the effectiveness of all the policies.(1009)
 24. Comments made regarding the wording of Core Strategy Policy H4 (1004, 1014).
 25. Concern about reference in paragraph 2.7 that states that traveller sites being permitted in the open countryside. (1004)
 26. Concern over clarity of paragraph 2.9 and recommend amending final sentence to say that the objective has been met through Policy TS3. (1004)
 27. In paragraph 3.3 need to confirm that sites previously considered are not considered suitable. (1004)
 28. Should state the meaning of 'PPTS' in full. (1004)
 29. Typographical errors to be corrected. (1004,1052)
 30. Issue with Travellers having resources required to acquire land and pursue planning applications (which are invariably opposed by the Council). Therefore need for a significant supply of land for council provided sites which is not adequately addressed.(1015)
 31. Concerned about the allocation figures and the commitment of council to address this need. It is, in terms of overall planning demand, a small challenge but it concerns one of the most marginalised and 'discriminated against' of communities and deserves very particular attention. (1015)
 32. There has been a history of unauthorised encampments and associated incidents (which have been reported to the relevant authorities) on the proposed temporary stopping site. This has an impact on local residents as well as employers and visitors of the nearby by Nursing Home. The levels of rural crime against businesses has risen within the area. The NFU lobby the local police and crime commissioners to give rural crime a higher priority with greater enforcement. (1014)
 33. The proposed site is the result of surplus ground from a compulsory purchase agreement when the A49 was constructed. The road was completed in 1988 and Herefordshire Council has not maintained, let or sell resulting in lost revenue. (1014)
 34. More sites are required and travellers want their own family sites. (1051)
 35. There should be additional sites in Hereford. (1048)
 36. Travellers should be given the opportunity to buy their own pitches.(1049 1050)

Supporting Comments:

37. Generally happy with the proposed plan and pleased to see that several of the points raised in the consultation have been addressed. (1002)
38. Support the pre-submission draft and consider it to be an excellent document. (1011)

Sustainability Appraisal

- 39 The Sustainability Appraisal suggests indicators for monitoring the impact of the DPD on the SA objectives in relation to Biodiversity, natural resources, landscape quality, flood risk, minimise pollution and cultural heritage.

Herefordshire Council's summary response

- 1) Comments regarding DTC are noted.
- 2) Comments regarding DTC are noted.
- 3) Support noted.
- 4) Noted.
- 5) The provision of new sites addresses the identified need in the GTAA so is seen as an appropriate response. The site at Sutton St Nicholas was not taken forward into the pre-submission draft in view of the findings of the revised GTAA and concerns about the feasibility of the delivery of the site given the cost of provision of services to it.
- 6) The problems associated with roadside camping are acknowledged and the provision of a temporary stopping place is regarded as an appropriate and proportionate response to help to address this issue.
- 7) Funding for the identified pitches will be sought through the capital programme bidding progress and the Homes England (formerly Homes and Communities Agency) Affordable Homes Programme. Funding for three of the identified new pitches was approved at the meeting of the Full Council on 28 January 2018. <http://councillors.herefordshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=291&MId=6242&Ver=4>. Funding for the further pitches will be sought in future rounds of the capital fund bidding process. The Council carried out several call for sites as part of the plan preparation process but this did not result in suitable private sites coming forward.
- 8) The plan is considered to be consistent with government policy in that it identifies sites to address the need identified in the GTAA. It also includes appropriate development management policies and the overall effect of the policies ensures fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional nomadic way of life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community.
- 9) Noted that City Council have no comments to make at this stage.
- 10) Comments regarding flood zone and vulnerability of different uses are noted. A strategic flood risk assessment was carried out for all the suggested sites and this has informed the plan making process. It has been confirmed that all the sites are within flood zone 1.
- 11) The Council is of the opinion that there is no detrimental impact on the assets identified in the Sustainability Appraisal and has provided further information to Historic England regarding this matter.
- 12) The Council has sought to encourage greater participation in the process by all communities, for example through the use of social media and through press

releases as well as through traveller organisations and media. This is set out in the Consultation Statements that are included in the submission document. Whilst the Council considers the consultation to be appropriate, comments about consultation methods are noted and will be passed to the Council's Communications Team with a view to considering them for future consultations.

- 13) Planning officers were able to provide appropriate information to visitors at the drop-in event.
- 14) Information regarding no recorded shallow coal mining features is noted.
- 15) The Parish Council comments are noted.
- 16) Innovative and cost effective ways of providing the new pitches will be explored as part of the delivery of the new pitches on local authority sites.
- 17) Noted. The DPD aims to ensure the provision of suitable accommodation for traveller families. Support for transit provision noted.
- 18) No suitable available sites for were identified in these areas.
- 19) All the authorised traveller sites, private or local authority, are treated in the same way as any other domestic property and council tax is charged. The residents of local authority sites pay rent to the Council. Private sites are either owned by the residents or rented out to the occupants, in which case rent is paid to the private landlord. Utilities are charged for on all sites as with other domestic properties.
- 20) Noted that National Grid has no comments to make in response to the consultation.
- 21) Noted that Care Quality Commission has no comments to make in response to the consultation.
- 22) The site at Mortimer's Cross / Shobdon Rock has been included in the GTAA but it is shown in the wrong location on the GTAA map.
- 23) See response to comment 39 below.
- 24) Core Strategy Policy H4 remains extant until such time the Core Strategy is subject to a formal review and any possible changes to it are outside the scope of this DPD. The policy was referred to in the DPD for information purposes.
- 25) Core Strategy Policy RA3 sets out the land uses that may be considered appropriate in the open countryside. These include for a site providing for the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in accordance with Core Strategy Policy H4.
- 26) Herefordshire Council's Equality Policy 2017 – 2019 is concerned with a number of issues relating to Gypsies and Travellers and is not simply concerned with the provision of the one temporary stopping place allocated through TS3. The DPD also contributes to achieving wider objectives relating to key areas of education, accommodation and health through the provision of other allocations and will continue to do so on an ongoing basis through the consideration of further sites which come forward through the planning application process.
- 27) Within the DPD it is not necessary or appropriate to include reference to other previously considered sites as they have been discounted.
- 28) The full title of the Planning Policy for Travellers Sites is given when first used in the DPD at paragraph 2.1.
- 29) Agree – insert missing word 'year'. Change end period from 2031/32 to 2030/31.
- 30) This plan does allocate Council land for additional pitches. There was a lack of suitable sites that came forward through the Call for Sites Process. Only five sites for gypsy and traveller residential use were proposed through this process. Only one of these was taken forward for further assessment but suitable highway access was not demonstrated. The other sites were not taken forward for other technical reasons or were already being considered through the planning application process. Therefore, the availability of suitable land to be developed as private sites remains very limited.

