



Local Plans and the National Planning Policy Framework

Compatibility Self Assessment Checklist – Planning policy for traveller sites

(May 2012)

Lewisham Planning Officers have completed this checklist as part of the Council's process in assessing whether the Local Plan is in accordance with the NPPF.

This checklist relates to the Planning policy for traveler sites Site Allocations DPD and should be read in conjunction with the checklists for the Core Strategy, Site Allocations Local Plan and Plan-making.

The CLG 'Planning policy for traveller sites' was published in 23 March 2012 and came into effect on 27 March 2012. Circular 01/06: Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and Circular 04/07: Planning for Travelling Showpeople have been cancelled. 'Planning policy for travellers sites' should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework, including the implementation policies of that document.

The government's aim in relation to planning for traveller sites is:

To ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic life of travellers which respecting the interests of the settled community'.

Government's aims in respect of traveller sites are:

- That local planning authorities (lpas) make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning
- That lpas work collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites
- Plan for sites over a reasonable timescale
- Plan-making should protect green Belt land from inappropriate development
- Promote more private traveller site provision whilst recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites
- Aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective.

In addition local planning authorities should:

- Include fair, realistic and inclusive policies
- Increase the number of traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply
- Reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan-making and decision-taking
- Enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure
- Have due regard to protection of local amenity and local environment

Planning Advisory Service
Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework: LPA Self Assessment

<p>Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development (para 6)</p>			
<p>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</p>	<p>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</p>	<p>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</p>	<p>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</p>
<p>Early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities.</p>	<p>Has your evidence been developed having undertaken early and effective engagement including discussing travellers accommodation needs with travellers themselves, their representative bodies and local support groups?</p>	<p>The 'London Boroughs' Gypsy and Traveler Accommodation Needs Assessment', published March 2008 (GTANA) provided the evidence base for need in Lewisham. This study involved extensive discussion with the traveler communities in London and their representative bodies. This evidence was subsequently updated with the 'Lewisham Gypsy and Travelers Future Needs Assessment', October 2011 (LGTFNA). This study also involved the local travel community.</p>	<p>The evidence base is considered relevant and up-to-date.</p> <p>No effect on overall strategy.</p> <p>See separate explanation for not including travelers site allocation in the Site Allocations DPD.</p>

Planning Advisory Service
Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework: LPA Self Assessment

<p>Co-operate with travellers, their representative bodies and local support groups, other local authorities and relevant interest groups to prepare and maintain an up-to-date understanding of likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of their areas.</p>	<p>1. Can you demonstrate that you have a clear understanding of the needs of the traveller community over the lifespan of your development plan? 2. Have you worked collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities? 3. Have you used a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of your local plan and make planning decisions?</p>	<p>1. The identification of Gypsy and Traveler (G&T) need is acknowledged as very difficult. However, the London Plan, EiP panel report concluded in relation to the GTANA that (par 3.121 'As far as we can see, it carefully followed extant Government advice and indeed addressed deficiencies found in earlier comparable studies... it is undoubtedly a substantial body of evidence to which weight should be given'.). 2. The GTANA was a collaboration of all London Boroughs except Bexley. 3. The GTANA and LGTFNA used robust evidence to establish accommodation need.</p>	<p>The evidence base is considered relevant and up-to-date.</p>
---	--	---	---

Policy B: Planning for traveller sites (paras 7-11)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects	Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p>Set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in your area, working collaboratively with neighbouring lpas (8)</p>	<p>Have you identified, and do you update annually, a supply of specific, deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against locally set targets? Have you identified a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10, and, where possible, for years 11-15. (9)</p>	<p>No. The Council did identify a site to meet the first 5 years of need but following public consultation this site was no longer considered suitable. There are currently no systems for annual update of sites.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Policy 2 sets out criteria for assessing sites.</p>	<p>See separate explanation for not including travelers site allocation in the DPD.</p>

Planning Advisory Service
Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework: LPA Self Assessment

