

Heine Planning Consultancy

Alison T Heine B.Sc, M.sc, MRTPI

10 Whitehall Drive, Hartford, Northwich, Cheshire CW8 1SJ

Tel: 01606 77775 e-mail: heineplanning@btinternet.com

25 September 2012

L1 – Barnsley dpd

Barnsley Council
Planning and Transportation
LDF / Development Plan section
PO BOX 604
Barnsley
S70 9FE

Dear Sir/ Madam

**Consultation on Development Sites and Places Consultation draft
Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
GT1 and GT2**

I have been unable to make my comments on line even though I registered to do so. Your system is very hard to access and despite many efforts to register my comments I have been prevented from doing so. I am therefore writing and would appreciate acknowledgement of this submission.

The overarching aim of PPTS is to ensure fair and equal treatment for Travellers. This policy fails to do this for the following reasons

1. The evidence base is out of date. Policy refers to a desk top refresh of the 2007 GTAA but this has not been published. This refreshed study has been discredited at recent appeals in Doncaster. It is not known how robust an assessment was made of the situation in Barnsley. The refreshed assessment should be subject to public scrutiny. There is no provision for benchmarking or scrutiny by a Regional Panel of inspectors. We are only told of the need for 2011-2016. This is an immediate, overdue need. The aim of 2011 Core Strategy was to meet the shortfall of sites for Travellers. The need for 10-15 years is not indicated. We are not told how this will be met. At best this policy will only address this need by the end of the plan period. That is not good enough. A more immediate solution is needed. It could be 18-24 months after the plan is adopted before

sites are provided as land will have to be bought, permission sought, remediation carried out, services provided, funding secured and building work done. Barnsley has a very poor record of doing anything to assist Travellers. Very few additional pitches have been provided.

2. As for general housing supply choice should be provided both in terms of location, type of development, size of site and tenure. The proposed policy offers very little choice
3. An indication should be provided of how many pitches would be provided at the locations put forward
4. Sites for Travellers in the Green Belt have been ruled out yet an exception to inappropriate housing development in the Green Belt is proposed for large, low density, high value housing. This is quite unacceptable. It discriminates in favour of the affluent and discriminates against Travellers.
5. It is unclear how policy will deliver the urgent pressing need for more sites in this district.

GT1 Protecting existing sites

This policy is supported but should not be used to retain sites in unsuitable locations.

Ings Road Wombwell is an unsuitable location. It was seriously flooded in 2007 causing serious damage to caravans. I am told it flooded again this year requiring some evacuation. The Table of rejected sites indicates that other sites have been rejected for reasons of flood risk. This site should not be safeguarded unless measures are to be taken to address the flood risk situation. Provision should be made to re locate those families still living on this land.

GT2 Additional sites

Only two sites are put forward. It is understood they are on safeguarded sites but they are outside urban areas and do not therefore even comply with adopted policy CSP 18.

Policy does not appear to have had any regard to the potential of existing private sites which could address the immediate need for more sites. There is no consideration of private sites occupied or put forward for sites in recent years at:

- a) Pleasant View, off Smithies Lane*
- b) Adjoining the canal on Shaw Lane, Carlton
- c) Engine Lane, FerryMore Way*
- d) Dovecliff Road Wombwell**
- e) Intake Lane Cudworth on land to rear of Cadwell Close –now on land adjoining a proposed housing area

*It is understood that those sites marked with an asterix are still occupied

**The site at Wombwell was considered as part of a planning application 2008/1512. The owner has addressed the highway issue and would like this site to be re considered as part of the consultation exercise.

There may be other sites I am not aware of.

After the consultation exercise started a table was published to list all sites considered as part of this process. This information should have been available at the outset to inform this process.

Many suitable sites have been ruled out simply because they are in the Green Belt yet the plan intends to make an exception for other residential development in the Green Belt. This is inequitable. Core strategy policy CSP 18 does not exclude sites in the Green Belt but does advise that they should be primarily located within urban areas.

Further details are needed to consider the suitability of the two sites identified. In particular we are not even told who owns the land.

Shaw Lane: We are told there is low level contamination and the site was earmarked for employment land. Why is this land not being put forward for general housing? What is wrong with it? How expensive would this site be to remediate, connect to mains services and make suitable for residential occupation?

Doncaster Road Darfield: This out of centre is accessed off a busy road. Is a pavement proposed to connect to nearby settlements? Is access safe?

It is not clear if either site would be made available at less than best consideration for sale to Travellers for small private family sites.

Policy fails to identify suitable sites for small family sites. Most unauthorised sites are for small family sites.

Yours faithfully

Mrs A Heine