- 31) The GTAA recommended that the Council considers applications for appropriate small sites to address the needs of local Gypsy and Traveller families should they be forthcoming over the plan period. Therefore the DPD enables planning applications to come forward for consideration and these will be considered on a case by case basis subject to them meeting the requirements of policies TS1 and TS2 as appropriate. The DPD does not set an upper limit on the number of applications on this type of proposal and therefore these applications will be not be considered against any particular target. This approach is in accordance with Herefordshire Council's Equality Policy. Of the eighteen planning permissions granted between 2011 and 2018, ten of these were granted by Council. The remaining eight were granted on appeal.
- 32) The DPD seeks to address issues that are associated with unauthorised encampments by identifying a site that can be properly managed. The provision of such a site is supported in principle by West Midlands Police.
- 33) The comments regarding the management of Council land are noted but are outside the remit of the DPD.
- 34) Policy TS1 provides the opportunity for private family sites to come forward through the planning application process.
- 35) Comments noted. No other suitable sites in Hereford were identified. See response to point 34 above.
- 36) The sale of local authority pitches is outside the remit of this planning document.
- 37) Support noted
- 38) Support noted
- 39) The Herefordshire Authority Monitoring Reporting process monitors the implementation of the Local Development Scheme (LDS) and the implementation of the policies set out in the Local Plan. When the Travellers Sites Development Plan is adopted it will form part of the Local Plan (2011-2031) together with Core Strategy and other adopted development plan documents. Therefore the effect of these policies of the plan will be monitored through that process.

Minor changes required

- In paragraph 4.12, third sentence insert "year" as follows: "Therefore the five year requirement is between....."
- In paragraphs 4.10 and 4.11 replace "2031/32" with "2030/31"

Main Issues Statement - Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment.

Objections: 1005 1014 1015 1026 1039

Supporting comments: 1052

General Comment: 1052

Support with no comment 1002 1022 1034 1044

Main issues raised (objections)

- 1) Disappointing that the GTAA seems to start from the presumption that the need for additional pitches should be forced down which seems likely to increase prejudice and intolerance towards Travellers. The traditional lifestyle is being assaulted from numerous directions and has created a situation where the Travelling life has almost lost its rationale. Sites address some of the Community's distinctive needs (living in caravans, living with family groups, being able to move away when necessary etc.) while providing a degree of stability for access to education, health, work etc. They reduce the perceived scourge of illegal encampment, while freeing up houses for others. Site management has improved but more sites are needed. (1005)
- 2) Detailed criticism of the use of turnover to suggest there is no current need for additional pitches given that there 40 families on the waiting list for pitches and nine families are 'doubling up'. An understanding of where people go to when they leave a pitch is required. While pitches should be occupied, there still needs to be elasticity in the system. The idea that Turnover of 6 pitches a year (based on only 2 years evidence and with no further detail) can address continuing assessed need is fanciful. If and when the new pitches are provided the number will still be well below what was assessed as being needed for the County in the 1980's. Applying turnover also disenfranchises the children of these families. (1005 1015)
- 3) Turnover assumes that a vacancy on one site is suitable for anyone who needs it. In reality the careful choice of residents is a crucial part of good site management. (1005)
- 4) There is an equality issue as site allocation should be applied on a 'choice based lettings' mechanism as for affordable housing. Traveller families can't be expected to occupy pitches if they are not in a location where they want to live.'(1005)
- 5) There is no proper assessment of the needs of housed Travellers of which Herefordshire (as recognised in the 2007 GTAA) has a high proportion. As none were interviewed, we can have little understanding of this requirement. The need calculations may already be out of date. Many Gypsies and Travellers have had to move into housing because of the inadequate supply of pitches and criminalisation of camping. Many wish to resume their traditional way of life but this has not been fully taken into account.
- 6) The nine pitches proposed are for future need therefore there is a failure to address the existing need. (1015)
- 7) The current plan exploits the revised definition of a Gypsy and Traveller. This is a troubling, unnecessary and a high risk strategy. The demand should be assessed without subtracting from the calculation people who may not meet the new definition. These people have accommodation needs regardless of this policy alteration. It is high risk because it is possible that the courts will find that this definition offends

- fundamental principles of Equality Law. In that case the council will have embarked (unnecessarily) on a revised strategy that will have to be fundamentally revised.
- 8) There is a need for a significant increase in the number of pitches to be provided for in the Travellers Sites Development Plan. (1015)
 - 9) I am concerned by a very low assessment of accommodation need. However, I would not want to see the process hindered by re-assessment at this stage. (1026)
 - 10) I object to the scheme of proposed traveller's sites. (1039)
 - 11) Paragraph 4.2 Consistency of approach to methodology and the assessment of traveller accommodation requirements assists the consideration of boundary issues and the broader understanding Traveller community needs and provision. Additional provision of pitches which improve the qualitative offer and diversity of pitches available is welcomed. Clarity is required regarding the five year supply calculation methodology.(1052)
 - 12) The GTAA, states that there is a requirement for different types of pitches. However over the years we have seen permanent sites at Red Hill in Hereford and Madley close. Plus the Pembridge site has been closed and refurbished many times. Herefordshire Council have contributed to this need. (1014)

