



**AYLESBURY VALE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**POSITION STATEMENT**

**GYPSIES & TRAVELLERS & TRAVELLING**

**SHOWPEOPLE**

**(July 2012  
Update)**

**AYLESBURY VALE DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING POLICY POSITION STATEMENT :  
PROVIDING FOR GYPSIES & TRAVELLERS & TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE**

**(July 2012 update)**

***PURPOSE OF THE POSITION STATEMENT***

1. Aylesbury Vale District Council is currently having to deal with issues relating to Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show People (G&T/SP) in something of a policy vacuum. Even with the publication of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (DCLG, March 2012), the policy framework is confusing and uncertain given the government's confirmed intention to remove the South East Plan (SEP), the `abandonment' of the SEP Partial Review for G&T/SP, and the withdrawal of our Core Strategy which included a policy for G&T/SP.
2. This position statement sets out the background to where we are and how we got here, highlights the difficulties currently being experienced, and outlines an interim approach to dealing with G&T/SP issues prior to these being dealt with through new policies in the emerging development plan for the district – the Vale of Aylesbury Plan (VAP).
3. In terms of complying with new national policies published in March 2012<sup>1</sup> our intention is to:
  - Produce a needs assessment (as required,) jointly with the other Buckinghamshire local authorities and which will take into account cross-authority issues. The authorities are in the middle of commissioning a new Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, to be completed later in 2012.
  - If the updated needs assessment identifies a requirement to allocate new sites then it is intended to manage this through the VAP or future site allocations documents.
4. Note this updated Position Statement is consistent with the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and the National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG 2012). This update in March 2012 also takes into account recent appeal decisions in the district including that at Causter Farm, Nash<sup>2</sup> (10/00680/APP dated 03.11.2011).

***CURRENT ISSUES***

5. The District has come under considerable pressure over the last few years to provide new sites in particular for G&T/SP. Some of this pressure has arisen because of the SEP process within which potentially high numbers have consistently been identified for AVDC<sup>3</sup>. Illegal sites have been coming forward effectively `jumping the gun' in anticipation of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)/Local Development Framework (LDF) process being completed. Many of these sites have been granted temporary permissions pending completion of the RSS/LDF process. See Appendix 1 for list of current sites.

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG, March 2012

<sup>2</sup> Land opposite Causter Farm, Nash Road, Great Horwood, Buckinghamshire MK17 0EJ, November 2011

<sup>3</sup> For further explanation about the South East Plan process and AVDC objections, see Appendix 4

6. In March 2012 the national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites was published. However because the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (AVDLP) policies for G&T/SP were not saved (because of emerging SEP policies and Circular 01/2006 on Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites,) there is now a lack of local policy against which proposals can be judged.
7. The current programme for VAP means we will not have an adopted policy framework in place until February 2014. In the meantime we have a number of temporary permissions which will be seeking either renewals or the granting of permanent permissions, local parishes asking what our approach will be to any such applications, new sites being processed and there is the constant threat of new sites being occupied.

### ***INTERIM WAY FORWARD***

#### ***Criteria based approach***

8. A criteria based framework (see Appendix 2) is proposed to deal with current and short term issues. This is based on the original AVDLP policy (as updated in the old Core Strategy policy) and which is consistent with the NPPF and the national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, and the 'localism' agenda.
9. The rationale is:
  - i) AVDLP policies GP14 and GP15 were not saved because they were superseded by SEP and Circular 01/2006. With the imminent revocation of the SEP there is a potential policy gap which needs to be reviewed once the SEP has been removed.
  - ii) Policy CS14 in the withdrawn Core Strategy provides the most up-to-date locally-based policy and the criteria set out in that policy can be used as a framework for guiding development management decisions on an interim basis. Although CS14 has not been formally adopted for development control purposes, the criteria it outlines have been referred to in Development Management decisions and it has not been disputed in recent appeal decisions where earlier versions of this Position Statement have been relied upon. The criteria, which have been reviewed and updated to ensure consistency with the NPPF and the national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, are set out in Appendix 2 of this Position Statement. These criteria will continue to be used in planning decisions, alongside the guidance in the NPPF and the national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

The criteria have also been updated to reflect feedback from implementing this policy so far and decisions at appeals.