<p>Consider the production of joint development plans that set targets on a cross-authority basis, to provide more flexibility in identifying sites.</p>	<p>Have you identified constraints within your local area which prevent you from allocating sufficient sites to meet likely future need? If so have you prepared a joint development plan or do you intend to do so? Is the reason for this clearly explained?</p>	<p>The GTANA was a collaborative exercise but there are no current proposals to update on a cross authority basis.</p>	<p>See separate explanation for not including travelers site allocation in the DPD.</p>
<p>Relate the number of pitches and plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population size and density.</p>		<p>These matters were considered in the original site search but the preferred site was not considered suitable following public consultation.</p>	
<p>Protect local amenity and environment.</p>		<p>Core Strategy Policy 2 includes these factors in the criteria.</p>	

Planning Advisory Service
Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework: LPA Self Assessment

<p>Set criteria to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need.</p>	<p>Has an up-to-date assessment of the need for traveller sites been carried out? If an unmet need has been demonstrated has a supply of specific, deliverable sites been identified based on the criteria you have set? Where there is no identified need, have criteria been included in case applications nevertheless come forward?</p>	<p>A site search was carried out to identify a site or sites to meet identified need. However, the chosen site is no longer considered suitable.</p>	
<p>Ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.</p>	<p>Have your policies been developed taking into account criteria a-h of para 11 of the policy</p>	<p>CSP 2 addresses most but not all of these issues. They will be taken into account in future site search work.</p>	

Planning Advisory Service
 Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework: LPA Self Assessment

<p>Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside (para 12)</p>			
<p>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</p>	<p>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</p>	<p>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</p>	<p>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</p>
<p>When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings lpas should ensure that the scale of such sites do not dominate the nearest settled community?</p>		<p>Lewisham is not a rural area and as such this paragraph does not apply.</p>	

<p>Policy D: Rural exception sites (para 13)</p>			
<p>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</p>	<p>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</p>	<p>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</p>	<p>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</p>
<p>If there is a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs, lpas in rural areas, where viable and practical, should consider allocating and releasing sites solely for affordable travellers sites.</p>	<p>If you have a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs in your rural area have you used a rural exception site policy, and if so, does it make it clear that such sites shall be used for affordable traveller sites in perpetuity?</p>	<p>Lewisham is not a rural area and as such this paragraph does not apply.</p>	

<p>Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt (paras 14-15)</p>			
<p>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</p>	<p>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</p>	<p>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</p>	<p>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</p>
<p>Traveller sites (both permanent and temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.</p>	<p>Have you made an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site? Has this alteration been done through the plan-making process and is it specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only</p>	<p>There are no green belt designations in Lewisham so this paragraph does not apply.</p>	

Planning Advisory Service
Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework: LPA Self Assessment

--	--	--	--

Planning Advisory Service
Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework: LPA Self Assessment

<p>Policy F: Mixed planning use traveller sites (paras 16-18)</p>			
<p>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</p>	<p>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</p>	<p>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</p>	<p>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</p>
	<p>Have you considered including travellers sites suitable for mixed residential and business use (having regard to safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents)? If mixed sites are not practicable have you considered the scope for identifying separate sites for residential and for business purposes in close proximity to one another? Have you had regard to the need that travelling showpeople have for mixed-use yards to allow residential accommodation and space for storage of equipment?</p>	<p>Yes, Core Strategy Policy 2 includes criteria for consideration of business uses as part of a mixed use site.</p>	

Planning Advisory Service
Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework: LPA Self Assessment

--	--	--	--

Planning Advisory Service
Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework: LPA Self Assessment

Policy G: Major development projects (para 19)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects	Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
	Do you have a major development proposal which requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site? If so has a site or sites suitable for the relocation of the community been identified (if the original site is authorised)?	Yes, the Lewisham Gateway redevelopment required the closure of the Thurston Road Travelers site. The occupants did not wish to be relocated in Lewisham.	See separate explanation for not including a travelers site allocation in the Site Allocations DPD.