Herefordshire Council's summary response

- 1) Local authorities are required to assess the demand for traveller sites in the same way as they do for other types of housing needs and to ensure that there this requirement can be met through the planning policy and development management processes. The GTAA was a thorough piece of work that involved site observations and interviews with households (89 achieved interviews out of 119 households living on pitches or 74.8%) and provides a sound evidence base for the DPD. Disagree that the starting point was to reduce the required number of pitches.
The 2017 GTAA updated recommended that the review of the Local Plan recognises an underlying cultural need for 91 pitches over the Plan period (2011/12 to 2030/31) and a need for 33 pitches under the PPTS definition before turnover is considered. For the remaining local plan period (2017/18 to 2030/31), the GTAA has identified a cultural need for 74 pitches and, as a subset of this number a PPTS need for 27 pitches.
- 2) Turnover relates to the number of pitches that are expected to become available for occupancy on local authority sites which will contribute to meeting the pitch needs identified. Turnover occurs when occupants permanently move away from the pitch or die (a comparable example is when a social rented dwelling becomes available because the previous tenant has either moved away or died and it becomes available for re-letting). Such analysis is important because it takes into account the potential supply of pitches coming forward, in the same way as analysis of affordable housing need has to take account of dwellings let to establish an overall net need for affordable housing). Analysis only includes expected turnover on public sites as this is referenced in (former) CLG guidance and more accurate data on changes in pitch occupancy is likely to be available. Although there is likely to be turnover on private sites, the ability of households to move onto private sites may be more restrictive (for instance the site may be restricted to a particular family) and less likely to be recorded.
Household survey data indicates that 19.5% of respondents living on local authority sites plan to move in the next 5 years or an annual rate of 3.9%. This analysis would suggest

annual capacity of 1.8 which translates to a capacity of 27 pitches over the plan period through turnover. As there are a substantial number of pitches on local authority sites (64 in total) and accurate management data kept by the Council, it is possible to make robust judgements about the likely number of pitches coming available for occupancy over the plan period. Site management data indicates there is a turnover of 6 pitches on local authority sites each year. This results in a potential supply of 84 pitches over the remaining plan period to 2030/31. For the purposes of the review of the Local Plan it can be concluded that turnover on local authority pitches is expected to address this need, and that there is no current requirement for site allocations or the identification of sites for longer term provision. Notwithstanding this, the GTAA recommended that the Council considers applications for appropriate small sites to address the needs of local Gypsy and Traveller families should they be forthcoming over the plan period.

During interviews, no households stated that they had people 'doubling up' or 'concealed'. Site observation and fieldwork suggests there are a total of 122 pitches that are occupied by 119 households (with 3 households occupying 2 pitches each).

As well as establishing a need over the next 5 years, the GTAA model takes direct account of children living on pitches and the likely time when they will form households as part of the overall pitch need calculation.

- 3) The use of turnover has been considered and tested at inquiries including the South Worcestershire Development Plan DPD and Shropshire SAMDev Plan and has been confirmed to be an appropriate approach.
- 4) See answer above.
- 5) It can be very challenging to engage with households living in bricks and mortar housing and establish whether they would prefer to live on a pitch and therefore add to pitch need. In order to take account of bricks and mortar housing, arc4 has drawn upon a wider range of bricks and mortar interviews from our other GTAA studies which establishes that 5.3% of households would prefer a pitch. We also considered housing register evidence. Using the 2011 census data figure of 100, this results in a need for 5 pitches. The housing register identified 20 households who want to move to a pitch from bricks and mortar. This higher figure has been used in the needs modelling. Evidence of households wanting to move from a pitch into bricks and mortar accommodation was also found.
- 6) The base date for the GTAA is 2011 and therefore takes into account current and future need.
- 7) As a local planning authority, Herefordshire Council is required to prepare its documents in accordance with government planning policy. The updated GTAA assessed both PPTS requirement and Cultural requirement in recognition of the legal challenge to the definition of Travellers in the PPTS. It is understood that the legal challenge has recently been withdrawn but it is recognised that a further challenge may still be made by another party.
- 8) Requirement for additional pitches noted. However the DPD is based on the findings of the GTAA that whilst identifies a requirement for new pitches concludes that the rate of turnover can significantly contribute to this.
- 9) Concern at low figures noted. However it is considered that the DPD provides for a number of additional pitches on local authority sites as well as allowing the addition of private sites on a case by case basis that meet the criteria of policy TS1.
- 10) As indicated above, local authorities are required to assess the demand for traveller sites in the same way as they do for other types of housing needs and to ensure that there this requirement can be met through the planning policy and development management processes.

11) Support for consistency of approach to methodology with a neighbouring authority is noted. An approach to calculating the five year supply in the DPD took into account the commitments and completions since 2011. On further review of the approach the five year supply methodology has been reassessed to bring it into line with the methodology used for the Council's five year supply for housing. This shows a higher five year supply figure of eight pitches as shown in the table below. This is met through the provision of the sites within the DPD and will also be augmented by any further commitments that come through the planning application process.

Source	Pitches	Notes
Traveller DPD requirement (2011-31)	33	
Requirement 2011-17	10	33/20 x 6
Pitches Completed	18	
1/4/2011 – 31/3/2017		
Requirement for next five years	8	33/20 x 5
Plus Shortfall	0	
Total Requirement	8	
Annualised requirement	1.6	
Total Deliverable pitches April 2018	10	Including DPD sites (9) + commitments since April 2017
Supply	6.25 years	

12) The Madley Site was closed because it was considered to be in an unsuitable location for a transit site. The site at Red Hill referred was refurbished and re-opened at a reduced scale. Herefordshire Council has a Gypsy and Traveller Site allocation and Management Policy approved in 2015.

Minor changes required: None

Main Issues Statement: Policy TS1 Residential Traveller Pitches and Sites

Policy TS1

Objections: 1004 1005 1006 1009 1014 1015 1020, 1025, 1039 1040

Objections without comments: 1036:

Support: 1001 1024

Support without additional comments: 1002 1003 1016 1017 1022 1026 1027 1044

General comments: 1004 1005

Main issues raised (objections)

1. Welcome reference to overcoming any potential mitigation measures for heritage assets and inclusion of the term 'heritage asset' in the policy as this covers designated and non-designated heritage assets. Would welcome a clause that seeks to protect heritage assets in the first instance, then that looks for mitigation measures to avoid impact and also seeks opportunities for enhancement, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). (1009) Criterion 4 needs to be amended to avoid sites that require mitigation. (1004)
2. Criterion 4 is not "justified" or effective. It implies that proposals will be supported if any unacceptable adverse impacts "can be" satisfactorily mitigated, rather "is" actually satisfactorily mitigated. It does not provide adequate protection against unacceptable adverse impacts for the duration of the development and could only provide protection prior to/ on the grant of planning permission. Inconsistent with Core Strategy Policy E4 – Tourism as it does not ensure protection for the county's natural and heritage assets. (1006)
3. Criterion 10 is not "justified nor effective because it only provides protection against adverse impacts of commercial activity for the amenity of local residents and not for other nearby land users as in TS2. Important to protect other land users, particularly for holiday accommodation and visitors. It is not effective as it is not consistent with Core Strategy policy E4. (1006)
4. Achieving planning consent for Traveller sites is difficult enough without a long list of requirements. It smacks of bullying and misses the key ingredient which is distinctiveness which makes the travelling community interesting to artists and photographers etc. These details are best left to discussions with Planning Officers so that applications can buy in to the process and the reasoning behind it. (1005)
5. Criterion 12b regarding the keeping of animals will impact on other land users being unable to gain access to their own land. Animal welfare issues and strict monitoring of the movement of animals should also be considered.(1014)