#### ***Needs Assessment***

10. The appeal decision at Nash includes some significant points in assessing need in the District in the absence of an up-to-date assessment by the Council:
  - The decision allows temporary permissions to be taken into account in assessing existing capacity; and
  - The Inspector in reaching a decision was mindful of the shortcomings of the South East Plan needs assessment process and therefore calculated a starting point for the District of 62 pitches.
11. Including the site at Haddenham, the current and anticipated provision is then 68 pitches.

12. The Nash appeal decision also accepts a calculation by the appellants about allowing for natural growth in the G&T population. In that appeal the appellants estimated it to be a further 17 pitches between 2011 and 2016. The Council believes a more realistic allowance for growth is 17% because this was what DCLG recommended, was used by other LAs, and was the figure recommended by the independent auditors for the SEP<sup>4</sup>.
13. A 15.9% growth rate was taken into account in the identified requirement of 39 put forward for the SEP<sup>5</sup>. To increase this to a 17% growth rate is a difference of less than half a pitch. However the 17% growth rate needs to be applied to the additional requirement (62 – 39 = 23 additional) established through the appeal process. Adding 17% to the additional portion takes the identified requirement figure to 66 (62 + 4) for the period to 2016.
14. To summarise therefore, the identified current requirement is calculated at 66, and current provision is 68, for the period to 2016. It is important to note that this calculation includes all the current temporary permissions, and extant permissions where there is a current application under consideration. If any of the temporary permissions were to expire during the period to 2016 and were not renewed then there would be need to re-provide that capacity elsewhere within the district. It is intended to address this through preparation of the VAP or a Site Allocations development plan document following adoption of the VAP.
15. Within the district there are currently 62 pitches (see Appendix 1) which either have temporary or full permissions, or extant permission with an application under consideration. Additionally the Council believes the capacity at the Council site in Haddenham (6 pitches) will be delivered within the next five years so should be taken into account in future provision up to 2016.

	<b>Existing (51 +11 = 62)</b>	<b>Anticipated at Haddenham (6)</b>
Identified requirement to 2016 (62 + 4 = 66)	adequate supply	Adequate and up to date supply to meet requirements

16. **Therefore currently there is an adequate and up to date supply of deliverable sites in the district. This will be a material consideration when applying the above requirements to assessing specific proposals.**
17. The updated criteria, as set out above, will be used on an interim basis to guide decisions on any applications on new sites, or applications on sites currently with temporary permissions. In addition, to assist in implementing the Criteria through the development management process, a checklist is appended which provides detailed guidance on how the Criteria should be applied (see Development Management Framework set out in Appendix 3) alongside the criteria in the NPPF and the national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

<sup>4</sup> Question 6 of The Benchmarking of the ACTVaR Study 'Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment for the Thames Valley Region,

[http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100908090945/http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan/consultation/g\\_and\\_t/local\\_authority\\_advice/bucks/benchmarking.pdf](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100908090945/http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan/consultation/g_and_t/local_authority_advice/bucks/benchmarking.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> SEERA revised table H7, submitted to Examination January 2010

## **CONCLUSION**

18. That the updated criteria set out in Appendix 2 be used on an interim basis, alongside the NPPF and the national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, to guide decision making on issues relating to proposals for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. In implementing this updated criteria regard will be had to the most up to date assessment of need as set out above and to the Development Management Framework set out in Appendix 3.

