



**Carlisle City Council Local Plan
Examination**

Agenda

Tuesday 19 January 2016

Timing and Programming

In order to make efficient use of time whilst allowing each participant the opportunity to put their case, the hearing will be run as a "Rolling Programme". There will be mid-morning, lunch and afternoon breaks.

09:30 am Inspector's Opening

Matter 4 – Gypsy & Traveller Site Provision

Issue 1: Whether the LP makes satisfactory provision to meet the needs of the gypsy and traveller community and travelling showpersons?

Q1. Does the GTAA provide a realistic assessment of the needs of the gypsy and traveller community? In particular:

- (a) Is the allowance made for an annual 10% turnover on existing sites realistic and supported by evidence?
- (b) Has in-migration to the area been assessed and included in the assessment of need?

Q2. The GTAA identifies a need for 15 pitches up to 2028 not 2030 as it has a base date position of 2013/14. In response to the Inspector's Initial Questions the Council confirms that the reference at paragraph 5.90 of the Local Plan to '2028' is a typographical error and should read 2030. However it would also be necessary to calculate the additional need for those two years. The Council has recently granted permission for an additional two pitches on an alternative site within the District. It suggests that this results in the residual unmet need between now and 2030 reducing to seven pitches. However, that would not take account of the additional two years of the plan period not already accounted for in the GTAA.

(a) Based on the methodology used in the GTAA, would the identified need between 2013 and the end of the Plan Period be 17 pitches? If so, even having regard to the two pitches that have since been granted planning permission, the identified need would remain 15 pitches over the plan period?

(b) Unless 6 pitches have been granted elsewhere, the allocation of 9 pitches at Low Harker Dene would not meet the identified need over the entire plan period; they would meet a need for the first 9 years of the plan with windfall sites being relied upon to meet the remainder. Is this correct?

Q3. Low Harker Dene is an existing Council owned gypsy site. The addition of 9 pitches will result in a large single site accommodating 24 pitches. The single allocation offers little choice to the gypsy and travelling community. The Sustainability

Appraisal Report (SD003) confirms that no other sites were put forward for consideration.

(a) What efforts were made to ensure that the gypsy and travelling community were able to engage in the site selection process?

(b) Is the site currently occupied by both Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers and will the additional 9 pitches provide accommodation that is realistically suitable for both ethnic groups?

Q4. Are the criteria set out in Policy HO11 consistent with national policy which requires criteria based policies to be fair and facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of travellers whilst respecting the interests of the settled community (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) paragraph 10) and realistically likely to facilitate additional accommodation to meet the needs of the gypsy and traveller community?

Q5. Policy C3 of the PPTS refers to sites in rural areas and the countryside. Is there tension between this policy and criteria 1 of Policy HO11 that requires sites to be physically connected to an existing settlement?

Q6. Is requirement (8) of Policy HO11 that requires proposals to include site management measures in proposals for all sites, including small family sites or single pitches, justified?

Q7. What criteria in Policy HO11 would distinguish between circumstances when a pitch may only be suitable for a temporary period rather than providing permanent accommodation? Is such a distinction justified?

Q8. The Council makes no allocations for transit pitches within the LP. What justification is there for relying on this provision to come forward through windfall development, for example can the Council provide evidence of the past delivery of such transit windfall developments to demonstrate that future provision is realistic?