6. The policy promotes mixed business and residential accommodation for the lifestyle of the Travellers. There is evidence that temporary Traveller Sites in Lincolnshire and Northamptonshire have turned into dumping grounds for waste, metal scrap and tyres and become uninhabitable. (1014)
7. Concern expressed over management issues particularly at Bromyard and the impact on local communities and businesses. (1025 1034 1040.) Social housing suggested as an alternative. (1025)
8. Objects to the provision of any sites for Travellers. (1039)
9. Refers to comments made recorded in the GTAA section.(1015)

General Comment

10. Paragraph 5.1 Typo in relation to Core Strategy. (1004)
11. There is a misprint in paragraph 10 – SuDS drainage systems are generally for impermeable surfaces (1005)
12. Comments in relation to Core Strategy Policy H4 (1004)

Supporting Comment:

13. Supportive of the aims, objectives and policies and particularly welcome the inclusion of Policy TS1, specifically criteria 9 which gives the assurance that there are suitable arrangements in place with regard to surface and foul water disposal. (1001)
14. Support increase or improvement in site provision but there is narrowness of recommended types of site. The application and interpretation of existing guidelines should be flexibly and imaginatively interpreted. There is little or no recognition of the value and importance of small independent private sites with less emphasis on hard standing, hard structure amenity blocks etc. which would have less environmental, visual and financial impact upon the local community, are need-responsive and are lower cost. The standard 'site requirements' mitigates against flexibility of site provision. (1024)

Sustainability appraisal Mitigation and Recommendations

15. It is recommended that Policy TS1 is amended to read: "An overall good quality of design which respects the setting of the site, local landscape character, and the character and significance of designated and undesignated heritage assets" to take into account Historic England's recommendation. This would have the effect of changing the current mixed effect of the policy to a neutral effect.
16. It is recommended that the policy is amended to include a new criterion relating to the provision of appropriate waste management and recycling facilities.
17. Minor amendments to the policy are also recommended to encourage the development of previously developed land in preference to greenfield land or land primarily near urban areas which would reduce the need to travel to access services.
18. It is recommended that minor amendments are made to the policy to prioritise the avoidance of adverse effects on biodiversity through good design, to require mitigation of all adverse effects and, where appropriate, to conserve and enhance on-site features of conservation value. This would have the effect of changing the current neutral effect of the policy to a minor positive effect.

Herefordshire Council's summary response

The above comments have been carefully considered and some minor amendments are suggested as a consequence. It is considered that these are minor amendments that result in improvements to the policy and consistency with Core Strategy policies.

- 1 It is accepted that the policy could be strengthened with regard to the protection of heritage assets and a minor modification is recommended in this respect.
- 2 Do not accept that reference is required to the 'duration of the permission' as this additional wording is superfluous. Any protections that are achieved through the grant of planning permissions and any associated planning conditions will remain in place for the duration of the planning permission. Similarly it is not necessary to change the wording from 'can be' to 'is' as the policy as currently drafted requires development proposals to demonstrate that they will adequately address any unacceptable adverse impacts at the planning application stage and any required mitigations must be achieved through the use of planning conditions/obligations.
- 3 Agree that a minor amendment is made to criterion 10 to ensure consistency with TS2.
- 4 The wording of Policy TS1 is positively prepared and provides appropriate clarity by setting out specific and appropriate requirements when it comes to planning applications for traveller sites. The intention is to offer a clear steer to any applicant on what is properly required rather than to make it more difficult to achieve planning permission. It is however recognised that the precise nature of proposals for traveller sites will vary and it is agreed that an explanation of this should be provided in paragraph 5.1. With reference to the provision of amenity blocks, criterion 2 does state "where included" which recognises that not all proposals will include an amenity block. This reference is also required in criterion 3 and explanation of this will be given in paragraph 5.1.
- 5 The reference to animal grazing was introduced as a result of a recommendation from the Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Options stage and reflects the tradition of Gypsies and Travellers when it comes to keeping animals. The welfare of animals and any required licensing for the movement of animals is subject to a different regulatory regime and therefore is outside the remit of the DPD.
- 6 Noted. Effective management will ensure that sites are properly maintained.
- 7 Management issues are outside of the scope of the DPD but planning officers have worked closely with the Traveller Sites team and other relevant professional staff in the identification of additional pitches on local authority sites. The identification of two additional pitches at Bromyard is intended to help address some of the management issues that have been experienced.

- 8 Objection noted. However local planning authorities are required to assess the demand for traveller sites in the same way as they do for other types of housing needs and ensure that any requirement can be met through the planning policy and development management processes.
- 9 See response under GTAA section.
- 10 Correct typographical error.
- 11 Agreed – remove reference to permeable surfaces as this is unnecessary text.
- 12 Core Strategy Policy H4 forms part of an adopted local plan that is not the subject of review through this DPD process and will remain in place until such time as there is a review of the Core Strategy.
- 13 Support noted.
- 14 See response under bullet point 4 above.
- 15 Agreed that it would improve the policy to extend the first criterion as recommended and also to include reference to biodiversity assets.
- 16 It is not necessary to include reference to waste and recycling facilities as this is covered by Core Strategy Policy SD1. However to provide further clarification it would be useful to include reference to the fact that the policies of the DPD should be read in conjunction with those in the Core Strategy and an amendment to paragraph 1.1 is therefore suggested below.
- 17 With regard to making reference to the encouragement of the use of previously developed land in preference to green field land, this is addressed by Policy SS2 of the Core Strategy and it is not necessary to restate this policy. Whilst it is acknowledged that the principle of encouraging the use of land primarily near to urban areas to reduce the need to travel is to be encouraged, in this instance this does not reflect intent of Policy RA3 which allows the development of gypsy and traveller sites in rural areas outside of settlements. In addition, Core Strategy Policy H4 will apply to any proposed development and will require any such development proposals to have reasonable access to services and facilities.
- 18 Agree that a minor amendment could be included to take on board to reflect the recommendation of sustainability appraisal