## Appendix 1

### Current Status of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites within Aylesbury Vale, July 2012.

Site	Type	Number of pitches (authorised) as in Tribal report	Number of pitches authorised subsequent to Tribal report	Total number of authorised pitches	Planning application number	Planning decision	Comments	Source of information
<b>Gypsy and traveller sites:</b>								
Cublington Road, Wing	LA	0	0	0	CC/18/07; 07/0164 8/ACC	Approved 09/08/2007	2007 decision related to remodelling of site to form 8 residential plots (one more than the 7 at the time of the Tribal report). Owned/managed by Bucks CC. Site currently unoccupied. 2011 Decision taken by BCC not to allocate funds for redevelopment, hence number of pitches counted here as 0 until further information known. 8 June 2012 decision by BCC not to commit any further finance to develop the site and to declare the land surplus.	CLG/Tribal report/See ra count
Baghill Lane, Haddenham	LA	6		6			Owned/managed by Bucks CC. discussions underway about bringing site back into use.	Tribal report
Great Horwood Road, Nash	Private	2		2	90/0082 6/APP	Appeal allowed 11/09/1991	Personal permission	Tribal report/See ra count
Cow Lane, Edlesborough	Private	3		3	91/0075 5/APP	Appeal allowed 18/09/1992	Personal permission	Tribal report/See ra count
New Road, Weston Turville	Private	1	1	2	93/0204 0/APP & 10/0255 6/APP	Approved 12/05/94 & 14/02/2011	Personal; 1994 permission was temporary but converted to permanent after appeal. 2011 permission for a further mobile home on the same site.	Tribal report/See ra count/Uniform
Willows Park (Green Acres), Horton Road, Slapton	Private	5	3	8	06/0065 9/APP and 10/0093 5/APP	Approved 03/01/2007	Extension from 5 to 8 pitches. Permission granted 16/08/2010 for turning facilities, replacement stable/storage building, and facilities for visitors (no more than 2 visitors caravan spaces for no more than 28 days occupation)	Tribal report/See ra count
Little Acre, Broughton Lane, Weston Turville	Private	1		1		Appeal allowed 1999	Personal permission	Tribal report/See ra count
Romany Tan, Wing Road, Cublington	Private	2		2	99/0161 2/APP	Appeal allowed 08/12/2000	Personal condition removed by 05/02297/APP	Tribal report/See ra count
Marroway, Weston Turville	Private	7		7	02/0084 3/APP and	Appeal allowed 16/01/2004		Tribal report/See ra count

					others				
Dun Roaming Park, Whitfield Road, Biddlesden	Private		7	3	10	06/00699/APP	Approved 03/08/2006	Increase from 7 to 10 pitches.	Tribal report/See ra count
Land adjacent Dun Roaming Park, Whitfield Road, Biddlesden	Private					07/01570/APP	Refused & appeal dismissed 16/12/2008	Extension to provide 5 additional plots	Uniform
Land adjacent Dun Roaming Park, Whitfield Road, Biddlesden	Private			8	8	09/00635/APP	Application refused 29/10/2009. Also enforcement notice issued. Appeal against enforcement notice - public inquiry 5 & 6 Jan & 12 Feb 2010. Appeal allowed 11/03/2010.	Change of use of land to gypsy caravan site to provide 8 caravan pitches. Land to east side of existing site. Temporary permission until 11/03/2013.	Uniform
Land Adjacent To Dun Roaming Park, Whitfield Road, Biddlesden	Private					10/01639/APP	Refused 16/12/2010. Appeal dismissed 16/09/2011	Stationing of one mobile home and touring caravan for traveller family	Uniform
Land Adjacent To Dun Roaming Park, Whitfield Road, Biddlesden	Private	n/a	2	2		11/02168/APP	Permission approved at DC 05.04.2012 for limited period ending on 11 March 2013	Change of use of land for extension of traveller site for touring caravans, No.2 mobile and No.2 day rooms (2 pitches). Temporary permission until 2013	Uniform
Burrows Field, Radclive Road, Gawcott	Private			16	16	04/01001/APP & 10/00898/APP	Appeal allowed 30/11/06. Continued use approved 14/10/2010. Application for continued use of land as gypsy caravan site submitted 08/11/2011 (11/02416/APP)	Recorded in Tribal report as 16 unauthorised pitches. Temporary permission until 11/03/2013; personal.	Tribal report/See ra count/Uniform
Rear of plot 2, Radclive Road, Gawcott (Oakhaven Park)	Private					09/01387/APP	Application submitted 29/07/09. Application withdrawn 03/09/2010.	Variation of condition for No.2 additional plots at rear of Plot2 until 30th June 2010	Uniform
Plot 17, Burrows Field, Radclive Road, Gawcott	Private			1	1	07/00983/APP & 10/00898/APP	Approved 08/11/2007. Continued use approved 14/10/2010.	Temporary permission until 11/03/2013; personal.	Uniform

