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1 Introduction and Background

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 City of York Council (the Council) have appointed Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA) to provide advice on the delivery of pitches and plots, which will help to identify sites required to meet the Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment undertaken by Opinion Research Service (ORS). The objective of the study is to assess potential sites to determine if they are suitable, available and achievable. This will include an assessment of sites identified by the Council as possible locations for new pitches.

1.1.2 The results of this study will inform the development of relevant policies and allocations in the emerging Local Plan and guide the consideration of future planning applications for Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites.

1.2 Background

1.2.1 Gypsies and Travellers have lived in Britain for at least 500 years and probably longer. For the purposes of the planning system, Gypsies and Travellers means:

“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 dependents’ 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.” (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, CLG, March 2012).

1.2.2 Many Gypsies and Travellers continue to pursue an active itinerant lifestyle and are generally self-employed people. However, increasingly communities are becoming more settled.

1.2.3 Gypsies and Travellers are not a uniform homogeneous community, but rather a group of communities which share some features but have their own histories and traditions. Even within each main group there is fragmentation between different families which emphasises the lack of a cohesive community and the need to avoid over generalisations. However, the main cultural groups include:

- Romany Gypsies;
- Irish Travellers; and
- New Travellers.

1.2.4 Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers are recognised in law as distinct ethnic groups and are legally protected from discrimination under the Race Relations Acts.
1.2.5 Travelling Showpeople have traditionally been involved in holding fairs and circuses for many hundreds of years. For the purposes of the planning system, Travelling Showpeople means:

“Members of a group organised 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 family’s or dependent’s more localized 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.” (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, CLG, March 2012).

1.2.6 The Government published a new policy statement Planning Policy for Traveller Sites in 2012, replacing Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007 to address future accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople because the previous planning policy arrangements had failed to deliver adequate sites to meet identified needs over the previous 10 years.

1.2.7 Local planning authorities are currently required to identify and allocate sufficient sites to meet the needs of these groups within their local plans. This means that when delivering sites consideration is required to which sites are available and suitable for different types of the travelling community.
2 Existing Sites and Needs

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ (CLG, March 2012) states that the overarching aim of Government is “to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community.” (para 3).

2.1.2 The document includes some significant changes to the way in which the site needs of Gypsies, Roma, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople are planned for. The most significant change has been the removal of regional targets and the replacement with a new system of locally generated targets. Under this, local planning authorities are required to:

- Use a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs;
- Set pitch and plot targets to address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of Travellers in their area;
- Identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide five years’ worth of sites against their locally set targets;
- Identify a supply of specific developable sites or broad locations for years six to ten and where possible for years 11-15; and
- Set criteria based policies to meet identified need and/or provide a basis for decisions in case applications nevertheless come forward.

2.1.3 The Council commissioned consultants, ORS, to carry out an Accommodation Needs Assessment of Gypsies, Roma Travellers and Travelling Showpeople within York; the objective of that assessment being to quantify the number of Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots to meet identified needs to 2030. The Study provides evidence to address the first two requirements set out above.

2.1.4 The Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites Study seeks to identify and assess potential sites to meet the needs identified in the Accommodation Needs Assessment. Peter Brett Associates’ objective is to provide evidence to support the Council to identify and allocate sites and establish criteria policy in the emerging Local Plan.

2.2 Existing Sites

Gypsies and Travellers

2.2.1 In York there is a need for residential Gypsy and Traveller sites. Residential sites provide residents with a permanent home and can be privately owned, publicly rented for affordable pitches, or privately rented to other Gypsies and Travellers. The size and the amount of facilities available on these sites varies between sites.
2.2.2 Sites are made up of a number of caravan pitches and associated facilities. Although there is no national definition of what size a pitch should be, a general guide contained in *Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites* states that “an average family pitch must be capable of accommodating an amenity building, a large trailer and touring caravan… drying space for clothes, a lockable shed…parking space for two vehicles and a small garden” (para 7.12). On average, usage is approximately 1.7 caravans per pitch.

2.2.3 Residential sites provide a permanent home and the amount of facilities on site varies mainly between public and private sites. Public sites will generally have amenity blocks and sometimes play areas and communal spaces. Private site facilities vary enormously depending on the requirements of the residents.

2.2.4 In York local authority area there are currently 1 private and 3 public owned and occupied Gypsy and Traveller sites, ranging in size from single pitch family sites to one site containing 24 pitches. The authority currently has 2 unauthorised sites located at Osbaldwick.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Planning Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YORK009</td>
<td>James Street, Layerthorpe</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Public site with permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK010</td>
<td>Water Lane, Clifton</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Public site with permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK011</td>
<td>Love Lane, Fulford</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Historically tolerated site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK012</td>
<td>Osbaldwick</td>
<td>Osbaldwick</td>
<td>Public site with permission*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK014</td>
<td>Behind Osbaldwick</td>
<td>Osbaldwick</td>
<td>Unauthorised site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK015</td>
<td>Outgang Lane</td>
<td>Osbaldwick</td>
<td>Unauthorised site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gained planning permission for an extra 6 pitches after the base date for the GTAA 2014

2.2.5 All public sites have full planning permission, whilst the site at Love Lane, Fulford is a historical site that is considered lawful. The other privately owned sites are currently unauthorised.

**Travelling Showpeople**

2.2.6 The needs of Travelling Showpeople are different to Gypsies and Travellers. Their sites often combine residential, storage and maintenance uses. Typically a site contains areas for accommodation, usually caravans and mobile homes, and areas for storing, repairing and maintaining vehicles and fairground equipment. These combined residential and storage sites are known as plots.

2.2.7 Although Travelling Showpeople travel for extended periods they require a permanent base for storage of equipment and for residential use during the winter. These plots (or yards) are also occupied throughout the year, often by older people and families with children, for example.

2.2.8 In York there is currently 1 privately owned and occupied Travelling Showpeople site. The site represent permanent base for the family which is occupied when they are not travelling for work.

---

1 Communities and Local Government (2008) *Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide*
City of York Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment 2014

The York Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment 2014 (GTAA) was completed by consultants Opinion Research Services (ORS) for City of York Council in 2014.

Interviews were attempted with every Gypsy and Traveller household in the area who were present during the fieldwork period in October 2013. In total, interviews were achieved on-site with 48 households and a further 8 in bricks and mortar.

The GTAA estimate for extra site provision to meet residential needs between 2014 and 2030 for York is 72 pitches to address the needs of all identifiable households. The GTAA outlines the methodology of how this number was derived.

This includes the needs of existing households on unauthorised sites and the households on the waiting list for a public site and new households likely to occur by 2030 due to household formation. The majority of the pitches will be required for public sites providing affordable pitches.

Interviews were undertaken with all Travelling Showpeople households in the area in October 2013. Three interviews were achieved at this time. One family living on a site with temporary permission. The other two families are keen to find a site in York.

The York estimated extra site provision to meet residential needs for the Travelling Showpeople households between 2013 and 2030 is 8 plots to address the needs of all identifiable households.

This includes 3 unauthorised plots seeking to stay in the area, 1 plot to meet the existing household with temporary permission, 1 plot to meet in migration and 3 plots to accommodate new households likely to occur by 2030 due to household formation.

Table 2.3 below sets out the GTAA need for York in 5 year time periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Planning Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YORK008</td>
<td>The Stables</td>
<td>Elvington</td>
<td>Private site with temporary permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The GTAA does not identify a need for transit or emergency stopping places within York. Although York does not currently have a public run transit site for policy to direct unauthorised encampments to.
2.3 **York Local Planning Policy**

2.3.1 The Council have consulted upon the Local Plan Preferred Options. This included policy ACHM4 ‘Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople Allocations’ set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy ACHM4: Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople sites will be supported that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. provide safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access to the site;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. provide for adequate on-site facilities for parking, storage, play and residential amenity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. are well located on the highway network;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. offer safe and convenient access to schools and local facilities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. provide adequate levels of privacy and residential amenity; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. make temporary plots available within larger sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above criteria, plots for Showpeople will be considered acceptable where they are designed to:

| vii. offer the potential for living and working on-site; |
| ix. permanently house a maximum of 12 families within any one site; |
| x. provide individual plots of minimum 500m$^2$; and |
| xi. be within 500 metres of the primary highway network. |

2.4 **Number of Sites Required**

2.4.1 National evidence would suggest that Gypsies and Travellers prefer small sites containing a small number of pitches to accommodate their immediate family and extended family. Government guidance\(^2\) suggests that “experience of site managers and residents alike suggest that a maximum of 15 pitches is conducive to providing a comfortable environment which is easy to manage. However, smaller sites of between 3-4 pitches can also be successful, particularly where designed for one extended family” (para 4.7).

2.4.2 It is therefore difficult to identify the exact number of sites required to meet the pitch requirements for York. The actual number of sites required will be determined according to a number of factors including taking account of:

- The different cultural, ethnic and family groupings of Gypsies and Travellers;

---

\(^2\) Communities and Local Government (2008) *Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide*
The extent to which additional provision could be made through extension or intensification of existing sites; and

Whether replacement sites need to be found for existing sites which may be unsuitable or unsustainable.

2.4.3 For Travelling Showpeople, the future need will arise from the occupants of existing yards and is likely to require additional sites.

2.5 Site Location

General Approach to Location

2.5.1 ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ (CLG, 2012) states that “local planning authorities should ensure that sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally” (para 11).

2.5.2 Local planning authorities should strictly limit the provision of sites in the open countryside away from existing settlements or areas allocated in the development plan but can provide for sites in rural areas subject to further considerations (para 23). Where there is a lack of affordable land to meet the needs of the travelling communities, local planning authorities in rural areas should consider allocating small sites specifically for affordable pitches in small rural communities (para 13).

2.5.3 Sites should be located so as to provide a settled base that reduces the need for long distance travelling and unauthorised encampment (para 11).

2.5.4 Local planning authorities should reflect the extent to which Travellers working and living from the same location could contribute to sustainability (para 11) and therefore should consider mixed sites with residential and business uses or separate sites but in close proximity (para 16).

2.5.5 Local planning authorities should also have regard to the needs of Travelling Showpeople to have mixed use yards containing residential accommodation and space for the storage of equipment (para 17).

Access to Services

2.5.6 ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ (CLG, 2012) states that local planning authorities should promote access to appropriate health services and ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis but avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services (para 11).

2.5.7 Local planning authorities should ensure adequate play areas for children (para 24).

2.5.8 The Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain has published a Model Standard Package (The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain, 2007) which states that sites should have good vehicular
access, suitable for the ingress and egress of large vehicles and should be in close proximity to a good road network. The site should be close to schools and other community facilities.

2.6 Relationship to Surrounding Land Uses

2.6.1 The Government is keen to promote a peaceful and integrated co-existence between a Gypsy or Traveller site and the local settled community. In order to facilitate this, national guidance\(^3\) states that "where possible, sites should be developed near to housing for the settled community as part of mainstream residential developments" (para 3.7). However, ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ states that “local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community” (para 12).