Minor changes suggested:

Policy TS1

- **Criterion 1** Replace criterion 1 with the following: “An overall good quality of design which respects the setting of the site, ~~and~~ local landscape character, the character and significance of designated and undesignated heritage assets and minimises any impacts on biodiversity assets.”
- **Criterion 3** Amend criterion to read “amenity blocks where included are sensitively designed.....”
- **Criterion 4** “Biodiversity assets and/ or designated and undesignated heritage assets are conserved and where appropriate enhanced. Any unacceptable

adverse impact on landscape or local nature conservation designations, ecology, biodiversity or heritage assets can be satisfactorily mitigated.

- **Criterion 9** suitable arrangements for **clean water supply**, foul sewerage disposal and surface water drainage, and where opportunities for sustainable drainage systems ~~particularly for permeable surfaces~~ are maximised.
- **Criterion 10:**” that any commercial activity that is proposed on the site is of a type that is appropriate to the location and does not impact on the amenity of ~~any~~ local residents and **other land users**”
- Add the following text in **paragraph 5.1** after the first sentence. **”Gypsy and Traveller sites may vary in their layout and type of development. Sites managed by Herefordshire Council are made up of a number of pitches which consist of hardstanding for a caravan and /or mobile home as well as a separate amenity block with cooking and washing facilities. Private sites which are either individual or small family sites often have either a small area of hardstanding or none at all and often do not include a separate permanent amenity block.”**
- In paragraph 5.1 amend as follows: “.....conjunction with Core Strategies policies.....”
- Amend paragraph 1.1 by adding an additional sentence to the end of the paragraph as follows: **”Therefore the policies of the Travellers Development Plan Document (DPD) should be considered in conjunction with the policies of the Core Strategy.”**

Main Issues Statement TS2 - Travelling Showpeople Plots

Objections: 1006, 1015, 1039

Objection with no additional comment: 1017

Supporting comments: 1022

Supporting comment with no additional comment: 1002 1025 1026 1034 1044

General comment: 1001 1004 1027

Objections

1. Draft Policy TS2 criterion 5 should use “must not” as opposed to “should not” to meet the justified and effective tests of soundness in relation to the impact on tourism and in relation to Core Strategy policy E4 Tourism. (1006)
2. Policy TS2 should include a criterion requiring the satisfactory mitigation of any unacceptable adverse impacts on landscape or local nature conservation designations, ecology, biodiversity or heritage assets to align with Policy TS1. (1006)
3. Add the following to make policy sound: “any unacceptable adverse impact on landscape or local nature conservation designations, ecology, biodiversity or heritage assets is satisfactorily mitigated for the duration of the permission.” (1006)
4. Comments made earlier under the GTAA section apply (1015)
5. This is being deliberately difficult to object to the whole scheme. Abandon it. (1039)
6. Paragraph 5.2 is not clear and requires redrafting. (1004)

General Comment

- 7 Recommend the replication of the criteria 9 in TS1 including reference to clean water supply. (1001)
- 8 Would welcome notification of sites selected for travelling showpeople.(1027)

Supporting Comment:

- 9 It is important that all children should have access to schools and TS2 with the "Live Work" site allows this. (1022)

Sustainability appraisal Mitigation and Recommendations

- 10 It is recommended that the policy is amended to include a new criterion requiring proposals to provide appropriate waste management and recycling facilities on site when the site is occupied (in line with paragraph 4.24 of the DPD).
- 11 It is recommended that the policy is amended to include reference to avoiding or mitigating adverse effects on biodiversity and where appropriate, conserving and enhancing on-site features of conservation value. This would help avoid potentially significant negative effects and result in neutral or minor positive effects.
- 12 It is recommended that clause 6 is expanded to include pollution prevention and control measures where vehicles, plant and machinery will be stored and/or maintained on site. This will help avoid significant negative effects in relation to pollution.

Herefordshire Council's summary response

The above comments have been carefully considered and some minor amendments are suggested as a consequence. It is considered that these are minor amendments that result in improvements to the policy and consistency with Core Strategy policies.

- 1 It is not necessary to change the wording from "should not" to "must not". The meaning of the words "should" and "should not" is clear and this terminology was used and accepted in the context of the Core Strategy policies.
- 2 Accept that to be consistent with the approach in TS1 then this additional criterion could be added to Policy TS2
- 3 Do not accept that reference is required to the 'duration of the permission' as this additional wording is superfluous. Any protections that are achieved through the grant of planning permissions and any associated planning conditions will remain in place for the duration of the planning permission.
- 4 Noted. See response to comments under the GTAA section.
- 5 Local planning authorities are required to assess the demand for traveller sites in the same way as they do for other types of housing needs and to ensure that this requirement can be met through the planning policy and development management processes.
- 6 Agreed that paragraph 5.2 would benefit from redrafting to make it clearer.
- 7 For consistency with policy TS1 accept that the wording is changed.
- 8 Noted. We will keep all relevant local planning authorities and other relevant consultees informed of any changes through on-going Duty to Co-operate meetings and usual consultation procedures.

- 9 Agree that an accommodation base is important to allow children to obtain regular access to school. Policy TS2 seeks to encourage the provision of new sites to support this objective.
- 10 This point is addressed by Policy SD1 of the Core Strategy. All residential traveller sites are treated in the same way as any other domestic property in terms of provision of waste and recycling bins.
- 11 Accept that the policy would benefit from the inclusion of the same clause as provided in TS1.
- 12 Accept that the policy would benefit if clause 6 is expanded to refer to pollution control.