Plot 18, Burrows Field, Radcliffe Road, Gawcott	Private		1	1	08/0078 2/APP & 10/0089 8/APP	Approved 08/05/2008. Continued use approved 14/10/2010.	Temporary permission until 11/03/2013; personal.	Uniform
Plots 19 (A and B), Burrows Field, Radcliffe Road, Gawcott	Private		2	2	08/0079 5/APP & 10/0089 8/APP	Approved 08/05/2008. Continued use approved 14/10/2010.	Temporary permission until 11/03/2013; personal.	Uniform
Oakhaven Park Radcliffe Road Gawcott Buckinghamshire	Private				11/0241 6/APP	Approved 05.04.2012	Continued use of land as a gypsy caravan site and retention of all buildings (including day rooms and stables) and roadway, walls, fences, gates, hardstanding and services. Now permanent permission.	Uniform
Land adjacent New Park Farm, Boarstall, Arncott (Oaksview Park)	Private		13	13	07/0007 0/APP & 07/0088 9/APP	Appeal allowed 08/05/2009	Recorded in Tribal report as 19 unauthorised pitches. Personal permissions relating to 13 pitches; temporary until 08/05/2012	Tribal report/See ra count/Uniform
Land at Swan Edge, Aylesbury Road, Wendover (plot 1)	Private				09/0021 4/APP	Approved subject to S106 at DC 08/10/2009	2 caravans unlawfully on site	Uniform
Land at Swan Edge, Aylesbury Road, Wendover (plot 2)	Private				09/0021 5/APP	Approved subject to S106 at DC 08/10/2009	1 caravan unlawfully on site	Uniform
Land opposite Causter Farm, Nash Road, Great Horwood	Private		11	11	10/0068 0/APP & 11/0018 1/APP	Application submitted 07/04/2010; application refused 04/11/2010; appeal lodged 17/03/2011. Enforcement notice issued (10/00155/C ON2); appeal lodged. Further application submitted 07/02/2011; refused 22/09/2011. Appeals allowed 03/11/2011, temporary planning permission granted.	Temporary permission until 03/11/2015	Uniform / appeal decision
<b>Total for gypsy and traveller sites</b>		34	59	93				
<b>Travelling</b>								

<b>showpeople sites:</b>								
Fairview, Fenny Road, Stoke Hammond	Private	3		3	02/0237 8/APP	Approved 25/10/2002	Recorded in Tribal report as 3 households. Personal permission; temporary until 31/10/2004; subsequent application for renewal was invalid	Tribal Showpeople report/See ra count

## Appendix 2

### UPDATED CRITERIA : Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

The following criteria will be used to assess planning applications and any future allocations for proposals for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in advance of adoption of the Vale of Aylesbury Plan. Proposals should:

- a) *Be justified in terms of meeting identified needs established in an up-to-date assessment;*
- b) *Be to meet the needs of those people with an existing significant and long-standing family, educational or employment connection to that area;*
- c) *Be at a sustainable location in or near existing settlements with access to local services, including shops, schools and healthcare;*
- d) *Be well located on the highway network, with safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access including public transport;*
- e) *Not be detrimental to the amenities of adjacent occupiers;*
- f) *Not have a significant adverse impact on environmental assets such as landscape, historic environment, biodiversity, waterways, open space and green infrastructure;*
- g) *Be large enough to provide for adequate on site facilities for parking, storage, play and residential amenity;*
- h) *Be large enough for appropriate landscaping to minimise any visual impacts of the development;*
- i) *Provide adequate levels of privacy and residential amenity for occupiers; and*
- j) *Not result in a concentration of such uses in a local area.*