Background to Lewisham search for a Gypsy & Traveller site

Brian Regan – Planning Policy Manager – 14th May 2012.

Introduction

This note sets out the reasons why a gypsy and traveller site or sites has not been included in the Submitted Site Allocations Development Plan Document. This is a complicated story which has evolved over a number of years. The process starts with the need for the replacement of the established legal site at Thurston Road as part of a Lewisham town centre redevelopment scheme known as the Lewisham Gateway development. The Planning policy guidance from Government and the Mayor of London have both changed over the time period of the site search leading to uncertainty about numbers of pitches to be provided and who was responsible for allocating them. The Lewisham preparation of its Development Plan Documents (DPD) and a search for a travellers site has overlapped but has also involved separate public consultation regarding the travellers site.

Thurston Road Travellers Site

In June 2004 the Mayor of Lewisham agreed to the selection of a developer for the Lewisham Gateway development. The Council joined a public sector land owning consortium with the London Development Agency taking the leading role to progress the redevelopment plans for Lewisham Town Centre.

The purpose of the Lewisham Gateway scheme is the redevelopment of a site around Lewisham Station including a new transport interchange, an extension to the existing shopping centre and additional residential and commercial developments. The redevelopment area is collectively known as Lewisham Gateway. This redevelopment was subsequently included as a strategic site allocation in the Lewisham Core Strategy, adopted June 2011.

Part of the land required for the Gateway development, on Thurston Road, was the Thurston Road Travellers site which therefore needed to be relocated to facilitate the Lewisham Gateway scheme. A project was initiated to identify a site to re-locate the travellers living on the Thurston Road site. This project was led by the Councils Director of Programme Management and Property.

Subsequently, a condition survey of the Thurston Road site was undertaken in November 2006. The report was highly critical of its condition and supported the view of the Council and the families living on the site that the existing facilities were no longer fit for purpose and should be relocated.

Prior to December 2006, two site searches were undertaken with a view to identifying a suitable replacement site. Neither of these two searches identified a suitable location that was both available and could be delivered within the required timescale.

In December 2006 CB Richard Ellis was commissioned to carry out a site search assessment to find suitable replacement sites to accommodate Travellers within the borough. In April 2007 the Mayor considered a report which set out the results of this search and agreed that consultation with Travellers and local residents should be carried out to determine views on the proposed use of two sites: the Laurence House Lorry Park in Catford or the site of the former Watergate School in Church Grove, Ladywell as the preferred replacement sites for Thurston Road.

In June 2007, Mayor and Cabinet noted the outcome of the consultation and approved the selection of the former Watergate School site in Church Grove as the preferred site. Following this decision, detailed design work continued and a planning application was submitted and in March 2008 the Council's Planning Committee approved an application for a new Traveller site on the Ex- Watergate School in Church Grove, Ladywell to replace the site at Thurston Road.

In June 2008 a local resident applied for permission for a Judicial Review of the decision of the Planning Committee. Permission was refused but the resident subsequently requested an oral hearing to enable reconsideration of the application. The hearing was held in November 2008. At the oral hearing residents were refused leave to appeal. However, towards the end of 2008 the travellers living on Thurston Road expressed concerns about moving to a new site on Church Grove and asked the Council if it would consider terms for the surrender of their licences. The travellers, with independent legal representation, agreed terms and vacated Thurston Road in February 2009. Although, the Church Grove site had planning permission for a Gypsy and Traveller site, the infrastructure was not in place to accommodate caravans or touring homes as the plans for the site were put on hold once agreement had been reached with the travellers. As Judicial Review proceedings had begun to challenge the validity of the planning permission, the three year period for the implementation of the permission is extended by one year and the planning permission therefore lapsed in April 2012, rather than April 2011.