2.6.2 The Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain Model Standard Package states that the site should respect amenities of any occupants of residential properties nearby.

2.6.3 DCLG guidance on the design of sites for Gypsies and Travellers also emphasises the importance of locating sites away from heavy industry and states that locations adjacent to industrial areas are unpopular because of their relative isolation, distance from local facilities and because of safety fears.

2.6.4 An important consideration is avoiding noise and disturbance. This can be to the settled community, in terms of the movement of vehicles to and from the site, from the stationing of vehicles on-site and on-site business activities. Given the greater noise transference through walls of caravans than through walls of conventional housing, there can also be noise and disturbance to the gypsies and travellers from adjoining uses, such as from industrial areas, railway lines or from highways.

2.7 Site Conditions and Essential Services

2.7.1 ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ (CLG, 2012) guidance on the design of sites for Gypsies and Travellers identifies that “no sites should be identified for Gypsy and Traveller use that would not be appropriate for ordinary residential dwellings” (para 3.6).

2.7.2 DCLG guidance on the design of sites for Gypsies and Travellers states that sites must have access to water, electricity, drainage and sanitation, with electricity and sewerage for permanent sites normally through mains systems, although in some locations alternative provision may be appropriate.

2.7.3 The Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain Model Standard Package states that the site should provide amenities normally expected for human occupation.

2.7.4 ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ states that local planning authorities should avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services (para 11).

---
\(^3\) Communities and Local Government (2008) *Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide*
3 Methodology for Site Selection and Assessment

3.1.1 This section sets out the methodology Peter Brett Associates have followed to complete the site assessment study to identify sites to meet Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople needs and establish site criteria for planning policy. A methodology has been developed that is driven by national guidance and we are confident it will provide what is needed in an efficient fashion. The methodology was made available for the stakeholder consideration. All comments received were fully considered before the methodology was finalised and applied to potential sites.

Source of Sites

3.1.2 PBA were provided a list of sites for assessment by the Council. These came from a variety of sources and initial sieving by the Council to remove sites with no potential early in the Plan making process. The sites came from the following sources:

- Existing sites - All existing authorised and unauthorised Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites, including those with full, temporary or personal consents, or certificates of lawful use and sites which are historically tolerated, were assessed for intensification and/or expansion of the existing site;

- Consultation sites (preferred options) - All sites promoted in the 2012 call for sites for Gypsy and Traveller and/or Travelling Showpeople uses and consulted on throughout the Local Plan preferred options consultation.

3.1.3 In Autumn 2012, the Council produced a Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople Accommodation Needs Supporting Paper and issued a call for sites, inviting developers, landowners and businesses to submit sites in the local area available for development over the next 15-20 years, including those potentially available for Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople accommodation. Of the 600 sites submitted to the council, 4 were put forward for Gypsy and Traveller sites, and 2 for Showpeople sites.

3.1.4 Sites put forward for Gypsy and Traveller use were:

- Chowdene Caravan Site, Malton Road
- Land at the Corner of Common Road and Hassacarr Road, Dunnington
- Land West of Outgang Lane, Osbaldwick
- Market Garden East of Dunnington

3.1.5 Sites put forward for Travelling Showpeople use were:

- The Stables, Elvington
3.1.6 The Council undertook site analysis of sites submitted to the call for sites to inform the Local Plan Consultation in 2012. Critically the Council have sought to assess sites that are genuinely available for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople use in accordance with the NPPF. To determine the broad suitability of sites, the Council undertook an initial assessment of the sites to ensure that, in line with the Local Plan Spatial Strategy:

3.1.7 “The City’s unique heritage is protected – this involved effectively ruling out sites deemed to be in areas important to the historic character and setting of York, such as, land forming ‘Green Wedges’ around the historic Strays and river corridors, areas preventing coalescence of villages between themselves and to the main urban area; and areas that retain the rural setting of the city providing views of key landmarks such as the Minster”.

3.1.8 “The protection of environmental assets – The protection and management of York’s Green Infrastructure is considered central to managing any future growth, whether it is publicly or privately owned, statutory or non-statutory, identified for its nature conservation or recreational value. Any sites affecting such areas were ruled out of consideration to completely protect environmental assets”.

3.1.9 “Flood risk is appropriately managed – The geography of the city and its surroundings are such that there are significant areas at risk of flooding. Areas that are considered at high risk of flooding where ruled out”.

3.1.10 The sites were then subject to internal evaluation by specialist officers within the Council to determine the sites suitability for living and working in terms of access and proximity to the local highway network and service provision. The internal evaluation of the site used assessment criteria specifically formed to reflect the preferences and lifestyle requirements of the travelling community.

3.1.11 Chowdene Camp (Site 3) – This site is part of larger site, incorporating a site allocated for residential development. The site proposed for Gypsy and Traveller is currently used to accommodate a touring caravan site. Permission to extend the site from 5 touring caravan pitches and 5 tent pitches to 20 touring caravan pitches, 15 tent pitches and 2 static caravan pitches has been refused in the past due to issues of increased traffic levels and narrow access. However, the adjacent field was also submitted to the 2012 call for sites, allowing the sites to be amalgamated and the access road widened. This site was deemed suitable for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation by the council on this basis from a highways and conservation standpoint.

3.1.12 Common Lane, Dunnington (Site 9) – The site predominantly lies in flood zone 3b and therefore considered unsuitable for housing or employment use. 0.92 ha of the site lies outside the flood zone and is considered suitable for Gypsy and Traveller pitches, although it acts as a natural buffer between the village and nearby industrial estate.
3.1.13 **Outgang Lane, Osbaldwick (Site 36)** – Site 36 borders an existing Gypsy and Traveller site. It is indicated that an application to extend the existing site onto site 36 would, in principle, be acceptable.

3.1.14 **Market Garden, East of Dunnington (Site 116)** – The site was submitted for residential development as first choice, followed by Gypsy and Traveller use. The site has been allocated for housing in the Draft Local Plan (Policy H31).

3.1.15 **The Stables (Site 22)** – This site was submitted as a site for Showpeople only. The site has temporary planning permission and has been judged suitable for a Showpeople site on appeal (APP/C2741/A/10/2142092).

3.1.16 **Land at Weatherby Road, Knapton (Site 220)** - This site was considered first for residential development and considered unsuitable due to its lack of proximity to local services. However, the site is located close to the highway network and offers a large space for storage and maintenance equipment in addition to adequate land to accommodate enough plots to meet the estimated Showpeople need for the entire plan period.

3.1.17 In addition to the sites from consultation the Council also received three additional sites that were considered by the Council since the Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople Accommodation Needs Supporting Paper was published. These were also assessed in the study:

- Land off Elvington lane, Elvington;
- Land at A1237/A64 junction, Askam Bryan; and
- Land North of Wetherby Road/Knapton Moor.

**Additional Sources of Sites**

3.1.18 Following the initial survey it was identified that the Council was likely to have a shortfall of sites to meet defined needs. The Council produced an addendum for Cabinet on 23rd April 2014 to enable member consideration the outcomes of further technical work since Preferred Options consultation and consider potential approaches to addressing the shortfall of sites for Gypsies, Roma and Travellers.

3.1.19 Further work has subsequently been undertaken by the Council to identify further potential sites for assessment: The sources of sites include:

- Publicly owned land – The Council considered its own land holdings and contacted other public bodies to establish potentially available site for assessment for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople use;
- Consultation sites (Further Sites Consultation) – All sites promoted to the Council following the Local Plan further sites consultation in June/July 2014 were included.

3.1.20 The following additional sites were included in the assessment following the consultation:
3.1.21 All sites were mapped onto GIS and put into a sites database. The study therefore includes a long list of 20 sites, which are mapped in Appendix 1 showing the distribution of sites subject to assessment. It should be noted that since the commencement of this study that Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton, has been confirmed as unavailable and whilst still included in the study for consistency, has been rejected in Stage 1 on availability grounds.

3.2 Identifying Criteria for Site Assessment

3.2.1 Based upon our review of available policy, guidance, the identification site needs and requirements, and physical constraints, we identified a series of site criteria for discussion and agreement with the Council. The methodology for site selection and assessment was consulted upon which helped inform the final criteria. We used these to assess potential sites and to inform recommendations regarding future site criteria for assessing future planning applications.

3.2.2 Account was taken of national policy, as contained within Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (CLG, 2012) and existing and emerging local policy. Account was also been taken of the existing pattern and distribution of need for Traveller provision as set out in the new Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment.

3.2.3 Within the overall policy framework, the general approach to identifying appropriate site selection criteria will be to build upon the national planning policy framework:

- Is the site available?
- Is the site suitable?
- Is the site developable, e.g. viable and deliverable?

3.2.4 A key consideration, based upon national policy, has been that criteria should be “fair and should facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community” (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, paragraph 10). Criteria should be clear and transparent and unambiguous. Many previous studies and local plan criteria based policies across the country have used very restrictive criteria which have prevented many reasonable sites from coming forward.

3.2.5 We have taken account of the various criteria from the following sources including:
3.2.6 The site criteria were developed and applied in two stages, Stage 1 is set out below.

3.3 Stage 1 Initial Site Assessment

3.3.1 Stage 1 in the assessment process involved a desk top study undertaking the application of broad suitability criteria, including absolute constraints, together with an initial investigation of likely availability.

3.3.2 The application of broad suitability criteria sieved out immediately sites which would be likely to fail on the grounds of contravening major constraints such as being within international environmental designations or within the boundaries of scheduled ancient monuments, etc.

3.3.3 Availability was identified throughout this study as a key criterion. With regard to existing occupied sites the future availability of the sites to accommodate additional pitches/plots or to expand was discussed with current owners/occupants and the Council.