## Appendix 3

### Development Management Framework for considering proposals for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

The following table brings together the various statements of policy at both local and national level and sets out a checklist of factors which development management case officers should take into consideration when assessing individual proposals against policy.

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Policy/Criterion 'hook' + cross-reference</b>	<b>Indicators of an appropriate proposal/checklist of questions to pose</b>	<b>Commentary/rationale</b>
	<b>Status</b>			
1.	Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (G&T/SP)	National Housing Act 2004; National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012	In order to have proposal assessed under the planning framework for Gypsies and Travellers or Travelling Showpeople, the status of the applicants should be in accordance with the definition of those groups in national policy (see Definitions section below).  Contacts Buckinghamshire County Council to check if applicants are known to them.  Check family history.	Definition set out in national legislation so local authority must comply with that. However, the local planning authority will make checks to ensure that the applicants do comply with G&T/SPS status otherwise they cannot be subject to the special planning rules which apply through national planning policy.
	<b>Local Need</b>			
2.	Accommodation proposed is to meet the needs of those people with an existing significant and long standing family, educational or employment connection to those areas.	Updated Criteria; National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012	Is there a proven need for G&T/SP within the area (ie within or adjoining the relevant parish)?  Is the individual or group already resident or working in the area?  Are children currently at school in the area?  Are there particular health needs of the travelling residents which need to be met in the locality?	Indicators reflect policy rationale in AVDC position statement and National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Policy/Criterion 'hook' + cross-reference</b>	<b>Indicators of an appropriate proposal/checklist of questions to pose</b>	<b>Commentary/rationale</b>
	<b>Location</b>			
3.	Location relative to an existing settlement	Updated Criteria; National Planning Policy Framework 2012; Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012	Distance between site and nearest settlement.  Is the site within reasonable walking distance of an existing settlement? (1 mile)	In order to maximise the possibilities for social inclusion and sustainable patterns of living by being located close to essential facilities and service.  N.B. Need to balance this criterion with the need to avoid detrimental impacts on adjacent occupiers.
4.	Impact on local services	Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012 (para 11)	Are sites placing an undue pressure on local infrastructure?  Assess the capacity of local services in the area of the site. Where the development would create a need to provide additional or improved infrastructure, amenities or facilities or would exacerbate an existing deficiency in their provision, seek appropriate contributions which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport</li> <li>• School</li> <li>• Open Space</li> <li>• Community Facilities</li> <li>• Police</li> </ul>	The relevant public authorities have a duty to provide sufficient schools and health services for their area (Education Act 1996: National Health Service Act 2006).  Where service providers indicate that capacity is inadequate, or that deficiencies in capacity will be exacerbated as a result of development, developer contributions may be sought. To assess this, regard will be had to the potential number of residents on that pitch/plot.
5.	Impact on public utilities	Circular 03/1999 (Planning Requirement in respect of the use of non-mains Sewerage incorporating Septic	Ensure that developments will be served by adequate infrastructure capacity in terms of utilities.  To include:	There is a statutory duty on utilities companies to provide water and electricity to service developments.  Sewerage/waste water provision to be