London Boroughs' Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA)

In March 2008, the London Boroughs' Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA) was published by Fordham Research. This report was commissioned by the Greater London Authority on behalf of London Boroughs. It was designed to respond to the requirement placed on local authorities under the Housing Act 2004 to complete an accommodation assessment and, once complete, to consider how to meet Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs identified in the assessment as part of their housing and planning requirements.

In Lewisham, the assessment identified 5 residential pitches (equating to the 5 pitches proposed on the ex-Watergate School site) and assessed a minimum need for an additional 4 pitches by 2012. However, the assessment

stated that if the needs of traveller families living in standard family housing but having a “psychological aversion to bricks and mortar accommodation” were taken into account then the minimum need would be 17 units by 2012 with an additional further 9 required by 2017.

London Plan

In October 2009, as part of the Draft Replacement London Plan, the Mayor of London included a target for London Boroughs to provide 538 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers in London over the period of the replacement plan (2007-2025). This allocation was based on the GTANA evidence and allocated to the individual London Boroughs. The distribution proposed in the allocation process would have created the requirement for Lewisham to provide an additional 15 pitches. Policy 3.9 (b and C) of the Draft Replacement London Plan specifically required Boroughs to create additional pitches and protect existing sites. As part of the GTANA Lewisham had declared five existing pitches at Thurston Road for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.

In March 2010, in response to consultation, the Mayor of London agreed to reduce the overall target for new pitches to the minimum required by the GTANA to 240. This target removed that part of the need which related to the need due to ‘a psychological aversion to bricks and mortar accommodation’. This new target was again distributed amongst the London Boroughs and placed a requirement on Lewisham to provide 8 pitches.

In July 2010 the Coalition Government announced that regional spatial strategies were to be abolished but the Mayor of London remains responsible for Regional Planning in London under the GLA Acts 1999-2007.

In response to the Secretary of State’s statement to the London Plan Examination in Public (EIP) on 9th July 2010, that the Mayor need not include targets on a particular matter in the London Plan unless he and other London stakeholders wished, the Mayor put forward a minor alteration to the Draft Replacement London Plan. The alteration proposed that reference to target pitch provision for Gypsies and Travellers be removed. The EIP Panel reported in March 2011.

In the March 2011 Report, the Panel rejected the aforementioned minor alteration and reverted back to the March 2010 position of setting specific minimum site targets for the sub-regions (increased from 238 in March 2010 to 268) and the Boroughs over the next 10 years. The target for Lewisham was set at 9 pitches. However, the Mayor of London did not accept this recommendation and the published replacement London Plan (July 2011) does not set targets for the provision of pitches. Instead, Policy 3.8 states that local planning authorities should address the accommodation requirements and pitch provision of Gypsy and Travellers locally through their DPDs. The targets for pitch provision are to be based on robust evidence of local need

which is to be tested through the process of consultation on, and public examination of local plans.

Government Advice

In August 2010 the Government announced that it intends to revoke its two planning circulars (circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007) relating to the provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers and, replace them with light-touch guidance setting out Councils' statutory obligations to include sites for Gypsies and Travellers in their DPD.

On 13 April 2011, the Government published a consultation document 'Planning for travellers sites', which proposes a new, single Planning Policy Statement for traveller sites. The consultation period ended on the 3 August 2011. The document consulted on, among other matters: whether Boroughs should make their own assessment of need and use this evidence to assess their own targets for pitch/plot provision; whether Boroughs should provide a five-year supply of land; and under transitional arrangements, whether six months is the right time Boroughs should be given to put in place their five-year supply before the consequences of having not done so come into force. The final advice 'Planning Policy for Travellers Sites' was published on 23rd March 2012 and came into effect on 27th March 2012 the same day as the new National Planning Policy Framework was published.

Lewisham LDF and the search for a Travellers Site

Lewisham started the production of its Local Development Framework in 2005, the adopted LDS (May 2005) shows an extensive programme of DPD and SPD was proposed. This included production of the following DPD: a Core Strategy, Development Policies and Site Allocations, Catford town centre AAP and Lewisham town centre AAP. At that time the policy and site allocation for travellers was to be dealt with in the combined Development Management and Site Allocations DPD (DM&SA).

