



Meeting: **POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE – Gipsy & Traveller Site Working Group**
Date: **7 NOVEMBER 2011**
Time: **6.00PM**
Venue: **COMMITTEE ROOM**
To: **Councillors R Musgrave (Chair), Mrs M Davis and I Reynolds.**

Agenda

1. Apologies for absence

2. Disclosures of Interest

Members of the Policy Review Committee Working Group should disclose personal or prejudicial interest(s) in any item on this agenda.

3. Minutes

To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the proceedings of the meeting of the Working group on 24 October 2011 (pages 2 to 4 attached)

4. Review of Sites

4.1. To confirm site selection methodology, pages 5 to 6 attached

4.2. To review and consider sites against the site selection methodology

4.3. To make a provisional recommendation.

4. Site visit

Jonathan Lund
Deputy Chief Executive

Dates of next meetings
21 November 2011

Enquiries relating to this agenda, please contact Richard Besley on:
Tel: 01757 292227
Email: rbesley@selby.gov.uk



Minutes

Policy Review Committee – Research Working Group on Gipsy & Traveller Sites

Venue: Committee Room

Date: 24 October 2011

Present: Councillor R Musgrave (Chair), Councillor Mrs M Davis and Councillor I Reynolds

Apologies for Absence: None

Officers Present: Jonathan Lund, Deputy Chief Executive; Eileen Scothern, Business Manager; Andrew McMillan, Policy Officer and Richard Besley, Democratic Services

1. Chair's Address to the Working Group

Cllr Musgrave explained how the Working Group had been set up by the Council following proposals on the SADPD by the Policy Review Committee. The group consisted of Cllr Musgrave as Chair together with Cllrs Mrs Davis and Reynolds.

The Chair introduced those present at this first meeting and thanked them for their participation. He reminded working group members and officers of the tight time constraint on the group and welcomed the opportunity to submit recommendations to Council

2. Declarations of interest

The Chair notified those present that he had been contacted by Mr S Humphrey, the chair of Whitley Parish Council prior to the meeting. Whitley is a community where one of the sites is located.

3. Terms of Reference

The Deputy Chief Executive introduced the draft Terms of Reference and re-emphasised the Chair's introduction to the group that this was a time limited piece of work. And it was important to recognise that there is a fixed end date.

RESOLVED:

To receive and note the Terms of Reference.

4. Review of Sites

4.1 To Confirm the Site Selection Methodology

The Chair asked for clarification on a question that rose at the working group briefing if sites within land identified for permitted development could be considered or whether it contradicted national planning policy?

Councillor Reynolds felt the policy was contradictory and felt that land identified for housing development would carry a high cost and be too expensive to develop for gypsy and traveller accommodation.

Chair asked for a definitive answer.

Action: Officers to respond to Chair's question by next meeting

The Chair had also asked at the briefing whether if authorisation was given to illegal or unauthorised sites would they count towards the shortfall which the Council was seeking to remedy?

Initial views were that it wasn't but that had been challenged by the Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer. Officers were currently working to provide a definitive answer

Councillor Reynolds proposed a further change to the revised methodology at item (b) moving consideration of land located 10km not 5km of identified road junctions.

On studying the map of the district he felt that the move to 10km did not really help in anyway and that, in hindsight, it may be better reverting to 5km.

The Chair seconded the proposal to revert to 5km and after a vote the proposal was carried.

Resolved

To amend the distance in (b) of the methodology relating to land “located within a 10km drive of one of the main road junctions”, to 5km.

The Chair identified that the sequential site selection methodology used for gypsy and traveller site allocation appeared to be less clear than the methodology used in other parts of the SADPD and he wondered if a common description would improve clarity.

Action: For Officers to consider a unified and consistent approach to recording the methodology

4.2 To review and consider sites against the site selection methodology

The Chair notified the group that with Andrew McMillan, Policy Officer he had written to various parties to enquire about other sites as part of the renewed call for sites.

So far there has been some contact, with some parties renewing interest, though to date nothing formal has arisen.

It was confirmed that landowners had been made aware of the tight timescale.

While sites are coming forward the Deputy Chief Executive sought and received confirmation that the next step would be to consider the existing sites put forward by landowners, and any other sites that come forward in the meantime, against the revised methodology to produce a shortlist for the next meeting.

4.3 To make a provisional recommendation and consider a site visit or visits

It was agreed that no provisional recommendation would be made at this meeting while some matters remained to be clarified.

Councillor Davis welcomed the possibility of site visit(s) so that any recommendation(s) made by the group is made with as much knowledge as able.

The Deputy Chief Executive asked the group if it was happy for Officers to arrange a co-ordinated visit for all participants as soon as possible after the next meeting on Monday 7th November.

RESOLVED:

To arrange a co-ordinated visit for all participants as soon as possible after the next meeting on Monday 7th November.