Minor changes suggested

- Include additional criterion in line with Policy TS1 to state that: **An overall good quality of design which respects the setting of the site, and local landscape character, the character and significance of designated and undesignated heritage assets and minimises any impacts on biodiversity assets.**
- Replace Criterion 4 with the following wording: ~~Measures to reduce the risk of flooding should be incorporated into the design and layout. Permeable surfaces should be incorporated to minimise surface water run-off.~~ **suitable arrangements for clean water supply, foul sewerage disposal and surface water drainage should be included in the design and opportunities for sustainable drainage systems are maximised**
- Criterion 6: Extend policy as follows: “Site layout should have proper regard to regard to health and safety requirements including adequate spacing between perimeter boundaries and any structures to meet fire safety standards **as well as incorporating appropriate pollution prevention and control measures.**”
- **Add additional criterion: “Biodiversity assets and/ or designated and undesignated heritage assets are conserved and where appropriate enhanced. Any unacceptable adverse impact on landscape or local nature conservation designations, biodiversity or heritage assets can be satisfactorily mitigated.”**
- Amend paragraph 5.2 for clarity:

The GTAA identifies a need for nine travelling show plots **to 2031**. The Council will continue to work with the Travelling Show Persons Guild and the local community to encourage **these** sites to come forward for this purpose. ~~The requirement will be met through the planning application process. and~~ Policy TS2 seeks to encourage the supply of suitable sites **and recognises the differences in the site requirements for travelling show people plots in comparison with other traveller sites, that is they usually require sufficient space for both living accommodation as well as for the storage and maintenance of fairground equipment.** ~~Because of the specific requirements and differences to the other traveller sites and given that there are no allocations for show people plots land, this enabling policy aims to encourage the provision of additional showpeople sites is included. Regard has been given to~~

the Showman's Guild's document "A Planning Focus Model Standard Package - Revised September 2007" in drafting policy TS2.

Main Issues Statement: Policy TS3 Temporary Stopping Place Leominster

Objections: 1005 1012 1014 1015 1023 1038 1039 1049 1050 1051

Objections without additional comment: 1010 1017

Supporting comments: 1022 1024

Support with no additional comments: 1002 1025 1026 1034 1044

General comment: 1001 1008 1029

Objections:

1. There is a need for an additional site in the South of the County (although support in principle the provision of site at Leominster). **(1005, 1022, 1024)**
2. There are insufficient pitches for the number of travellers that come into town. It is unrealistic to assume that 5 will go to the temporary site and the others elsewhere. **(1012)**
3. The site is part of the traditional Lammas Meadows and should be retained as part of Leominster's heritage. **(1012)**
4. Question how facilities will be provided for when the travellers arrive. **(1012)**
5. The site is outside the town with no public transport to the town's facilities. **(1012)**
6. Concern about highway access / safety. **(1012, 1023)**
7. The site has been recently used for fly-tipping. The rubbish is seldom cleared. Making it more accessible will invite more fly-tipping. **(1012)**
8. The site has potential to become a permanent site by default. A detailed budget plan regarding funding required for the works required, management costs and procedures is necessary. Question how the agreed period of stay will be enforced and how staff will monitor residents and vehicles in adhering to the fourteen day period. **(1014)**
9. Views set out in answer to earlier questions (recorded under the GTAA section) **(1015)**
10. The policy is not sound, as it does not sufficiently take into account the objections raised by the Parish Council in September 2016 namely: concerns over access, the site being in a flood-zone, possible damage to the habitat, especially the River Lugg SSSI, and the visual impact on one of the main approaches to Leominster. These are matters of national and local planning policy which would indicate that this is not a suitable site for a temporary stopping place. The proposed site should be re-considered accordingly. **(1038)**
11. Abandon it **(1039)**
12. Temporary stopping site is a waste of funding as need for more permanent plots. **(1049 1050 1051)**
13. This area of Leominster, (where TS3 is situated) known as Leominster Out parish does not form part of a local or town parish so therefore local councillors are not concerned in representing local parishioners living and working in the area. Many Leominster businesses shocked that they have not been kept informed. **(1004)**

Supporting comments:

14. Support TS3 but request more emphasis is given to security to reduce fears of objectors. The provision of temporary stopping places, is a necessity and should be of advantage to all communities. It should be possible to make the site safe and secure for those that use it and to address fears of nearby commercial interests. The council should consider what steps and budget are needed regarding reassurance for all communities. **(1024)**
15. Basically agreed though being so near the railway and the A49 it could be dangerous for children. **(1029)**

General Comment

16. If a temporary connection be required to Welsh Water's sewerage or water supply networks then will provide comments as and when consulted as part of the planning application and connections processes. At the northern end of the site there is a 6" distribution water main for which protection measures will be required in the form of an easement width or diversion. (1001)
17. With regard to the site adjacent to the roundabout on the A49 in Leominster our Flood Map for Planning does show that the site partially falls within Flood Zone 3, the high risk Zone. The modelling technique used to inform the Flood Map at this location is Jflow (generalised modelling). However, as stated in Paragraph 6.3 of the submitted plan, detailed modelling of the Arrow and Lugg confirms that the site lies within Flood Zone 1, the low risk Zone. Whilst the recent modelling needs to be refined before it is included within the Flood Map it provides the confidence that the site can be utilised as a temporary stopping places for up to five pitches.
18. The site on the A49 gives good accessibility but will be noisy (1022).

Sustainability appraisal Mitigation and Recommendations

19. It is recommended that policy should be strengthened to avoid adverse effects to the character and significance of heritage assets.
20. It is recommended that the policy is amended to include a new criterion requiring proposals to provide appropriate waste management and recycling facilities on site when the site is occupied (in line with paragraph 4.24 of the DPD).
21. It is recommended that a sequential approach to the layout of the site is included as a criterion in the policy.
22. It is recommended that a clause is added to the policy requiring appropriate pollution prevention measures relating to temporary sanitation facilities.

Herefordshire Council's summary response

Herefordshire Council's summary response

- 1) The GTAA identifies a requirement for a five pitch site for temporary stopping place/transit site, the development of the identified site would meet this requirement and therefore there is no need to identify an additional site at this time.
- 2) Whilst it is recognised that this site cannot meet the requirements of all unauthorised encampments, especially when large groups of travellers move through the county, records of encampments show an average number of 4.5 caravans on each

encampment and therefore this site would provide for that average. The provision of this well located temporary stopping place will therefore significantly mitigate this problem by providing a site of sufficient size to accommodate most of the travellers passing through Herefordshire. This site will also address the concerns of West Midlands Police who have consistently reiterated the need for the provision of a transit site and / or temporary stopping places for the travelling community within Herefordshire to address unauthorised encampments and associated issues.