3.3.4 A traffic light approach for the initial Stage 1 desk top assessment was utilised, identifying where sites do not satisfy criteria in red, where criteria may be capable of being satisfied in yellow, and where criteria are satisfied in green. Table 3.1 overleaf sets out the Stage 1 Assessment Matrix. Results are set out in Appendix 2.
## Table 3.2: Stage 1 Assessment Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Designation/Issue</th>
<th>Red (Sites does not satisfy criteria)</th>
<th>Yellow (Criteria may be capable of being satisfied)</th>
<th>Green (Criteria are satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Character and Setting of York</td>
<td>Green Belt Character Areas</td>
<td>The site is within an area significant to the character and setting of York.</td>
<td>The site is within a sensitive area and could therefore have a negative impact on the character and setting of York, requiring further investigation.</td>
<td>The site is not located in an area that is significant to the character and setting of York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assets</td>
<td>Special Protection Area RAMSAR Site Site of Special Scientific Interest National Nature Reserve Site of Nature Conservation Importance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The site is covered by an international, national or local environmental designation or is within close proximity and could therefore have a negative impact.</td>
<td>The site is not within an international, national or local environmental designation or within its buffer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functioning Floodplain</td>
<td>Environment Agency Indicative Flood Mapping and SFRA Area at Risk of Flooding</td>
<td>The site is within flood zone 3 and not suitable for Gypsy and Traveller use.</td>
<td>The site is affected by Flood Zones 2 requiring further investigation (and application of policy tests).</td>
<td>The site is not affected by identified areas of indicative flood mapping or is located in Flood Zone 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination or Unstable Land Issues</td>
<td>Land contamination or unstable land issues</td>
<td>The site is located on or adjacent a landfill site or the land is as unstable, and the land has been identified as unsuitable for residential use.</td>
<td>The site is potentially contaminated or unstable and requires further investigation.</td>
<td>There are no known contamination or unstable land issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Issues</td>
<td>Noise issues relating to existing land uses or transport corridors</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The site is located adjacent noisy land uses, which requires further investigation.</td>
<td>There are no noisy adjacent land uses and therefore no noise impact on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Amenity</td>
<td>Location of site in relation to existing dwellings</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>The site is adjacent existing dwellings and requires further investigation.</td>
<td>There are no adjacent dwellings and therefore no impact on residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) Sites of Archaeological Importance Historic Park and Garden Conservation Areas</td>
<td>The site is likely to result in substantial harm to the significance of a Scheduled Monument, Grade I or II*</td>
<td>The site could result in harm to elements which contribute to the significance of a designated heritage asset, which require further</td>
<td>The site is unlikely to harm the significance of any designated heritage asset or its setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Identification Study

**Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Listed Buildings</th>
<th>Listed Building, or a Grade I or II* Registered Park and Garden.</th>
<th>investigation.</th>
<th>Site availability is unknown and requires further investigation.</th>
<th>There is evidence that the landowner is willing to sell or develop the site as a Traveller site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3.3.5 If sites did not receive a “red” at Stage 1, the site was considered further at Stage 2. Stage 2 involved a more detailed assessment of suitability issues and an examination of developability. Potential capacity and delivery issues will also be investigated.

3.4 Stage 2 Detailed Site Assessment

3.4.1 All Stage 2 sites were visited by the consultant team. PBA are experienced in recording information and assessing sites in a consistent way and PBA recorded site details and surroundings using a standard proforma. All Stage 2 sites were sent to key Council officers, including highways, environmental protection and officers in design, conservation and sustainable design for comments on landscape and ecology, for comment. These comments fed into the Stage 2 assessment, which involved a more detailed assessment of suitability and an examination of achievability issues. A further examination of availability was also undertaken at this stage.

3.4.2 Further investigations of suitability centred upon:

- **Availability** – we contacted landowners and identified whether sites were available and any potential legal or ownership constraints;
- **Suitability** – we assessed each site against the agreed criteria which were grouped into policy requirements, physical constraints and potential impacts; and
- **Developability** – we identified potential site constraints needing to be rectified which may affect viability and any potential alternative uses likely to affect deliverability.

3.4.3 Stage 2 Matrix, in Table 3.3, overleaf provides the details for how sites were assessed relating to suitability, availability and achievability. For each potentially suitable and available site a proforma was completed, providing more detailed information, including a site map. All sites were measured to key services and facilities, to enable the Council to allocate the most sustainable sites in the event that a range of sites be identified for the Council’s consideration. Each site has a site proforma providing more detailed information, including a site map, which is provided within Appendix 4.

3.4.4 All issues of potential delivery identified have been subject to investigations where possible, with recommendations on how they can be addressed. All sites that are considered suitable, available and developable have been subject to an initial broad assessment of the capacity of the site in terms of the number of pitches or plots which could be provided on site. This has taken into account:

- Size and shape of site and character of the adjoining area;
- ‘Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites’, CLG, May 2008; and
- Relevant planning history and design templates developed by Peter Brett Associates, as set out in Appendix 2.
## Table 3.3: Application of site assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft criteria</th>
<th>Stage at which criteria considered</th>
<th>Designation/Issue</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Accept but further investigation/mitigation required</th>
<th>Accept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability</strong></td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Site promoted by landowners, agents or travelling community Public land confirmed as available</td>
<td>Site not available for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople use. There are known legal or ownership problems, such as multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements which cannot be resolved. Public land has been identified in another plan / strategy for another use.</td>
<td>There continues to be doubt over whether the site is genuinely available for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople (GTTS) use after further investigations.</td>
<td>There is evidence that the landowner is willing to sell and/or a developer is interested in developing within the timeframe of the Local Plan. There are no known legal or ownership problems, such as multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements which are not capable of being overcome within the timeframe of the LDP. Public site is not identified plan or strategy for another use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suitability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination and unstable land</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Contaminated Land Unstable Land</td>
<td>Contains an area of unstable or contaminated land that is likely to undermine the site’s suitability and achievability.</td>
<td>Could contain unstable or contaminated land that should be subject to further investigation.</td>
<td>Not located on unstable land. Not located on contaminated land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>Steep slopes which make the site unsuitable and/or unachievable.</td>
<td>Sloping or undulating land which may require works to achieve a suitable development.</td>
<td>Level or gently sloping site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site Identification Study
### Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site access and safety</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Access Proximity to major roads</th>
<th>Poor access and/or road of poor standard. Likely to be subject to safety issues from surrounding uses incapable of mitigation</th>
<th>Access poor but capable of being improved. Road of adequate or good standard. Likely to be affected by safety issues but this is capable of mitigation.</th>
<th>Adequate or good access off adequate or good standard of road. Not affected by safety issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility to facilities</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Access to facilities: GP Surgery Primary School Shop Access to public transport: Bus stop or route Train station</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(Actual distances to be measured to facilities).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character and Setting of York</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Green Belt Character Areas, landscape impact and visual containment</th>
<th>Unacceptable impact on the character and setting of York and/or landscape impact not capable of mitigation.</th>
<th>Impact capable of mitigation Potential cumulative impact with other identified sites.</th>
<th>No unacceptable impact on the character or setting of York or landscape.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity / Protected Species / Important hedgerow</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Impact on biodiversity resources or known protected species Site of Special Scientific Interest Local Nature Reserve Geological Conservation Review Site Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation</td>
<td>Significant effect and unacceptable impact of site upon ecology or protected species or habitats not capable of mitigation where no overriding public interest.</td>
<td>Impact capable of mitigation. Potential cumulative impact with other identified sites.</td>
<td>No significant effect or unacceptable impact on ecology, protected species or habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic environment</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monuments Listed Buildings</td>
<td>Significant harm to the significance of a heritage asset not capable of</td>
<td>Harm to the significance of a heritage asset but capable of mitigation.</td>
<td>No harm to the significance of a heritage asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Groundwater Source Protection Zone</td>
<td>Unacceptable risk to the supply and quality of water resources.</td>
<td>Risk to the supply and quality of water resources capable of mitigation.</td>
<td>No risk to the supply and quality of water resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Noise pollution from surrounding uses e.g. road, rail and air transport</td>
<td>Likely to be adversely affected by noise pollution from surrounding uses that could make for an unacceptable residential environment.</td>
<td>Likely to be affected by noise pollution but this is capable of mitigation.</td>
<td>Not affected by noise issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential amenity (Impact of site on adjoining uses)</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Relationship with existing adjacent uses</td>
<td>Close proximity to existing adjacent uses esp. residential properties where any potential impact (light, visual, noise, traffic) on adjoining uses is not reasonably capable of mitigation.</td>
<td>Close proximity to existing adjacent uses esp. residential properties but any potential impact (light, visual, other disturbance) on adjoining uses is capable of mitigation.</td>
<td>Unlikely to adversely affect existing adjoining uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential amenity (Impact of adjoining uses on site)</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Relationship with existing adjacent uses</td>
<td>Close proximity to existing adjacent uses and any potential impact from these uses (light, visual, other disturbance) on the site is not reasonably capable of mitigation.</td>
<td>Close proximity to existing adjacent uses but any potential impact from these uses (light, visual, other disturbance) on the site is capable of mitigation.</td>
<td>Unlikely to be adversely affected by existing adjoining uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developability</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Deliverability Viability</td>
<td>Has hope value for housing and/or other land uses. Extensive buildings on site requiring demolition. Other constraints incapable of resolution without considerable expense.</td>
<td>Site constraints capable of being overcome but where extent and cost of mitigation are unclear at this stage.</td>
<td>In a location where housing development is contrary to spatial policy. No site constraints needing to be overcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.5 PBA have developed specific recommendations for the Council to take the evidence study forward into the preparation of policy and the identification of site allocations within the emerging Local Plan. The recommendations are detailed within the following sections and seek to identify:

- A shortlist of suitable, available and achievable sites to meet identified needs; and
- Identification of site capacity and delivery options for all sites.
4 Site Assessment and Capacity

4.1.1 City of York Council commissioned an update of the GTAA and further site assessment work to ensure they have an up to date picture of needs and assist them identifying sites to allocate within the Local Plan. Peter Brett Associates involvement in this process builds on the work already undertaken by officers to produce a robust evidence base for Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople to inform the emerging Local Plan.

4.2 Capacity

4.2.1 In this section we identify a list of sites which we believe are potentially suitable for additional Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitches and plots. All potentially suitable sites have been subject to an initial broad assessment of the number of pitches which could be provided on site. This has taken account, firstly, of:

- *Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide* (DCLG, 2008);
- *Travelling Showpeople’s Sites Model Standard Package* (The Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain, 2007); and
- Any relevant planning history.

4.2.2 In addition, Peter Brett Associates have developed templates for various forms of Gypsy and Traveller development, including for residential and transit sites. These have been used to inform the theoretical capacity of sites and optimum size and configuration of pitches (or plots) on site. On larger sites a mix of pitch sizes to reflect the needs of different families can be assumed. Relevant templates are set out in Appendix 5.

4.2.3 Site capacity has also taken account of on-site constraints and the need, where appropriate, for landscaping and other mitigation measures to achieve a suitable development. Providing good quality landscaping and access arrangements have been taken into account. This will result in sufficient access and accommodation space to create a site which Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople find attractive. At the same time, sufficient space and landscaping will help to preserve the residential amenity of neighbouring uses.

4.2.4 The shortlisted sites have been assessed for their capacity to accommodate residential uses for Gypsy and Traveller sites and mixed residential/commercial uses for Travelling Showpeople.

4.3 Stage 1 Suitability and Availability Matrix

4.3.1 The first stage in the assessment process involved the application of broad suitability criteria, including absolute constraints, together with an initial investigation of likely availability.

4.3.2 The initial assessment of site suitability and availability is summarised in a matrix, which is set out in Appendix 2. A traffic light approach has been utilised, to identify where sites do...
not satisfy criteria in red, where criteria may be capable of being satisfied in yellow and where criteria are satisfied in green.

4.3.3 Sites identified as red have not gone forward to be assessed at Stage 2. Four sites were rejected at Stage 1 and therefore 16 sites were examined further at Stage 2.

4.4 Stage 2 Suitability, Availability and Achievability Site Assessments

4.4.1 Stage 2 involved a more detailed assessment of suitability, availability and an examination of achievability issues.