The meeting closed at 6:50pm

G&T Methodology for Allocating Sites in the SADPD

Working Group Original Review (7/10/11)	Alternative (24/10/11)	Notes
<p>Located in the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 1, or in Flood Zone 2 if no sites in FZ1 are available and appropriate measures can be put in place to limit the impact of flooding. Sites will not be located in Flood Zone 3.</p>	<p>Located in the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 1, or in Flood Zone 2 if no sites in FZ1 are available and appropriate measures can be put in place to limit the impact of flooding. Sites will not be located in Flood Zone 3.</p>	<p>This is PPS25 national policy.</p>
<p>Located within a 10km drive of one of the main road junctions, listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A64 – A19 interchange at York • A64 – A162 interchange at Tadcaster • A64 – A1(M) interchange at Hazlewood • A1(M) (Junction 42) – A63 interchange at Lumby • M62 (Junction 33) – old A1 interchange at Knottingley • M62 (Junction 34) – A19 interchange at Eggborough/Whitley • M62 (Junction 36) – A614 interchange at Goole • M62 (Junction 37) – A63 interchange at Howden 	<p>Located within a 5km drive of one of the main road junctions, listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A64 – A19 interchange at York • A64 – A162 interchange at Tadcaster • A64 – A1(M) interchange at Hazlewood • A1(M) (Junction 42) – A63 interchange at Lumby • M62 (Junction 33) – old A1 interchange at Knottingley • M62 (Junction 34) – A19 interchange at Eggborough/Whitley • M62 (Junction 36) – A614 interchange at Goole • M62 (Junction 37) – A63 interchange at Howden 	<p>Agreed to revert to 5km as 10km did not assist in narrowing the search. Retains consistency between criterion 2 and 3 Maintain road junctions.</p>
<p>Sites should be within 5km of the Principal Town, a Local Service Centre or a Designated Service Village.</p>	<p>See next box</p>	<p>Need to ensure <i>appropriate access to services and facilities</i>, not necessarily be bound by a set distance. However 5km is PPS2 "cycling distance" – a recognised planning distance and is helpful in setting out what we mean by reasonable access. This is now incorporated in to the seq test below.</p>
<p>Sites inside the Limits to Development of the Principal Town, a Local Service Centre or a Designated Service Village Selby Town will be discounted as they are likely to be suitable for market housing, and as such will have too high a</p>	<p>Potential sites will be considered in a sequential manner, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Previously developed land inside the Limit to Development b) Green field land inside the Limit to 	<p>This is the Sequential test applied to other forms of development, albeit with additional bullets that allow sites in the open countryside if necessary. The land value should not be a factor – we discounted</p>

land value	<p>Development</p> <p>c) Previously developed land adjacent to the limit to development</p> <p>d) Green field land adjacent to the limit to development</p> <p>e) Previously-developed land as close as possible to the Principal Town, Local Service Centres or Designated Service Villages (maximum 5km)</p> <p>f) Well-screened green field land as close as possible to the Principal Town, Local Service Centres or Designated Service Villages (maximum 5km)</p>	<p>originally because “nobody” would want G&T use when they could have market housing and therefore make more profit. However this was shown to be incorrect as 2 such sites came forward. National policy is to direct development to the most sustainable locations. Using land value to steer the sites out of settled communities is likely to be found unsound and fail at EiP.</p> <p>Whitley is still the preferred site.</p>
Sites may be considered in the open countryside or Green Belt only if there are no sequentially preferable sites, and preference will be given to previously developed land, and already appropriately screened so as to prevent loss of the openness of the Green Belt.	<p>Sites will be assessed against extant local policy restrictions identified in the 2005 Selby District Local Plan, and will only be considered in restricted areas if</p> <p>a) there are no alternative sites</p> <p>b) land is previously-developed</p> <p>c) site is already appropriately screened</p> <p>Sites will not be allocated in the Green Belt</p>	<p>Again, Whitley is still the pref site as other 2 are GBelt.</p> <p>Note: Core Strategy EiP noted strong steer towards protecting the Green Belt. Draft Traveller Site consultation reaffirmed that G&T sites are inappropriate in the Green Belt. We therefore need to be clear that Green Belt is the last option.</p>
Ideally promoted by the land owner for such use	Sites should ideally be promoted by the land owner for such use, however if no sites are available or suitable with land owner agreement, then the Council will consider use of its statutory powers of Compulsory Purchase on sites that meet the above criteria.	<p>We may as well be honest about it. We want to do it amicably, but if we have to then we'll CPO.</p> <p>Note: we have said many time we don't want to force a site on a community that doesn't want it and that we won't CPO. This is therefore a significant change of stance.</p>

However new instructions are, we are only assessing the 6 sites in the SADPD Preferred Options and any new sites proposed for G & T use.