At Issues and Options stage for the DM&SA DPD (consultation October/November 2005) a criteria-based policy for assessing new Gypsy and Traveller sites was proposed as the most appropriate option. At this time the London Boroughs' Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA), discussed above, was being undertaken by the GLA on behalf of the London Boroughs however, as it was not yet complete, the Council could not include a target for pitch provision and therefore no site was put forward to be allocated for use by Gypsies and Travellers. Nine responses were received in support of a criteria-based policy and no objections were received.

At Preferred Options stage for the DM&SA DPD (consultation June-August 2007), as the GTANA was not complete, a draft criteria based policy was put forward. The existing site at Thurston Road was acknowledged and no additional / alternative sites were put forward as allocations.

Three representations were received in relation to the criteria-based policy at Preferred Options stage. The GLA commented that as the GTANA was not yet complete, it was not possible for the Council to include a borough target. The Government Office for London objected to the reference to the Council's operation of the site at Thurston Road as it had not been assessed or allocated. The Creekside Forum supported the policy.

By 2007 it had become clear that the Lewisham LDS programme was too ambitious and following advice from the then Government Office for London it was decided to prioritise the production of the Core Strategy and put the other DPD on hold. A new timetable and revised LDS was produced and adopted in April 2008 and following advice the opportunity was taken to split the Development Management and Site Allocations into two separate DPD. Having made substantial progress on the production of the Core Strategy work started again on the Site Allocations DPD in 2010.

As there had been a delay of 2-3 years in producing the Site Allocations DPD a Further Options stage was introduced. Consultation on the Further Options was undertaken during October – December 2010. As this followed the completion of the GTANA (in March 2008) the decision was made to include a traveller site allocation in the Further Options report. As the Mayor of Lewisham had consulted separately on alternative sites and the Church Grove site had been adopted by the Mayor as his preferred travellers site it was introduced as a site allocation providing a suitable alternative to the now closed Thurston Road site.

Four representations were received in relation to the allocation of the Church Grove site. Thames Water commented that they had no concerns regarding Water Supply or Waste Water capabilities. Officers have noted these comments. The Environment Agency (EA) commented that the site is located adjacent to the River Ravensbourne which at this point is a concrete channel. There is a future scheme that would possibly involve wall raising at this location therefore the EA would like provision of an access to the river channel. Officers recommend including text to this effect in the Proposed Submission version of the document. Ladywell Society commented that the buildings on the site have been demolished and officers recommend the document is amended to reflect this. The GLA noted that one new gypsy and traveller site was proposed (Church Grove) to replace the former site (Thurston Road).

As discussed above, there was uncertainty as to whether a target for pitch provision would be included in the replacement London Plan and therefore uncertainty regarding the number of pitches to be provided by the Council. On 1 December 2010 Mayor & Cabinet agreed to instruct officers to undertake further work, including a Lewisham Housing Needs Survey for Gypsies and Travellers and bring a further report back to Mayor & Cabinet proposing a consultation process for a proposed Gypsy and Traveller site or sites in the borough.

Work continued on the preparation of the proposed submission Site Allocation DPD but as a result of this decision it was decided to hold up submission of the DPD until the further work the Mayor of Lewisham had requested was undertaken and there was clarity about which travellers site or sites were to be allocated.

Site Requirements and Site Search:

In summary, the corporate officers group was re-established again under the chairmanship of the Director of Programme Management and Property and including representatives from the Legal, Planning and Housing services. This group compiled a long list of potential sites drawn from the following sources:

- The 2007 site search to find a site to relocate the Travellers who were then living on Thurston Road.
- The Site Allocations Further Options Report
- Sites contributing to Housing Trajectory targets
- The Council's surplus property list
- The London database of vacant sites.

The above sources resulted in a long list of 41 sites across the borough. From this a shorter list, using objective criteria which reflect the potential needs of Gypsy and Traveller sites, was compiled that could be used for further consideration.