4.4.2 Appendix 3 sets out those sites where it is considered there is no potential for further provision and the reasons for this decision. Appendix 4 sets out the detailed site assessment results for those sites considered potentially suitable, available and achievable for future provision.

4.4.3 A total of 3 sites were identified as potentially suitable sites to contribute additional pitches and plots towards meeting future identified needs for Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. No sites have been identified in the main urban area and villages. Draft results are set out in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.1: Sites with Potential within the general extent of the Green Belt for Gypsies and Travellers in York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YORK020</td>
<td>Land at Moor Lane and B1224</td>
<td>Rufforth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK021</td>
<td>Acres Farm,</td>
<td>Naburn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Sites with Potential within the general extent of the Green Belt for Travelling Showpeople in York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YORK008</td>
<td>The Stables</td>
<td>Elvington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 All the shortlisted sites have been assessed for their potential capacity. The results are set out in Appendix 4 and considered in Section 5.
5 Recommendations and Delivery Options

5.1 Pitch and Plot Targets

5.1.1 ‘Planning policy for traveller sites’ (CLG, 2012) requires local planning authorities to set pitch targets for Gypsies and Travellers and plot targets for Travelling Showpeople, to meet likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs arising in each area.

5.1.2 The Gypsy, Roma Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment, completed by ORS in 2014 details the total identified need for new permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller pitches to meet residential needs between 2014 and 2030 to address the needs of all identifiable households in York. The results are set out in Table 5.1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy and Traveller Residential Pitches</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Showpeople Plots</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.3 The Council is now in a position to include local targets in its emerging Local Plan to reflect the pitch and plot targets identified in the study.

5.2 A Supply of Deliverable and Developable Sites

5.2.1 In developing the Local Plan, ‘Planning policy for traveller sites’ (CLG, 2012) requires local planning authorities to identify and keep up-to-date a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of sites against those locally set targets and a supply of specific developable sites or broad locations to meet needs, where possible, for up to 15 years.

5.2.2 PBA recommend that to address the requirement to ensure that identified need is met throughout the Plan period, the Council consider the following:

- Safeguarding existing sites (and providing additional pitches/plots where appropriate at those locations);
- Allocating potential sites with the main urban area or villages;
- Consider allocating potential sites within the general extent of the Green Belt and define the Green Belt Boundary accordingly);
- Consider making provision a policy requirement within strategic or broad locations; and
- Ensure a fair and reasonable criteria policy is established and supplemented by identified delivery partners and funding sources.
5.3 Safeguarding Existing Sites

5.3.1 It is suggested that, as an initial starting point, the Council should consider safeguarding existing Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites, to ensure that existing needs continue to be met in perpetuity. If sites are lost from these uses, then new replacement sites may need to be found to maintain an adequate supply to meet needs in accordance with the identified pitch and plot targets.

5.3.2 There are 3 existing Gypsy and Traveller sites with full permission and 1 site which is considered to have established lawful use over time. It is recommended that these sites are safeguarded in the Local Plan to ensure their continued use.

Table 5.2: Existing Authorised Gypsy and Traveller Sites in City of York Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ref</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Existing Provision (including extant permissions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YORK009</td>
<td>James Street, Layerthorpe</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>20 pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK010</td>
<td>Water Lane, Clifton</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>23 pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK011</td>
<td>Love Lane, Fulford</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>17 Pitches (transit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK012</td>
<td>Osbaldwick (including 6 pitch permission)</td>
<td>Osbaldwick</td>
<td>18 pitches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3 From site survey it is clear that these sites are currently in use and are occupied. There appear to be no reasons on the grounds of need why these sites should not be safeguarded in the City of York Local Plan. Safeguarding these sites will prevent their loss to other uses and therefore ensure that new site provision is only required to meet future needs. There are no existing Travelling Showpeople sites with full permission within York.

5.4 Site Delivery Options

5.4.1 A number of potential delivery models have been identified and considered for the potentially suitable sites and strategic/broad locations identified overleaf. These include:

- **Delivery model 1**: Existing privately owned sites where there is potential for new or additional pitches/plots to be created to meet future needs. Under this model, planning permission would be needed. The Council should consider encouraging planning applications to meet short and medium term needs through entering into dialogue with site occupants.

- **Delivery model 2**: Sites which are not currently owned by the travelling communities but have been identified as available for these uses. Allocation in the emerging Local Plan could identify these sites to travelling communities and they could be purchased on the open market. Alternatively, the Council could consider using New Homes Bonus or other capital monies to buy the site or identify their own public assets and then make them available to organised groups on a non-profit making basis to enable them to develop and manage. Such groups could also be offered the opportunity to buy stakes in the site, allowing the income from such sales to provide further sites, as appropriate.
There are emerging examples of innovative acquisition and funding arrangements across the country.

- **Delivery model 3**: New sites where the Council considers that additional affordable pitch provision may be appropriate. In this case, the Council should investigate the potential for either buying sites, developing their public assets or work with other public providers using Government grant funding or other monies to secure or increase affordable provision. Sites could then either be managed by a Council or a Registered Providers (RP’s).

- **Delivery model 4**: Provision required as part of the planning of strategic housing or mixed use development sites/broad locations. There may be opportunity to require suitable strategic allocations/broad locations in the Local Plan to provide for Gypsy and Traveller pitches or Travelling Showpeople plots as part of their overall delivery of development in these locations. These could then be either managed by the Council or RPs, sold on the open market, or affordable pitches brought forward.

### 5.5 Sites with Potential within the main urban area and villages

5.5.1 The Gypsy, Roma Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment 2014 (GTAA) identifies a need for 66 net additional Gypsy and Traveller residential pitches to be developed by 2030. The GTAA also identifies a need for 8 additional plots for Travelling Showpeople in York by 2030.

5.5.2 The Site Identification Study is planning evidence that has been produced to inform the emerging York Local Plan and provide a robust basis for decision to be made on future planning policy. It is the role of the emerging Local Plan to define what land is in the Green Belt and how Green Belt purposes are interpreted in the York context, therefore the study has assessed sites based on emerging spatial principals which shape growth in York to identify if any appropriate sites exist within the main urban area and villages, or whether it will be necessary to explore allocating sites outside the general extent of the Green Belt in the emerging Local Plan. The green belt boundary in the emerging Local Plan will be the consequence of decisions about which land serves a greenbelt purpose and which can be allocated for development during the plan period.

5.5.3 The study has identified no potentially suitable or available sites in the main urban area and villages, therefore to meet the needs identified in the GTAA, the Council will need to consider potential sites currently within the general extent of the Green Belt and to be allocated for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople in the emerging Local Plan. Through the Local Plan process the Green Belt boundary will be defined for York.

### 5.6 Sites with Potential within the general extent of the Green Belt

5.6.1 A total of 2 sites have been identified within the general extent of the Green Belt as potentially available and suitable sites for Gypsies and Travellers to meet identified current and future residential pitch needs in the short to medium term period. **Table 5.3** sets out the potential sites for allocation. Details of this site are contained in **Appendix 4**.
Table 5.3: Sites with Potential for Gypsy and Traveller Pitches in York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>No. of existing authorised pitches</th>
<th>No. of pitches (extant permissions)</th>
<th>No. of future potential pitches</th>
<th>Pitches in first 5 years</th>
<th>Pitches beyond first 5 years</th>
<th>Delivery option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YORK020</td>
<td>Land at Moor Lane and B1224</td>
<td>Rufforth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Model 2 – private site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK021</td>
<td>Acres Farm</td>
<td>Naburn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Model 3 – public site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.2 One potential site has been identified within the general extent of the Green Belt for Travelling Showpeople use, however given its size it may be appropriate to retain this site within the general extent of the Green Belt. Table 5.4 sets out the potential site. Details of this site are contained in Appendix F.

Table 5.4: Sites with Potential for Travelling Showpeople Plots in York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>No. of existing authorised Plots</th>
<th>No. of plots (extant permissions)</th>
<th>No. of additional plots</th>
<th>Plots in first 5 years</th>
<th>Plots beyond first 5 years</th>
<th>Delivery option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YORK008</td>
<td>The Stables</td>
<td>Elvington</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Model 1 - Private Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The site currently has temporary permission for 1 plot

5.7 Meeting the Needs within the general extent of the Green Belt

5.7.1 The following paragraphs and tables compare the supply of potentially suitable and available sites within the general extent of the Green Belt against identified pitch and plot needs in the GTAA. The comparison shows the need in 5 year time periods to set out potential shortfalls over the Local Plan timescale to 2030.

Gypsy and Traveller need and supply (within the general extent of the Green Belt)

5.7.2 Table 5.5 sets out summaries of need and supply within the general extent of the Green Belt for Gypsy and Traveller sites in York.

Table 5.5: Gypsy and Traveller need and supply within the general extent of the Green Belt in 5 year time periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Need for Gypsy and Traveller Residential Pitches</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Existing sites with potential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) New sites with potential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Total potential supply (b+c)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Net Need (a-e)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7.3 Peter Brett Associates consider that there are potentially 2 sites which may be suitable for up to 30 Gypsy and Traveller pitches. Overall this is 36 pitches short of the identified need figure for 2014-2031. The Council have insufficient sites to identify provision to meet the first 5 year of needs, however given the size of Land at Moor Lane and B1224 it could be considered appropriate to consider more than 15 pitches at this location to help meet the 5
year accommodation need. National Guidance contained in ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ states that “Sites should ideally consist of up to 15 pitches in capacity unless there is clear evidence to suggest that a larger site is preferred by the local Gypsy or Traveller community”. The owner of YORK020 has suggested the site could be available for 20 residential pitches and additional transit pitches.

**Travelling Showpeople need and supply (within the general extent of the Green Belt)**

5.7.4 Table 5.6 summarises the need and supply within the general extent of the Green Belt for Travelling Showpeople for York:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Travelling Showpeople Plots</th>
<th>2014-2018</th>
<th>2019-2023</th>
<th>2024-2030</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Existing sites with potential</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) New sites with potential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Total potential supply (b+c)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Net Need (a-d)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7.5 Peter Brett Associates consider that there is potentially 1 new site which may be suitable for up to 3 Travelling Showpeople plots. Overall this is 5 plots short of the identified need figure for 2014-2030 and insufficient to meet the first 5 years of needs.

5.7.6 To conform to ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ the Council would generally need to identify sites in the Local Plan in order to meet the needs of the local travelling community within the first 5 years. The study has not identified sufficient sites to meet the need for Travelling Showpeople in the first 5 years and therefore runs the risk of being found unsound at Local Plan examination unless additional policy options in section 5.10 are taken forward.

**Transit Site Provision**

5.7.7 There are currently no public transit sites in York, (Love Lane is privately owned and managed). The GTAA does not identify a need for future transit provision in York.

5.8 **Policy Recommendations**

5.8.1 To meet any unidentified need through the plan period (e.g. 5 to 15 years) and to provide a base for considering planning applications, the Local Plan needs to include a criteria policy. The Local Plan preferred options included a criteria policy (Policy ACHM4) for assessing planning applications.