- 3) The phase 1 habitat mapping shows this site as part improved grassland and part tall ruderal (i.e. tall weed growth). It is not classified as unimproved meadow.
- 4) Entry on to the site will be managed by the Council's Licensing, Travellers and Technical Support Team who will book the travellers on to the site and set out the terms and conditions of occupancy including an agreed time period for the stay. Temporary facilities will be brought in as and when required and again this will be managed by the Licensing team.
- 5) The site is adjacent to a pedestrian and cycle path leading to the town centre providing good sustainable links to facilities and services.
- 6) A location near to a main route through the county is required. The Council is working with Highways England in order to address highway issues. The Council has commissioned a highways risk assessment at their request and this is included in the evidence base. This concluded that with some identified works the site proposal is acceptable in principle.
- 7) The fencing and securing of the site will prevent further fly tipping. See also response to point 4 regarding management of the site.
- 8) The Site will be managed by the Travellers Team who will ensure that it remains a temporary site. The length of each stay will be negotiated on a case by case basis but will not exceed 14 days.
- 9) See response given under GTAA section.
- 10) The Council has worked with the Environment Agency (EA) regarding flood risk issues. The EA has advised that the site is outside flood zones 2 and 3. The policy includes reference to the impact on the River Lugg SSSI. The policy requires the retention and enhancement where possible of the boundary planting to mitigate landscape impact.
- 11) The Council is required to assess the pitch requirements of the travelling community and plan accordingly.
- 12) The DPD allocates sites for both permanent sites and for temporary stopping places to help meet the identified requirement.
- 13) The site at Leominster under TS3 is situated within Leominster Town Council administrative area (1014)
- 14) Support noted. Issues regarding security will be dealt with at the planning application stage and as part of the Council's management policy.
- 15) Policy TS3 requires fencing to prevent access to the railway line.
- 16) Comments regarding the location of the water main are noted and will be taken into account in the detailed design of the layout of the Site.
- 17) Comments regarding latest flood zone modelling are noted.
- 18) Noted. However the Site is only intended for temporary stays so any potential impact from road noise will inevitably be short lived. In any event a degree of protection from road noise will be offered through existing vegetation and planting.
- 19) Impacts on character and significance of heritage assets would be addressed under policy TS1.

- 20 We accept that it would be helpful to include reference to waste management facilities in the policy for added clarification. It is appropriate to such a reference to this policy as the fact that it is a temporary stopping site requires different arrangements than for the sites allocated under TS4 – TS7.
- 21 Paragraph 6.3 includes reference to the need for a sequential approach with regard to the layout of the scheme.
- 22 It is not considered necessary to include reference to pollution control in relation to the temporary sanitation facilities as these will be provided by an authorised supplier and conform to all regulations regarding pollution control which is subject to a separate regulatory regime.

Minor changes suggested

For clarification in TS3 amend first criterion (second sub-bullet point) as follows:

- “Provide an area of hardstanding for:
 - Towing vehicles and caravans for short stays only
 - Temporary sanitation **and waste management** facilities to be brought on site when it is occupied and removed at the end of the stay”

Main Issues Statement: Policy TS4 Romany Way

Representations:

Objections: 1047 1048 1015 1039

Supporting comments: 1046

Support with no comment: 1002 1005 1022 1026 1034 1044

General comment: 1001

Main issues raised (objections)

1. Should make more plots on this site and keep families together. There are two potential places (the picnic area and the office). This would be better than spending the money on transit pitches in Leominster. (1047 1048)
2. Set out concerns in earlier responses (1015)
3. The proposals are unsound. Abandon the scheme. (1039)

General Comment

- 4 Given that this pitch is proposed on an existing local authority site, there are no problems envisaged in providing a clean water supply though we will provide further comment as and when consulted at planning application stage. Should the pitch propose to connect to the public sewerage network, there is a public sewer to the north west of the site though some level of offsite works may be required in order to provide the connection. (1001)

Supporting Comment:

- 5 In favour of another plot being built, but need more parking spaces for visitors and residents and the road way widening. Lack of turning points and parking can sometimes cause problems. (1046)

Sustainability appraisal Mitigation and Recommendations

No recommendations were identified in relation to this policy.

Herefordshire Council's summary response

- 1 Generally there is support for the identified additional pitch. Some respondents have stated that they would like the play area redeveloped as a second addition pitch. However it is considered preferable to maintain the play area as although it is currently underused it may be better used in the future. The site could become unacceptably overcrowded with two additional pitches.
- 2 Noted (See previous response in the Statement on the GTAA).
- 3 Noted (See previous response in statement on TS1)
- 4 Comments regarding water supply and sewerage disposal are noted.

5 It is not possible within the constraints of the site to widen the on-site road.

Minor changes required

None

Main Issues Statement: Policy TS5, Watery Lane Lower Bullingham

Objections: 1001 1015 1018 1039 1048 1049 1050

Support without additional comments 1002 1005 1022 1034 1026 1044

Objections

1. There are no public sewers or water mains within proximity of this site, therefore if the additional two pitches wish to connect to the public supply then off-site mains/sewers will be required at developers' expense. Further comments will be provided when consulted at planning application stage. (1001)
2. I have set out my concerns in my earlier responses (1015)
3. The Hereford Enterprise Zone recognises the need to provide additional space for the travelling community and we have no objection in principle to the proposed addition of two new pitches to the Orchard Caravan Park on Watery Lane. Previous comments submitted in the initial consultation in 2016 are reiterated regarding the need to involve the Enterprise Zone in a joined up approach and the access into the extension site. Emphasise the vital importance of this as to not compromise the future viability of, and ability to gain access to, the Enterprise Zone employment site to the south in any way (1018).
4. New pitches should be for people who don't have pitches that are homeless not for existing residents (1048).
5. Improvements and extensions to sites throughout Herefordshire are a good idea but 2 and 3 plot extensions are not enough as sites are already holding 2 families per plot. Phillip Hammond says the government will build 300,000 new homes a year to tackle the housing crisis until 2020 with affordable housing. Travellers should be given the opportunity to buy plots. The Leominster transit site will not last and will cost the council money. Building a permanent site would lessen need for plots as many travellers have no permanent plot. (1049, 1050)
6. The barriers on sites are not wide enough as a wide range of traveller families are now residing in mobile homes. There are no play areas/parks on site for children which there should be a safe area for child play. Existing amenity blocks require updating to make easier for young children, elderly people and disabled people who struggle in cold dark nights. Toilets should be in new day rooms. All facilities should be in comfort. Water pressure issues mean that showers are not possible but these are needed for people with disabilities. The fence alongside the road is a hazard as there is no barrier and structure. Dust that comes from Lorries can make asthma worse. There are potholes which are a danger. There is a need for more plots and upgraded sites. (1049, 1050)
7. Welcome new plots that are suitable for those with disabilities.(1050)

8 Abandon it. (1039)

Sustainability Appraisal Mitigation and Recommendations

9 It is recommended that a clause is added to the policy requiring the retention of existing boundary trees and hedgerows.