The criteria from the Core Strategy policy on Travellers was developed and applied to the long list of sites in order to arrive at a shorter list for further consideration. The following criteria were used for the selection of a suitable site for Gypsies and Travellers:

- Suitability – within 800m of primary school, GP and food shop
- Planning Constraints – site must not be on designated open space or nature reserve or employment land etc
- Availability – deliverable within a reasonable timescale
- Site allocated for an Alternative corporate use

Using these criteria a shortlist of 7 sites from the original long list of 41 was Produced. These were:

- Laurence House Lorry Park, Canadian Avenue, SE6
- Church Grove (Former Water Gate School), Ladywell SE13
- Site of Former Greenvale School, Perry Rise Forest Hill SE23
- Catford Dog track and Adenmore Road Sites, Catford SE6
- Ladywell Leisure Centre Site, Lewisham SE13
- Giffin Street Site (R/O Old Tidemill Primary School) Deptford SE8
- Deptford Green School (Upper School) Amersham Vale Deptford SE8

The report to Mayor and Cabinet 5th October 2011 set out the details of the appraisal of each of the shortlisted sites. Officers scored each of the 7 sites

against these criteria on 1 - 5 point un-weighted scale with 5 being the best match and 1 being the worst. The Church Grove site scored highest and officers recommended that it should be the preferred site.

The Mayor agree to consult on the Church Grove site as the preferred Gypsy and Traveller site to accommodate the current need identified in the Lewisham Gypsy and Traveller Future Needs Assessment and ask officers to report the outcome of this consultation in 2012.

Extensive consultation was undertaken in December 2011 and the results reported to Mayor and Cabinet on 15th February 2012. The report concludes by recommending that, based on the outcome of the consultation and an independent Technical Report on Access, the proposals for redevelopment of the Church Grove site to meet the current accommodation needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community in the borough be discontinued and a new site search begun. The independent technical report on traffic access had concluded that the access road was not wide enough to take travellers caravans.

Further Work after Mayors decision in February 2012

Further to the recommendations agreed by the Mayor at the February 2012 meeting, officers are undertaking a fundamental review of the approach to indentifying a site or sites to be developed to meet the current accommodation needs of the Gypsy and Traveller population in the borough. This involves a re-appraisal of the criteria previously used and a new site search that will take into account both Council sites and those outside of Council ownership.

As a start to this work, in April 2012, officers met with a cross section of the borough's Gypsy and Traveller community in an attempt to identify the issues which need to be considered in compiling a set of criteria to be used for site selection. Following this a brief is now been developed to appoint a consultant to carry out an in-depth site search. Initial findings on the potential sites will be reported back to the Mayor in September 2012 for consultations to begin on the shortlisted sites shortly thereafter.

Conclusions

The Council has undertaken a great deal of work to try and identify and allocate a travellers site in the borough. This has involved both independent consultants and the Councils Corporate Group identifying long lists of potential sites filtering to shorter lists and extensive consultation on preferred sites.

The planning service had intended to incorporate the results of this work in the Site Allocation DPD. The decision was made to hold up the publication of the Proposed Submission DPD to await the results of the latest consultation. However, as a result of the consultation and new evidence on access the

Mayor has decided not to proceed with the allocation of the Church Grove site.

As the Site Allocations DPD includes a large number of other site allocations and identifies and safeguards sites that are needed to help implement the Core Strategy it has been decided to submit the DPD without the inclusion of the travellers site.

Attention is drawn to the Mayors decision that he has instructed officers to undertake a further site search to identify a suitable Traveller site or sites and report the options to Mayor & Cabinet in due course. The Corporate officers group mentioned above will undertake this work and progress so far is discussed above.

It is always a difficult and contentious process to identify and implement a travellers site. Lewisham is no exception but it is hoped that the explanation shows the Council has made efforts over a number of years and will continue to do so in the future. Further delay in submitting the site allocations DPD was not considered reasonable.