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Policy/Criterion 'hook' + cross-reference</b>	<b>Indicators of an appropriate proposal/checklist of questions to pose</b>	<b>Commentary/rationale</b>
		Tanks in New Development)  Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012 (para 11, criteria f)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewerage or other appropriate foul drainage/waste water facilities, including non-mains sewerage and sewage disposal where appropriate</li> <li>• Roads – safety and access</li> <li>• Drainage</li> <li>• Electricity</li> <li>• Water supply</li> </ul>	<p>assessed against the principles in Circular 03/1999.</p> <p>See Chapter 5 of the CLG Good Practice Guide 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites' for detailed requirements.</p> <p>Highway access arrangements to be assessed.</p>
6.	Relationship to number of houses/development locally	Updated Criteria  National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012 (para 12, 13 & 23)	<p>What is the percentage of pitch/plot numbers compared with conventional dwellings? Can it be judged to be disproportionate and/or over-dominant? An assessment of this should include the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of site (in area) relative to size of settlement.</li> <li>• Speed of change – number of pitches/plots which have been developed over the past 5 years (see Consolidated Site List)</li> <li>• Number of G&amp;T/SP pitches/plots granted via retrospective planning permissions over the past ten years (see Site List).</li> <li>• Number of pitches/plots permitted in locations where conventional development would be contrary to normal planning policies.</li> <li>• Also see issues 7- 9 below</li> </ul>	Judgement required in each case as to whether the combination of answers to these questions leads to the conclusion that the site is disproportionate or over-dominant compared to the scale of the existing settlement.
	<b>Pattern of development</b>			
7.	Visual impact including landscape	Updated Criteria; National Planning Policy Framework 2012; Planning Policy for	Density  No breaks	

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Policy/Criterion 'hook' + cross-reference</b>	<b>Indicators of an appropriate proposal/checklist of questions to pose</b>	<b>Commentary/rationale</b>
		Traveller Sites 2012 (para 15, 23 & 24)	Ability to screen  Refer to AVDC's Landscape Character Assessment and Areas of Sensitive Landscape studies	
	<b>Sustainability</b>			
8.	Transport/environmental issues	Updated Criteria; National Planning Policy Framework 2012; Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012 (para 11,	Will the site provide a settled base that reduces the need for long-distance travelling and possible environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment?  Is the site located in an area at high risk of flooding, including the functional flood plain?	
9.	Social cohesion	Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012 (para 4, 11, 24)	Ability of the site to promote the peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.  Access to schools, churches and other community facilities.	Availability of opportunities to become involved in community activities.
	<b>Proximity</b>			
10.	Direct impact on neighbours	Updated Criteria; Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012 (para 11 & 26)	Any evidence/likelihood of the following issues arising as a result of the G&T/TS site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overshadowing</li> <li>• Overbearing impact</li> <li>• Overlooking</li> <li>• Light and noise pollution</li> <li>• Noise and disturbance</li> </ul>	
	<b>Good Site Layout and Design</b>			
11.	Site Design and Management	CLG Good Practice Guide 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites;	Is site designed for safer communities and to reduce the fear of crime?	Good layout can improve amenity levels for occupiers, e.g. privacy levels, access to play space.

	Issue	Policy/Criterion 'hook' + cross-reference	Indicators of an appropriate proposal/checklist of questions to pose	Commentary/rationale
		CLG Good Practice and Travellers Site Management'; National Planning Policy Framework 2012; Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012 (para 11)	<p>Are the proposals of high quality design?</p> <p>Is an appropriate level of open space provided on-site?</p> <p>If site is privately run, no direct means of the LA to control site management through the planning system – however, applicants should be pointed to the CLG Good Practice Guide on Gypsy and Travellers Site Management.</p>	<p>Definition of private and shared space can reduce potential conflict.</p> <p>Good layout of access, circulation and parking space to provide good access, minimise manoeuvring etc.</p>

## Definitions<sup>6</sup>

### ***Gypsy and Traveller status:***

Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.

### ***Travelling Showpeople status:***

Members of an organised group for the purposes of holding fairs, circuses or shows (whether or not travelling together as such). This includes such persons who on the grounds of their own or their family's or dependants' more localised pattern of trading, educational or health needs or old age, have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently but excludes Gypsies and Travellers [as defined above].