Herefordshire Council's summary response

1 The existing site, to which this is a proposed extension, is served by water mains and mains sewerage. The Council will liaise with Welsh Water as the proposals progress to ensure that the issue is appropriately addressed.

2 Noted (See response to earlier comments recorded in the GTAA section.)

3 Comments regarding the Enterprise Zone (EZ) are noted. The Council will continue to discuss the issue of access with the EZ team to ensure that the future viability of, and ability to gain access to, the Enterprise Zone employment site is not compromised.

4 The allocation of new pitches will be carried out in line with the Traveller Team's pitch allocation policy.

5 Comments are noted however, the need for a temporary stopping place has been identified in the GTAA and it is appropriate to identify a site for this provision (see statement relating to the GTAA.)

6 Many issues raised that refer to the management of the site and the existing facilities. These issues are outside the remit of this plan but some of these are being addressed through a separate sites improvement strategy for which capital funds are being sought to make various improvements.

7 Noted. All new structures will be designed to be compliant with the requirements of the Equality Act 2010.

8 Noted (See response to earlier comments in summary statement TS1)

9 Policy TS1 includes reference to retention of trees and hedgerows and therefore an additional criterion is not considered necessary.

Minor changes required

No Changes required.

Main Issues Statement - Policy TS6 Openfields Caravan Site Bromyard

Representations:

Objections: 1009, 1015 1034 1039

Supporting comments: None

Support with no additional comment: 1002 1005 1022 1026 1044

General comment: 1001

Main issues raised (objections)

1. Require further information in form of heritage impact statement about potential negative effect for a Grade II heritage asset in order to make a judgement regarding potential harm or mitigation measures. The potential landscaping measure identified are noted but it is not clear how relevant this is if there is no visibility between the development site and the heritage asset. Other mitigation measures could be more appropriate. (1009)
2. I have set out my concerns in my earlier responses (1015)
3. Lack of support to existing traveller families which have failed to satisfactorily integrate with the community. The plot was already sufficiently large in relation to both the size of the parish and the needs of the current occupiers of the site. Concern was also raised regarding the previous poor management of the site; closer supervision is requested in future to ensure the satisfactory integration of new families with the community. (1034)
4. "Really?" (1039)

General Comment

- 5 Given that the additional two pitches are on an existing local authority sites, there are no problems envisaged in providing a clean water supply though we will provide further comment as and when consulted at planning application stage. Should the pitches propose to connect to the public sewerage network, the nearest public sewer is located in the A44, therefore off-site sewers will be required at developers' expense. (1001)

Supporting Comment:

Sustainability appraisal Mitigation and Recommendations

No recommendations were identified in relation to this policy

Herefordshire Council's summary response

- 1 The Council is of the opinion that there is no detrimental impact on the assets identified in the Sustainability Appraisal and has provided further information to Historic England regarding this matter.
- 2 Noted (see response to comments in summary statement relating to the GTAA)

- 3 This site is the subject of a Multi-Agency Tasking and Coordination (MATAC) group to address management issues. The reinstatement of the two plots would prevent the use of that land from being used for anti-social practices. The allocation of the two additional plots will subject to the Council's allocation policy and be made in consultation with the MATAC group.
- 4 Not clear what this comment is suggesting.
- 5 Comments about water supply and sewerage infrastructure are noted.

Minor changes required

None

Main Issues Statement Policy TS7 - Pembridge

Representations:

Objections: 1005 1009 1015 1039

Supporting comment: 1035

Support with no additional comment 1002 1022 1027 1034 1044

Objections

1. Require more information on how this development could impact on the setting of heritage assets and what mitigation measures may therefore be appropriate. It may be that design considerations should be included within the Plan, to ensure that any potential harm can be overcome, when any future planning applications are received by the Council. (1009)
2. I have set out my concerns in my earlier responses (1015)
3. This survey is a joke - abandon (1039)

General Comment

- 4 Given that the additional four pitches are on an existing local authority site, there are no problems envisaged in providing a clean water supply though we will provide comments as and when consulted at planning application stage. There are no public sewers within proximity of the site, therefore if it is proposed to connect to the nearest public sewerage network then significant off-site sewers will be required at great expense to the developer.(1001)
- 5 An isolated site - difficult to manage at present size- additional management capacity may be required. (Support with reservations 1005)

Supporting Comment:

- 6 Hereford Council has amended the plan to build behind the current site instead of along the roadway as requested, the litter is currently being managed well and it is hoped will continue. There should be no access from the rear on the Kingspan road from the site. (1035)

Sustainability Appraisal Mitigation and Recommendations

- 7 It is recommended that the policy should be amended to require the provision of an appropriate heritage impact assessment/heritage statement with any application.

Herefordshire Council's summary response

- 1 Further work on the impact on heritage assets has been completed and has shown that there are no issues of concern.

- 2 Noted (see comments in the summary statement relating to the GTAA)
- 3 Noted (see comments in the summary statement relating to TS1)
- 4 The existing pitches are served by a private sewage disposal system and a similar system would be required to serve the new pitches.
- 5 Comments noted.
- 6 Noted. Policy is clear that existing access will be used for this site.
- 7 Further assessment of the heritage impact has been carried out and it is not considered that the extension of the site will create an unacceptable impact on heritage assets in the locality. In any event appropriate protection of heritage assets is required under policy TS1 and LD4 of the Core Strategy so no additional policy protection is justified.

Minor changes required

None