5.8.2 Peter Brett Associates recommend that all existing sites are safeguarded through the proposed Local Plan and all potential sites should be allocated in the Local Plan. As with other forms of development, the release of additional pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites should be managed to ensure a good fit with identified need.

5.8.3 The policy also needs to be expanded to incorporate targets, as set out in the GTAA. PBA have amended the policy to reflect the findings of the needs assessment and this report, to include:
Targets for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople uses;

Allocate potential sites;

Safeguarding of existing sites;

Criteria for assessing all Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople planning applications.

Revised Policy ACHM4: Sites for Gypsy, Roma, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

I. To meet the identified need, 66 pitches for Gypsy, Roma and Travellers and 8 plots for Travelling Showpeople will be provided at the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land at Moor Lane and B1224</td>
<td>Rufforth</td>
<td>15 pitches</td>
<td>Residential Gypsy and Traveller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Farm,</td>
<td>Naburn</td>
<td>15 pitches</td>
<td>Residential Gypsy and Traveller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Stables</td>
<td>Elvington</td>
<td>3 plots</td>
<td>Travelling Showpeople</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. The following existing sites for Gypsy, Roma, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, will be safeguarded from development which would preclude their continued occupation by these groups, unless acceptable replacement accommodation can be provided or the site is no longer required to meet any identified need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Existing Provision</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Street, Layerthorpe</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>20 pitches</td>
<td>Residential Gypsy and Traveller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Lane, Clifton</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>23 pitches</td>
<td>Residential Gypsy and Traveller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Lane, Fulford</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>17 pitches</td>
<td>Transit Gypsy and Traveller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osbaldwick</td>
<td>Osbaldwick</td>
<td>18 pitches*</td>
<td>Residential Gypsy and Traveller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Including extant permission for 6 pitches.

III. Gypsy, Roma Traveller and Travelling Showpeople uses will be permitted where:

(a) the site is in a sustainable location in terms of accessibility to existing local services;
(b) the site is suitable in terms of vehicular access to the highway, parking, turning and road safety and servicing arrangements and has access to essential services such as water supply, sewerage, drainage, and waste disposal;
(c) proposals make adequate provision for on site facilities for storage, play, residential amenity and sufficient on-site utility services for the number of pitches proposed;
(d) the proposal is well related to the size and location of the site and respects the scale of the nearest settled community;
(e) proposals provide for satisfactory residential amenity both within the site and with neighbouring occupiers and thereby do not detrimentally affect the amenity of local residents by reason of on site business activities, noise, disturbance or loss of privacy;
(f) proposals ensure that the occupation and use of the site would not cause undue harm to the visual amenity, character and setting of York and should be capable of being assimilated into the surrounding landscape without significant adverse effect;
(g) the site is not affected by environmental hazards that may affect the residents’ health or welfare or be located in an area of high risk of flooding, including functional floodplains;
(h) within or adjacent recognised environmental designations, proposals would not compromise the objectives of the designation.
IV. Proposals for sites accommodating Travelling Showpeople should also allow for a mixed use yard with areas for residential provision and the storage and maintenance of equipment. All other proposals for mixed residential and business activities will be assessed on a site specific basis, taking the above criteria into account.

V. Any development granted under this policy will be subject to a condition limiting occupation to Gypsy, Roma and Travellers or Travelling Showpeople, as appropriate.

5.9 Additional Policy Options

5.9.1 The Council have insufficient sites to meet the needs for Gypsy and Traveller pitches within the first 5 years of the GTAA, even if they allocate all potentially suitable and available sites within the general extent of the Green Belt. If the Council proceed without a 5 year supply they will be at risk of having the Local Plan found unsound at examination or at the very least being instructed to undertake further work on this issue. Peter Brett Associates would not recommend consider proceeding unless the Council is confident that every endeavour has been made to review potential site sources to identify sites.

5.9.2 It is clear to Peter Brett Associates that the Council has undertaken considerable technical work to review potential site sources, including incorporating further sites from more recent consultation exercises, including with York Travellers Trust and concerted efforts to identify publically owned sites for consideration. It is considered that without sufficient sites the Council is faced with several choices regarding the Local Plan, including:

- Delaying the Local Plan to undertake further work;
- Separating the provision of Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople from the Local Plan and producing a separate Development Plan Document (DPD) on the use;
- Proceeding without sufficient identified sites in the Local Plan and setting out additional policy, funding and delivery mechanisms to illustrate delivery.

5.9.3 It is not for Peter Brett Associates to make this decision for the Council, but the following observations are set out to help inform the Councils consideration of this difficult issue.

Delaying the Local Plan

5.9.4 The Council appear to have a strong commitment to meeting the needs of the travelling community, but also an overriding objective to adopt a Local Plan and establish a formal planning policy and proposal framework for the future development of the City and its surrounding areas.

5.9.5 Delaying the Local Plan to undertake further work may identify further specific sites, however Peter Brett Associates are of the view that the Council has already considered all the sources of sites and therefore would question what further work could be undertaken or if additional sites would be forthcoming in the short term.
Producing a separate Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Development Plan Document (DPD)

5.9.6 The Council could choose to separate the Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople issue from the Local plan and produce a separate Development Plan Document (DPD). The Council appear to have a strong commitment to meeting the needs of the travelling community and historically have underprovided compared to previous needs assessments.

5.9.7 This approach would enable the Local Plan to proceed, but consequently would delay the planned provision of Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople and consequently continue the historical under provision of pitches and plots. Once the Local Plan is adopted the Green Belt boundary will prevent the identification and delivery of sites outside defined urban areas beyond the Green Belt. Peter Brett Associates would therefore not recommend the Council produce a separate DPD.

Proceeding with the Local Plan at risk

5.9.8 Peter Brett Associates must stress that proceeding without sufficient sites is a significant risk, but in the absence of any likely site options being identified to address the 5 year need requirement and the context of both limited private Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople market activity and historical lack of adopted plan provision and policy could be considered a pragmatic option.

5.9.9 However if the Council were to proceed on this basis Peter Brett Associates would suggest that they cannot be solely reliant on criteria policy to delivery sites and overcome the lack of identified sites in the first 5 years. PBA recommend further consideration of the following additional policy options:

- Consideration sites over 15 pitches contrary to ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ guidance;
- Delivery of Gypsy, Roma, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople provision within strategic Allocations;
- Delivery of Travelling Showpeople provision within non-strategic employment allocations;
- Council Commitment to help the travelling community with funding and delivery
- Cross boundary working.

5.10 Larger Sites

5.10.1 ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ guidance is clear that sites of over 15 pitches are not recommended, best practice has illustrated that sites below this size are easier to manage and in general are preferred by both the travelling community and the settled community. Peter Brett Associates do not recommend sites over 15 pitches and therefore otherwise potentially suitable and available sites are rejected on this basis.
5.10.2 In York, an extension to the Clifton site has been rejected due to the size of the existing site being 23 pitches. The Council’s currently position is in line with guidance, however given the lack of identified sites to meet the needs in the first 5 years the Council may wish to reconsider this option and other sites such as land at Moor Lane/B1224 Rufforth which are physically capable of accommodating more pitches or plots than has been recommended in this study. This would require the careful consideration of design issues to ensure an appropriate proposal comes forward.

5.11 **Strategic Allocations**

5.11.1 To meet needs beyond the first 5 year time period the Council could choose to plan for provision to be included within strategic allocations via policy in the Local Plan. This approach is becoming increasingly common and, subject to master planning and viability, could be a valuable source of pitches/plots in the future. PBA consider that this is generally an option for delivery for beyond the first 5 years due to the longer lead times for delivery of mixed-use strategic developments, however if proposed allocations are phased to come forward in the first 5 years, therefore could represent a policy option of the Council.

5.11.2 The Council Cabinet addendum proposes to use of small parts (less than 1% of the site area) of the largest sites identified in the Plan for the settled community to contribute to provision. The proposed cut off of 50ha would bring in 4 sites.

- ST7 East of Metcalf Lane;
- ST8 North of Monks Cross;
- ST14 Clifton Moor;
- ST15 Whinthorpe.

5.11.3 The Council have presented land owners with a choice in the following priority order; (1) on site provision, (2) provision on another suitable site in their ownership or (3) a commuted sum. The Council could decide that any funds collected could then be used to pay for provision of facilities on any other identified sites and the purchase of sites by the Council.

5.11.4 PBA would recommend that the Council consider making it a policy requirement for on-site Gypsy, Roma Traveller and/or Travelling Showpeople provision within these large strategic allocations. This could be included with in the specific policy for each site or an overall policy for strategic allocations.

5.12 **Travelling Showpeople Provision within employment allocations**

5.12.1 Following correspondence with the Showman’s Guild, the Council have considered setting out policy to support the reuse of employment sites by Travelling Showpeople. It is considered that whilst this policy approach does not specifically identify sites, it could be a positive approach to ensure that redundant employment sites such as builders yards and vacant plots within industrial estates that are no longer required for employment uses are considered for Travelling Showpeople use prior to being considered for alternative land uses,
such as residential. PBA do not recommend this approach for Gypsy and Traveller pitches due to the primary residential nature of this type of development.

5.12.2 Former employment sites would need to meet clear criteria to be considered suitable in the same way as other planning applications such as site access and impacts on historic character and setting of York, environmental designations and residential amenity etc. Travelling Showpeople yards should be permitted on existing and allocated employment sites provided development does not lead to the loss of land that is necessary to meet both immediate and longer term employment land requirements over the plan period in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

5.13 Council commitment to funding and delivery

5.13.1 The Council Cabinet addendum also sets out an offer to all promoters of new Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites for travellers the possibility of:

- Either, Council purchase of the site provided that it is confirmed through the Local Plan examination, with the Council then taking the lead on implementing the new provision

- Or offer a ‘partnership to ensure delivery’ with the owners of proposed sites that are confirmed through the Local Plan examination.

5.13.2 Both options are considered by PBA to help to de-risk implementation. The Council acknowledge that there is a risk attached to if new sites were proposed at the Publication stage of the Local Plan.

5.13.3 Peter Brett Associates would suggest that the Council could potentially do further with the following commitments:

- As acknowledged by the Council, there is a need to identify a third party to take on the long term management of the sites – this could be a Registered Social Landlord or a Traveller organisation;

- Specifically commit funding from strategic allocations (option 3 above) and/or other funding sources such as new homes bonus to the purchase and delivery of sites.

5.14 Cross boundary working

5.14.1 The Council has a duty to co-operate with adjacent authorities and given the lack of sufficient identified sites should make every endeavour to work with neighbouring local authorities to see if they could help meet Yorks need for both Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites.

5.14.2 The needs of Gypsies, Roma, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople do not stop at local authority boundaries and the potential for the delivery of all types of sites (especially public sites) should be explored across these boundaries through the Duty to Cooperate, where appropriate. This is particularly pertinent for a specific family who currently travel across
several Local authorities that City of York Council have committed to meeting the needs of, as the lead authority.