---

<sup>6</sup> As defined in National Planning Policy Framework 2012; Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012

## Appendix 4

### BACKGROUND TO THE CALCULATION OF NEED THROUGH THE REGIONAL PLANNING PROCESS

#### *SEP G&T/SP Partial Review Examination in Public*

The single issue partial review of SEP was required to identify a pitch allocation for G&T/SP for each district up to 2016. An Examination in Public was held in February 2010. The author of the South East Plan, the South East of England Regional Assembly (SEERA), sought AVDC's opinion on the early part of this process, as part of a wider process within our sub-region led by Buckinghamshire County Council as the principal authority with needs studies undertaken by consultants 'Tribal'.

A paper presented to the 9<sup>th</sup> October 2007 AVDC Cabinet meeting sets out this in greater detail – please see

<http://committees.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/committees/SitePortalPage.aspx?siteid=2&archives=1&committeeid=6&meetingid=161>

SEERA identified four options for consultation for each district:

- Option A – addressing need where it arises
- Option B – a local redistribution within the advice group area (i.e. in Aylesbury Vale District's case this would be Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes)
- Option C – a 25% regional redistribution between advice group areas (i.e. in Aylesbury Vale's case, Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes). Under this option 75% of local need is retained locally, and 25% reapportioned regionally.
- Option D – a 50% regional redistribution between advice group areas (i.e. in Aylesbury Vale's case, Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes). Under this option 50% of local need is retained locally, and 50% reapportioned regionally.

Option C and D attempt to take account of large constraints which may occur (i.e. protected landscapes, flooding issues etc.), and also to take account of the population across the region forecasted to 2016, on the rationale that users of pitches will need to access local facilities and that these are more easily attainable in areas of higher population. The only difference between these two options is the level of redistribution allocated. In our case this means that we 'receive' additional pitches from other parts of the region, inflating our overall potential pitch requirement.

Through the consultation process SEERA promoted Option D.

#### **AVDC Objections**

For AVDC, the number of G&T pitches between the options varied from 33 to 52. We argued in favour of Options A & B, which had the least numbers, and against C & D on the basis:

- It is wrong to assume that pitch provision can be made up where apparent low levels of protected landscapes exist. This would seem rather strange, as whilst this level of designation will undoubtedly have a bearing on the level of available land, the number of pitches and hence sites are relatively small when compared with available land. As such it provides an unrealistic picture in this context.
- It is wrong to assume that any specialist services that occupants of pitches would require would 'naturally' be available and increase with greater population numbers. The effect of this would mean that special services provided for the prospective clients will be able to be provided equally across the region irrespective of the number of pitches in that locality. This again goes against the concept of enabling and supporting those areas with the greatest need to be able to provide the level of expertise that is

required, rather than spreading this across the region, and diluting any expertise along with it.

- It should not be assumed that historic encampment patterns can be disregarded, in a vain hope that the users of such sites will follow the pitch provision rather than staying where they have historically lived. The users of the pitches are a unique ethnic group who reside together as a community because of their work commitments, the need to provide protection because of the value of their equipment and the need for family support whilst other members are travelling the region for employment reasons. To provide a distribution option which requires the allocation of individual pitches for this group across multiple districts is inappropriate, ineffective and would not address the wishes or needs of this community.
- Even if this was possible, this would be at the potential cost of segregating large family units and or ethnic groupings – which in the case of the lifestyle of the pitch users is unlikely to come about, and indeed why should this be the outcome for this social group and no other?
- What is clearly evident when addressing this issue at any level, is that the ‘normal’ spatial planning approaches are unlikely to be applicable, and certainly applying factors that may well impact on the delivery of housing (as options C and D do) will not be the same that impact on the lifestyles of the users of these pitches.
- On the basis of the above points, it was argued that only Options A and B are truly viable for consideration. Building on the argument that Option B still ‘artificially’ attempts to increase pitch provision in other than on a local needs basis, we supported Option A (33 pitches) as the most evidence led and fairest to the potential users of the pitches, and strongly objected to the other options.