5.14.3 The timing of evidence review is the key consideration for cross boundary working and the production of site assessments to identify specific sites is crucial. York should liaise with adjacent authorities, especially those that have undertaken site work to establish if there are site opportunities that could help the authority to meet its needs.

5.14.4 The duty to co-operate is not the duty to accept, so the Council will have to be both proactive and potentially persuasive if this option if to yield results. Crucially the very definition of the travelling community, would suggest that this land use is in fact very cross boundary in nature and we would encourage Local authorities to resist the political sensitivities of providing suitable site.

5.15 Funding

5.15.1 The Government has identified that it is focusing on incentivising councils to deliver new housing, including traveller sites. ‘Planning policy for traveller sites’ (CLG, March 2012) identified three potential sources of funding for local authorities:

5.15.2 Firstly, the New Homes Bonus scheme which operates in the same way for traveller sites as for other forms of housing. Namely, for every new pitch, a local planning authority will get six years of matched Council Tax funding, with an extra supplement for affordable pitches (such as sites owned or managed by local authorities and Registered Providers).

5.15.3 Secondly, the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) has allocated £1.7bn, as part of its National Affordable Housing Programme for 2015-18, to fund the provision of affordable housing, including traveller sites. The Homes and Communities Agency has launched its prospectus inviting housing associations, councils, developers and others to bid for a share of grant funding for delivery of new affordable housing outside London. Bids will only be accepted for the provision of new traveller pitches and as with other types of accommodation, the Government does not expect to receive bids for schemes on Green Belt land or other land with special environmental protections.

5.15.4 A proportion of the £1.7bn funding will be retained for future bids through ongoing Market Engagement. This will allow organisations to take the longer timeframes they need to submit funding bids where schemes had not been fully worked up by 30 April 2014. when the formal bid round closed. This approach will also encourage bidders to bring forward a higher proportion of firm and realistically deliverable schemes at the outset as it will allow them the flexibility to respond to development opportunities as these arise.

5.16 Delivery and Management

5.16.1 It can be difficult to find organisations willing to manage public sites in York. Councils are sometimes reluctant to take on any new sites and PBA are unaware of any Registered Providers (RP’s) managing any sites in York. It is recommended that the Council discuss the potential delivery and/or management of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites with these RPs, to determine if this is an option.
5.16.2 The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) is also a potential partner to deliver sites. The study has not been made aware of any HCA owned sites within York, but in other Local Authority areas, the HCA works with Councils to deliver new sites.

5.16.3 There are also emerging examples within the country of local planning authorities planning for the future provision of sites for travelling communities by allocating urban extension sites for housing and traveller pitches, requiring developers to design and layout serviced pitches/plots for private sale to Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople. Where there is a demonstrable need for provision, some local planning authorities are identifying a need for developers to provide pitches/plots or commuted sums as part of the overall benefits package required for new development sites. Peter Brett Associates have worked with Mid Sussex Council, who have specifically set out this requirement in adopted policy for a future urban extension.

5.16.4 There are also innovative delivery models being developed in other parts of the country, such as Elim Housing in West of England, which could provide for the funding of initial sites to be recycled to provide for further sites, in the same way as affordable housing has been delivered by housing bodies for some years. For example, the Council could consider using New Homes Bonus or other monies to buy a site or identify their own public assets and then make them available to organised Gypsy and Traveller groups on a non-profit making basis for them to develop and manage. Such groups could also be offered the opportunity to buy stakes in the site, allowing the income from such sales to be recycled to provide further sites.

5.16.5 The Council should investigate these sources of funding and delivery options further, in partnership with the Registered Providers and other delivery partners.

5.17 Phasing and Monitoring

5.17.1 As with other forms of development, the release of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites should be managed to ensure that it corresponds with identified need.

5.17.2 The Council has insufficient sites to meet all needs within the plan period, and also insufficient sites for the first 5 years to meet all the needs. It will be necessary to monitor the situation and revisit the identification of sites in the future. Peter Brett Associates suggest that it would be prudent for the Council to identify a potential reserve of land in the long term which could be brought forward in the future if required, rather than wait for the need to be established and then start a review of the development plan at that time.

5.17.3 Site with potential within the Green Belt for meeting future needs should be considered for allocation to ensure GTAA needs can be delivered. Once sites are identified and allocated, active monitoring of supply against need on an annual basis, as required by ‘Planning policy for traveller sites’, would determine the need for any potential release of land to meet future needs. To ensure that it is able to demonstrate that it has an up to date understanding of local needs, the Council should also undertake periodic review of its needs evidence base via an updated GTAA when appropriate.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ref</th>
<th>Site name and address</th>
<th>Site area (ha)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Historic Character and Setting of York</th>
<th>Environmental Assets</th>
<th>Functioning Floodplain</th>
<th>Contamination or Unstable Land Issues</th>
<th>Noise Issues</th>
<th>Residential Amenity</th>
<th>Historic Environment</th>
<th>Availability for G+T Use</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Should the site be considered further?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YORK001</td>
<td>Chowdene, Malton Road</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Privately promoted to Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK002</td>
<td>Land at Common Road and Hassacarr Road, Dunnington</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>Privately promoted to Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK003</td>
<td>Eastfield Lane, Dunnington</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>Privately promoted to Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK006</td>
<td>The Market Garden, Eastfield Lane, Dunnington</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Privately promoted to Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK007</td>
<td>Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>Privately promoted to Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK008</td>
<td>The Stables, Elvington</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>Private authorised site (temporary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK009</td>
<td>James Street, Layerthorpe</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Public authorised site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK010</td>
<td>Water Lane, Clifton</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>Public authorised site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK011</td>
<td>Love Lane, Fulford</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>Private tolerated site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK012</td>
<td>Osbaldwick, Outgang Lane, Osbaldwick</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Public authorised site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK013</td>
<td>Land at Wetherby Road/Knapton Moor, Knapton</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>Public owned land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK014</td>
<td>Behind Oswaldwick, Outgang Lane, Osbaldwick</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Private unauthorised site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK015</td>
<td>Outgang Lane, Osbaldwick</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Private unauthorised site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK016</td>
<td>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Private owned land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK017</td>
<td>Land at A1237/AB4 junction, Askham Bryan</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>Private owned land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK018</td>
<td>Land at Burton Green, York</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>Council owned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK019</td>
<td>Land at Westfield Fen, York</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Council owned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK020</td>
<td>Land at Moor Lane/B1224, Rufforth</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>Privately promoted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK021</td>
<td>Acres Farm, Naburn</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>Council owned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Sites with No Potential at Stage 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ref</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Reason for rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YORK001</td>
<td>Chowdene York Development</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Development could be accommodated in landscape terms, but it would impact on openness of general extent of the Green Belt in an area where the Green Belt is becoming very limited in extent and where it is vulnerable to further erosion (loss of openness) from piecemeal development. Access is single carriage but there may be capacity to improve the access working with the neighbouring landowner. However the existing access currently serves a caravan park and therefore already provides an access for a similar development use. The site is potentially available for Gypsy and Traveller use. However, the asking price is currently too high for the Council to develop for a public Gypsy and Traveller site, and very likely to be too expensive for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople to purchase and develop themselves privately. The site is therefore not considered suitable or viable for Gypsy, Roma, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople development at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK002</td>
<td>Land at Common Road and Hassacarr Road Dunington</td>
<td>Dunington</td>
<td>The majority of the site is within flood zone 3 and unsuitable for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople use. The northern corner is outside flood zone 3. However, development in this location would have a significant adverse effect on the village’s approach and setting. Development would conflict with the purposes of Draft Green Belt and would appear as an obvious encroachment into the open countryside, and would reduce the openness that exists in the small area of open general extent of the Green Belt. The site is therefore not considered suitable for Gypsy, Roma Traveller or Travelling Showpeople development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK009</td>
<td>James Street, Layerthorpe York</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>This is an existing public Gypsy and Traveller site which has planning permission for 20 pitches. The existing site should be safeguarded as a residential Gypsy and Traveller site in the Local Plan. The site is over the recommended number of pitches for a site and therefore it is not considered suitable for further intensification or expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK010</td>
<td>Water Lane, Clifton York</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>This is an existing public Gypsy and Traveller site which has planning permission for 23 pitches. The existing site should be safeguarded as a residential Gypsy and Traveller site in the Local Plan. The site does have capacity for a further pitches, and there are no planning policy restrictions and the site is within the urban area of York. However, the site is over the recommended number of pitches for a Gypsy and Traveller site and therefore not a recommended location for further pitches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK011</td>
<td>Love Lane, Fulford York</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>This is an existing private unauthorised Gypsy and Traveller site which is very likely to have established lawfulness over the passage of time. It has a license for the provision of 17 permanent pitches and currently operates as a transit site. The site should be safeguarded for Gypsy and Traveller use in the Local Plan. The site is over the recommended number of pitches for a site and therefore it is not considered suitable for further intensification or expansion. Beyond current licensed levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK012</td>
<td>Osbaldwick, Outgang Lane Osbaldwick</td>
<td>Osbaldwick</td>
<td>This is an existing public Gypsy and Traveller site which has an implemented planning permission for 12 pitches. Planning permission has recently been granted for an extension of a further 6 pitches (18 total). The site should be safeguarded for residential Gypsy and Traveller use in the Local Plan. The site is over the recommended number of pitches for a site and therefore it is not considered suitable for further intensification or expansion, beyond which is already permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK013</td>
<td>Land north of Wetherby Road/Knapton Moor York</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>The site is not suitable for Gypsy and Traveller use as it would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape and general extent of the Green Belt purposes. Development in this location is likely to be prominent, would be out of character with the surroundings, and would represent a clear encroachment into open countryside. There is also a large landfill site to the north west of the site, which could have a negative impact on residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK016</td>
<td>Land at Elvington Lane Elvington</td>
<td>Elvington</td>
<td>The site is potentially suitable for Gypsy and Traveller use. The site is within the general extent of the Green Belt and therefore only suitable if there are not enough sites outside of the Green Belt area to meet the identified needs of Gypsies and Travellers across the whole area. Availability and therefore deliverability is uncertain due to the owners ambition to develop the site for residential use. This combined with the negligible activity in the private market for provision makes delivery unclear. In principle, any proposal for this site would require mitigation measures relating to ecology, flooding, landscape and highway access. The site is considered capable of appropriate mitigation to ensure development for Gypsy and Traveller use is suitable and it is recommend that the Council keep the site under review to monitor if the sites availability and therefore deliverability becomes more certain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ref</td>
<td>Site name</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Reason for rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK017</td>
<td>Land at A1237/A64 junction, Askam Bryan</td>
<td>Askham</td>
<td>The site is potentially available but considered to be the primary location for a CNG facility due to it being the only site within the authority with a high pressure gas main. Development within the site could conflict with the purposes of general extent of the Green Belt and could constitute an obvious encroachment into the open countryside, within an area where the character is rural and generally uninterrupted by any significant development (although the busy roads, telecommunications mast, and the sewage works are particular detractors adjoining the site). Development of this type is likely to be particularly prominent in views from the north in landscape terms. Overall the consideration of other uses and negative impact on the general extent of the Green Belt and landscape are likely to make this site unsuitable and/or unavailable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK018</td>
<td>Land at Burton Green</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>The site is considered unsuitable as it does not have a suitable access to the highway and would have an unacceptable impact on the Bootham stray/ general extent of the Green Belt. The southern part of the site is also immediately adjacent residential properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YORK019</td>
<td>Land at Westfield Fen</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>The site is considered unsuitable as it does not have access to the highway. The north east corner is designated as a Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC) and the southern part of the site is also immediately adjacent residential properties. The site was previously used as a landfill site and has been investigated by the Council who found elevated levels of contaminants in the soil and groundwater. The site is therefore rejected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Sites with Potential at Stage 2
Description of site

This is an existing Travelling Showpeople site, comprising a roughly triangular grass field, currently being used by a single travelling showpeople family. A mobile residential unit and caravan are located on the northern side of the site, behind a belt of deciduous woodland, east of the site entrance off Elvington Lane; a timber stable block, where equipment and a touring caravan is stored, is located on the opposite side of the entrance. There is a large area of stone-surfaced hardstanding, some of which has grassed over. The south western boundary is defined by a post and rail fence alongside the mature tree-lined drive up to Brinkworth Hall and Brinkworth Park House set in mature grounds. A lodge house lies at the end of the drive adjoining the north western end of the site; a large detached house (Oaktrees) adjoins the site at the northern end of the eastern boundary. Elvington Airfield industrial estate lies to the west, beyond the Hall.

Site ref

YORK008

Site name

The Stables, Elvington

Settlement

Elvington

Site address

Local authority

City of York

Size (ha)

1.57

Planning history

The site gained temporary planning permission (10/02082/FUL) for a Travelling Showpeople's site, for 5 years from 14.06.11, on appeal (APP/C2741/A/10/2142092). This included the re-use of the stables as storage for showmen's equipment.

AVAILABILITY

The site has temporary permission for 1 plot which allows permission in the short term (5 years). There are currently a couple of children on site and in the longer term there is the need for 2 additional plots (3 total).

SUITSABILITY

Policy constraints

The site was identified in the Local Plan Preferred Options document and was consulted upon for Gypsy, Traveller and Traveller Showpeople use.

Draft Local Plan 4th set of changes (2005) policies: Green Belt

The site is identified in the Preferred Options Local Plan consultation document (Policy ACHM3: Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople Allocations) for an allocation of 1 plot.

Physical constraints

Highway officer - The provision of access from the highway is viable, although the location would require careful consideration in order that visibility, including that for approaching (and turning) traffic is to the required standards based upon the speed limit. Forming appropriate sight lines may necessitate the removal/repositioning of boundary landscaping.

Yorkshire Water - There is a Yorkshire Water easement crossing the site. The site is remote from the public sewer network. The nearest sewer with capacity to accept this site is a significant distance from the site. A connection will be likely to incur significant cost.

Areas of character and setting in the Green Belt

Appeal decision from Inspector stated that "The site benefits from some screening and is capable of further landscaping. Impact on neighbouring uses would be limited".

Landscape comments - Given the significant enclosure of the site from public locations the development has a limited adverse effect on views, and these are restricted primarily to the immediate road frontage and principally, it would seem, in winter owing to the deciduous nature of the wide tree belt (covered by TPO) that intervenes along the south side of the road. The site is open to views from the private drive serving the properties at Brinkworth Hall. The Airfield development and the Elvington estate to the east have a significant adverse effect on the character of the wider surroundings such that the development within the site is not entirely at odds with the surrounding settlement pattern. The whole site is much larger than that required to accommodate a plot for a single family and there are no internal boundaries that provide a discreet smaller contained plot within the site. However, there is scope to create a contained site within the field with an appropriate and comprehensive landscape scheme (based on species that are appropriate to the character of this location); this could include additional land to accommodate the possible growing needs of the family. There is the potential to create further logical plots here through long term, extensive woodland planting that contained the site from the west, south and east, and defined a clear area for expansion within centred on the existing location.
Other Potential Impacts

Archaeology officer - The City of York HER records archaeological monuments (medieval ridge and furrow and Elvington Airfield) within and immediately adjacent to this site. There are no designated heritage assets within the site. There are no archaeological reasons why this site could not be allocated. However, prior to development a full archaeological field evaluation will be required. A report on the results of the evaluation and an agreed mitigation strategy for any archaeological remains identified on the site must be submitted as part of a Heritage Statement in support of an application.

ACHIEVABILITY

The site is occupied and owned by a Travelling Showpeople family who have temporary permission for 1 plot. There is a Yorkshire Water easement crossing the site and the restrictions on development are being explored with Yorkshire Water and yet to be confirmed.

Conclusion

This is an existing Travelling Showpeople site with temporary permission for 1 plot. The site has an immediate need for 1 plot and presently (in the long-term) for a further 2 plots. The site is suitable for further plots subject to suitable landscape mitigation measures. There is a Yorkshire Water easement crossing the site and the restrictions on development are being explored with Yorkshire Water and yet to be confirmed. The site offers the potential for living and working on site given the existing mixed use of the site. This area will allow for on-site provision of facilities for parking, storage, play and residential amenity.

DELIVERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delivery model

- [✓] Privately owned traveller site requiring planning permission.
- [ ] Site available to be purchased and occupied by traveller family.
- [ ] Use of public grants to allow site to be purchased and managed by travellers.
- [ ] Existing public owned site to be developed for publicly managed traveller provision.
- [ ] Purchase of site by public bodies for publicly managed traveller provision.

This map is reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map by Peter Brett Associates with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office - Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. City of York Council. 2013.
Description of site
The site consists of a low lying, broadly rectangular, medium sized field located directly north of Wetherby Road, west of Moor Lane which is followed by a public right of way. A large refuse tip, which has created a prominent raised artificial landform, is active directly to the north of the site and there is a strong odour arising from it.

AVAILABILITY
The site is privately owned and being promoted for Gypsy and Traveller use.

SUITABILITY
Policy constraints
Draft Local Plan 4th set of changes (2005) policies: Draft Green Belt. Current emerging evidence base being produced by the Council indicate that the area does not meet the purposes of the Green Belt.

Physical constraints
Council Highways - A detailed assessment will need to be undertaken to considering providing safe vehicular access to the site. The B1224 is derestricted, with a 60 limit and obviously carries traffic travelling at speed, including above average volumes of HGV’s. The introduction of turning traffic is a genuine risk and location of the access and visibility would need to meet national standards. I would advise that visibility spays of 215 metres would be required in both directions and this could impact on current boundary hedgerows, meaning that they would need to be removed and/or substantially cut back. Forward sight lines approaching the access would also need to be demonstrated, together with the potential for some traffic management measures to ensure that the entrance was robust in highway safety terms, which could include lighting, signing, road markings and coloured surface treatments.

Access to services: 
The location will offer negligible opportunity for residents to undertake travel on foot by bike or bus. However the size of the site will limit those circumstances, and I suspect pitches would be limited by the council should it consider it a suitable site. As with other potential allocations I would advise it appropriate for bus stops to be secured/created in proximity to the frontage/main access. This would be in the form of a limited section of hard standing and bus stop pole/flag. The access to the site should have a section of footway connecting to the stops. In addition there would be the need to assess the requirement to provide crossing facilities to the bus stop on the south side of B1224. This would need to be confirmed as viable with Andrew Bradley/Sam Fryers.

Areas of character and setting in the Green Belt
The site comprises a broadly rectangular area of level pasture land located between the northern side of Wetherby Road and a large active landfill site with a raised prominent artificial landform that is particularly notable in this otherwise quite flat/gently undulating landscape. The field boundaries are defined by reasonable hedgerows which provide a reasonable level of containment in summer, although the roadside hedgerow is thin and there are very filtered views through it into the site in summer; quite open views are likely to be possible in winter. A bridleway follows a grass track alongside the eastern boundary beyond which lies open level arable land allowing moderately distant views across the countryside; similarly open level farmland lies to the south of the road with an airfield and transport depot to the south west. The western boundary is defined by a small watercourse and hedgerow with some trees, beyond which are two further level fields, the western most one of which is currently subject of an application for a waste transfer facility. A hedgerow containing some trees defines the northern site boundary with the raised landfill site which forms a backdrop to it. Access into the field is off a layby at the southern end of the eastern track. Whilst a G&T development at this site would constitute a sporadic development in the countryside (and general extent of the Green Belt if it is to be retained in the new Local Plan) it would possible, lacking alternative better sites, to accommodate a modest G&T development in this location; the most appropriate location would be in the north eastern part of the field where it could be ‘tucked in’ to the field corner. However, mitigation would be needed in the form of planting to provide containment from the rest of the field (also to deter piecemeal expansion/activities that would adversely affect the character of the remaining field); reinforcement of the southern roadside hedgerow to provide year-round visual containment from the road; safeguarding of the eastern hedgerow alongside the track and the use/amenity of the bridleway; and planting to conceal the view into the site from the access. The site could constitute an encroachment into the countryside (Green Belt purpose 3) and, potentially, an adverse effect on one of the approaches to York thereby conflicting with the preservation of the wider setting of the historic city (purpose 4), although it is recognised that there are some significant existing detracting influences in this locality and therefore appropriate mitigation and removal from the general extent of the Green Belt in the Local Plan could address this.
Other Potential Impacts
Council Ecologist - From information available there are no major biodiversity constraints for this site. Aerial photos show the site to be an arable field surrounded by mature hedgerows and mature standing trees. The site is not designated or immediately adjacent to any statutory or non-statutory nature conservation sites. However as normal any application coming forward would need an ecological assessment, as there are ponds within 500m of the site that could support great crested newts, water courses adjacent to the site which could provide habitat for water voles and hedgerows/trees that could support nesting birds and foraging bats. The site falls within a SSSI risk assessment zone for Askham Bog and Clifton Ings & Rawcliffe SSSIs for ‘developments where any discharge of water or liquid waste that is more than 20m³/day’ so that if this applied to a development on this site then Natural England would need to be consulted.

ACHIEVABILITY
The impact of the landfill on residential amenity in this location is unknown and requires further investigation, therefore the achievability of this site is unknown at present. There are potential costs for mitigation measures relating to landscaping, potential contamination issues and transport measures which will need to be overcome. Otherwise, there appear to be no reasons why the site could not be developed for Gypsy and Traveller use. The land is available, policy and physical constraints are potentially capable of being overcome and mitigation measures are feasible subject to the ability of the owner/Local Authority to finance the development.

Conclusion
The site is considered suitable subject to several caveats that will require further investigations by any potential planning applicant. Issues include the proximity to the adjacent landfill site and the potential effects of noise and air pollution, this will have to be address to the satisfaction of the environmental protection team. Substantial landscape mitigation will be required to address the sites potential impacts on the landscape and surrounding general extent of the Green Belt. Ground contamination issues will been to be investigated and transport and access concerns will also require careful consideration as part of any planning application if the site is to be delivered.

DELIVERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Type of use     | Residential |

| Delivery model   | ✔ Privately owned traveller site requiring planning permission. |
|                  | ✔ Purchase of site by public bodies for publicly managed traveller provision. |

This map is reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map by Peter Brett Associates with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office - Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. City of York Council. 2013.
The site comprises a series of agricultural field and farm buildings. The collection of farm buildings are located in the north eastern corner. The associated farm land is located to the south and west of the site. It is located just south of the York Outlet Village and east of a sewerage plant. Surrounding uses include agricultural land.

### Planning history
Site is part of a larger parcel of land (site 609) identified in the Site Selection Paper, produced for the Local Plan Preferred Options.

Within the Further Sites document the site, as part of a strategic site of 15 hectares, was recommended as an employment allocation.

### Availability
The site is owned by York City Council and therefore deemed potentially available for Gypsy, Roma Traveller and Travelling Showpeople use.

### Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: call for sites</th>
<th>Source: current unauthorised</th>
<th>Source: strategic site</th>
<th>Source: candidate site</th>
<th>Source: public owned land</th>
<th>Source: privately promoted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Policy Constraints

**Draft Local Plan 4th set of changes (2005) policies: Draft Green Belt.** Current emerging evidence base being produced by the Council indicate that the area does not meet the purposes of the Green Belt.

A small section in the middle of the site is within flood zone 3a.

### Physical Constraints

Council Highways - Comments relate to any access coming off Naburn Lane. The introduction of turning traffic is a genuine risk and location of the access and visibility would need to meet national standards. Visibility spays of 215 metres would be required in both directions and this could impact on current boundary hedgerows, meaning that they would need to be removed and/or substantially cut back. Forward sight lines approaching the access would also need to be demonstrated, together with the potential for some traffic management measures to ensure that the entrance was robust in highway safety terms, which could include lighting, signing, road markings and coloured surface treatments.

The small section within the central part of the site is within flood zone 3 and is unsuitable for Gypsy and Traveller use.

### Accessibility to services:

This site offers opportunity for safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle access, using the sustrans cycle route from the site to the village of Naburn where the school and local facilities are located and safe pedestrian access via footways into Fulford. The existing Park and Ride at the Designer Outlet which is within walking or cycling distance offers good access to the public transport network.

### Areas of character and setting in the Green Belt

The site is proposed as part of a wider allocation for employment use. In landscape terms the site is not considered suitable in isolation, but as part of the wider allocation is not considered to have any additional landscape impact. The site located within the general extent of the Green Belt, but if it is allocated for employment purposes is not considered to have any additional impacts on the purposes of general extent of the Green Belt. In isolation development for Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and/or Travelling Showpeople development is likely to undermine the openness of the Draft Green Belt and represent an encroachment in the open countryside. The site is particularly visible from the South.
Other Potential Impacts

The site is located close to a sewerage treatment works which could impact on the residential amenity of future Gypsies and Travellers living in this location, which would require further investigation. This site is all improved grassland but may have a bit of ecological interest. Site is also in proximity to Naburn Marsh SSSI wetland habitat. May require advice from Natural England with regard to impact upon SSSI and breeding waders but the site is thought small enough to be able to mitigate any effects.

ACHIEVABILITY

There appear to be no reasons why the site could not be developed by public bodies. There are a number of farm buildings grouped together in the north eastern corner of the site and this area realistically would not be used for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople use, due to the expense of demolishing the buildings in this location. However the eastern part of the site is available, policy and physical constraints are capable of being overcome if part of a wider employment development and mitigation measures are feasible subject to the ability of the public body to finance the development, either through grant monies or utilising existing assets.

Conclusion

The eastern part of the site has existing farm buildings, and therefore the most suitable location for Gypsy and Traveller use is on the western side of the site, with access off the B1222 outside flood zone 3. The site is considered suitable as part of a wider employment allocation but not a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople development in isolation.

DELIVERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Yield</th>
<th>2013 - 2018</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018 - 2023</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2023 - 2028</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of use

- Residential

Delivery model

- Privately owned traveller site requiring planning permission.
- Site available to be purchased and occupied by traveller family.
- Use of public grants to allow site to be purchased and managed by travellers.
- Existing public owned site to be developed for publicly managed traveller provision.
- Purchase of site by public bodies for publicly managed traveller provision.
EXAMPLE OF 1-2 PITCH PRIVATE SITE (0.14 acres)

Use of existing landscaping (such as mature hedgerows) is desirable particularly if it encourages biodiversity (generally native species) and is low maintenance. It affords a good level of privacy and security without the defensive/hostile nature of gates, walls and fences. That said, each site will need to be designed with the appropriate security measures in mind as per the Police’s ‘Secure By Design’ Principles. There will be considerable difference in these needs between urban and rural locations, for example.

There should be at least a 3m gap within the inside of all site perimeter boundaries and a 6m gap between combustible units, which includes caravans and mobile homes, though not amenity buildings if made out of non-combustible materials.

Government guidance suggests that amenity buildings should include:

- water closet (basin, toilet, bath/shower)
- (open plan) kitchen/dining/living area
- secure storage space for harmful substances/medicines
- enclosed storage for food, broom, washing/cleaning items
- space for cooker, fridge/freezer & washing machine

We suggest also that a large porch, veranda or other covered outdoor space would be useful given the limited indoor living space and the relatively high levels of cloud cover and precipitation in this country.

Access routes will need to accommodate all vehicles that need access to the site. In this case tracking would need to be carried out to ensure that there is sufficient turning space (on hard standing if regularly moved) for a large mobile home. Standards for refuse and fire truck access will need to be met too. Again, in this case space for safe stopping only is needed as the site is small enough to ensure that distance to refuse collection points and hose length standards are met. These standards and others can be found in Building Regulations and Manual for Streets.

Living quarters should generally not be overlooked by neighbours so some further hedging may be necessary.

Some families will also have need of grazing land for their horse(s). Minimum spaces are for 1 horse to 1 acre (or 0.5 acre for ponies or horses under 14.2 hands).

A secure/lockable shed should be provided for storage of things like bicycles and other large but portable equipment. Size is dependent on needs, but there should be sufficient space for each member of the family to have a bicycle as well as any other gardening equipment.

Ideally sites would provide space play and/or food growing. In this instance this area of land could also accommodate a further pitch if necessary, though that would of course restrict the play and food growing to the small open space on each pitch.

Access to washing lines (diam. 309cm) will ensure that all families can wash their own clothes and is a useful amenity. Space for large UK mobile homes (8.15m x 2.46m) and large touring caravans (5.85m x 2.10m) will need to be provided as well as space for local residents to park their vehicles. Sized is dependent on the number of pitches on the site.

A secure/lockable shed should be provided for storage of things like bicycles and other large but portable equipment. Size is dependent on needs, but there should be sufficient space for each member of the family to have a bicycle as well as any other gardening equipment.

Access to washing lines (diam. 309cm) will ensure that all families can wash their own clothes and is a useful amenity. Space for large UK mobile homes (8.15m x 2.46m) and large touring caravans (5.85m x 2.10m) will need to be provided as well as space for local residents to park their vehicles. Sized is dependent on the number of pitches on the site.

Living quarters should generally not be overlooked by neighbours so some further hedging may be necessary.

Some families will also have need of grazing land for their horse(s). Minimum spaces are for 1 horse to 1 acre (or 0.5 acre for ponies or horses under 14.2 hands).

A secure/lockable shed should be provided for storage of things like bicycles and other large but portable equipment. Size is dependent on needs, but there should be sufficient space for each member of the family to have a bicycle as well as any other gardening equipment.

Ideally sites would provide space play and/or food growing. In this instance this area of land could also accommodate a further pitch if necessary, though that would of course restrict the play and food growing to the small open space on each pitch.

Access to washing lines (diam. 309cm) will ensure that all families can wash their own clothes and is a useful amenity. Space for large UK mobile homes (8.15m x 2.46m) and large touring caravans (5.85m x 2.10m) will need to be provided as well as space for local residents to park their vehicles. Sized is dependent on the number of pitches on the site.

Living quarters should generally not be overlooked by neighbours so some further hedging may be necessary.

Some families will also have need of grazing land for their horse(s). Minimum spaces are for 1 horse to 1 acre (or 0.5 acre for ponies or horses under 14.2 hands).
Use of existing landscaping (such as mature hedgerows) is desirable particularly if it encourages biodiversity (generally native species) and is low maintenance. It affords a good level of privacy and security without the defensive/hospitable nature of gates, walls and fences. That said, each site will need to be designed with the appropriate security measures in mind as per the Police's "Secure By Design" Principles. There will be considerable difference in these needs between urban and rural locations, for example.

There should be at least a 3m gap within the inside of all site perimeter boundaries and a 6m gap between combustible units, which includes caravans and mobile homes, though not amenity buildings if made out of non-combustible materials.

Specific additional space available for scrap storage can be well used (e.g. Piddlehinton Gypsy Site)

A site manager's office is ideally located near the entrance for ease of access and is of a size to accommodate an office, a kitchenette, a bathroom and a storage room.

Government guidance suggests that amenity buildings should include:
- water closet (basin, toilet, bath/shower)
- (open plan) kitchen/dining/living area
- secure storage space for harmful substances/medicines
- enclosed storage for food, broom, washing/cleaning items
- space for cooker, fridge/freezer & washing machine

We suggest also that a large porch, veranda or other covered outdoor space would be useful given the limited indoor living space and the relatively high levels of cloud cover and precipitation in this country.

Access routes will need to accommodate all vehicles that need access to the site. In this case tracking would need to be carried out to ensure that there is sufficient turning space for a large mobile home. Standards for refuse and fire truck access will need to be met too. Again, in this case space for safe stopping only is needed as the site is small enough to ensure that distance to refuse collection points and hose length standards are met. These standards and others can be found in Building Regulations and Manual for Streets.

A secure/lockable shed should be provided for storage of things like bicycles and other large, but portable equipment. Size is dependent on needs, but there should be sufficient space for each member of the family to have a bicycle as well as any other gardening equipment.

A horseshoe layout is recommended in government guidance as it allows residents to look out for each other while at the same time affording sufficient privacy. It also allows a central play area/open space that is easily visible from each of the pitches.

Some families will also have need of grazing land for their horse(s). Minimum spaces are for 1 horse to 1 acre (or 0.5 acre for ponies or horses under 14.2 hands).

Living quarters should generally not be overlooked by neighbours so some further hedging may be necessary.

A communal building may be needed where an existing building is inacessible. This is particularly useful for larger sites. It can be an important resource in sustaining a more remote site, offering an opportunity for health visitors, youth workers and education services, as well as for use by residents and the site manager.

Some families will also have need of grazing land for their horse(s). Minimum spaces are for 1 horse to 1 acre (or 0.5 acre for ponies or horses under 14.2 hands).

A communal building may be needed where an existing building is inaccessible. This is particularly useful for larger sites. It can be an important resource in sustaining a more remote site, offering an opportunity for health visitors, youth workers and education services, as well as for use by residents and the site manager.