

**Initial Sustainability Appraisal of the
Draft Gypsy and Traveller
Local Plan
(Preferred Options)**

May 2015

Introduction

Wokingham Borough Council is producing a Gypsy and Travellers Local Plan (GTLP) to address the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers in the Borough. This will include the allocation of sites and the formation of criteria-based policies.

The Council consulted upon the Draft Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)) Scoping Report of the GTLP from 18th July to 23rd August 2013. This contained a number of objectives against which the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan (GTLP) was proposed to be assessed. Following this stage the Council has drafted options to consider in the GTLP and the Draft Options Paper and its accompanying SA/SEA were then consulted on from 7th August to 2nd October 2014.

The results of the draft options consultation have been considered and have allowed the Council to identify its preferred options for the GTLP. This document is the SA/SEA of the preferred options. It looks at how each option performs against the SA criteria and will be assessed on a consistent basis to identify if any issues associated with the option could be mitigated.

The Council is seeking your views on the SA/SEA of the preferred options for the GTLP. The consultation is running from 4th June to 30th July 2015. (Please note this **does not** include assessment of potential sites for allocation.)

The SA/SEA of the GTLP Preferred Options consists of the following:

Chapter 1 – Non-Technical Summary

Chapter 2 – Sustainability Appraisal (Incorporating the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)) of the GTLP Preferred Options

Chapter 1 – Non-Technical Summary

- 1.1 An essential part of drawing up planning documents involves assessing their impact on the environment and upon quality of life both now and in the future. To help address this Sustainability Appraisals (SAs) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) are carried out alongside the preparation of planning documents to make sure that social, environmental and economic issues are taken into account at every stage, in order to ensure sustainable delivery.
- 1.2 The Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process and the first stage of the SA was the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The Council carried out a 6 week consultation seeking views on the Draft Scoping Report from the 18th of July to 23rd of August 2013. The Scoping Report contained a number of objectives against which the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan (GTLP) was proposed to be assessed. Taking account of responses received, the objectives were then agreed.
- 1.3 A Draft Options Paper for the GTLP was then prepared, together with an accompanying SA/SEA which assessed each of the main issues associated with meeting Gypsy and Traveller need in Wokingham Borough and what alternative options were available to address them. These two documents were subject to an 8 week consultation from 7th August to 2nd October 2014.
- 1.4 Following this consultation the Council has now undertaken a SA/SEA of the Preferred Options for the GTLP.
- 1.5 This Non- Technical Summary consists of the following sections:
 - The role of the GTLP
 - An outline of the role of the SA, incorporating the SEA, in appraising the impact of the Preferred Options for the GTLP
 - A summary of what the SA/SEA has found

Role of the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan

- 1.6 The Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan sets out how the Council will meet Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation needs in Wokingham Borough until 2027.
- 1.7 In March 2014 Wokingham Borough Council commissioned a refresh to the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) to ensure the robustness of the evidence for future pitch requirements. The updated GTAA was published in June 2015. This study found a need for 52 additional permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches in Wokingham Borough between 2014 and 2029. In the first 5 year period (2014-2019) there is a need for 21 pitches.

1.8 As a result of the updated GTAA, the GTLP has the following objectives:

- To deliver 52 Gypsy and Traveller pitches between 2014 and 2029, to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsy and Travellers in Wokingham Borough.
- To minimise the number of unauthorised sites by identifying a supply of deliverable and developable sites throughout the Plan period (up to 2029).
- To deliver a supply of permanent sites in close proximity to existing settlements that will improve access to healthcare, education and other services.
- To provide a clear policy framework for making decisions on applications regarding Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites in Wokingham Borough.

1.9 Following the results of the Draft Options consultation, the preferred options for site allocations and policies have been identified and are outlined in the GTLP Preferred Options Paper. These are summarised as follows:

Issue	Preferred Option
Issue A - Approaches to meeting Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Requirements	Option f: using a mix of options a – e (including allocating new sites, expanding existing sites and granting permission to established unauthorised sites where appropriate)
Issue B - Site Size	Option c: 15 pitches and under
Issue C – Site Distribution	Option c: the Council should not include a policy on site distribution in the GTLP
Issue D – Phasing of Site Allocations	Option b: to have no phasing of sites
Issue E – Allocation of Reserve Sites	Option b: to not allocate reserve Gypsy and Traveller sites
Issue F – Sites for Travelling Showpeople	Option b: to not allocate sites for Travelling Showpeople
Issue G – Transit Sites	Option b: to not allocate transit sites
Issue H – Site Layout, Safety and Management	Option a: to include a specific local policy on site layout, safety and management in the GTLP, including all of the identified issues
Issue I – Site Boundaries and Landscaping	Option a: to include a specific local policy on boundaries and landscaping in the GTLP, including all of the identified issues
Issue J – Standards for Amenity Buildings	Option a: to include a specific local policy on amenity buildings in the GTLP, including all of the identified issues
Issue K – Site Retention and Restoration	The Council should seek to retain sites in Gypsy and Traveller use and require their restoration after that use ceases Option d: using a mix of planning conditions, legal agreements and a 'restoration and retention' policy in the GTLP is preferred

Characteristics of Wokingham Borough

- 1.10 Wokingham Borough covers an area of 17,892 hectares (Ha) and is made up of three towns and fourteen parishes. Despite being near the nation's capital and the location of a number of modern employment areas, the Borough is noted for its rural character including woodlands, river valleys, heaths and secluded villages such as Farley Hill and Remenham. The natural environment, wildlife, biodiversity and heritage assets of the Borough provide considerable socio-economic value as they all contribute to the Wokingham's attractiveness as a place to live, work and visit. The Borough's diversity is confirmed by the Council's Landscape Character Assessment, which shows that the Borough has three separate Landscape Areas defined at a national level.
- 1.11 The four Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) in Wokingham Borough are Heath Lake; Longmoor Bog; Sandford Mill & Lodge Wood and Stanford End Mill & River Loddon). There are also a number of other SSSIs within 2km of the Borough boundary (Temple Island Meadows, Rodbed Wood, Harpsden Woods, Bramshill, Wellington College Bog, Sandhurst to Owlsmoor Bogs and Heaths, Broadmoor to Bagshot Woods and Heaths, and Wykery Copse).
- 1.12 The Borough also contains three Country Parks, 117 Local Wildlife Sites and 10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR) covering an area of 79.4Ha, as well as sections of the Rivers Blackwater, Loddon and Thames together with the Emm Brook.
- 1.13 14.2% of the Borough is covered by woodland, which amounts to 2550Ha (Source: Berkshire Nature Conservation Forum (BCNF)). Wokingham Borough contains 14% of the Berkshire woodland resource in only 14% of the county's land area.
- 1.14 The Borough has 17 priority Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species, emphasising its local wildlife value.
- 1.15 Much of the southern third of the Borough lies within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA). The Borough Council opened (March 2011) a SANG at Rooks Nest Wood Farm to provide mitigation measures to offset the impact of new development on the SPA.
- 1.16 The extent and condition of all habitats and species included in Habitat Action Plans or Species Action Plans has been produced at national, county or local level.
- 1.17 The Borough's geology helps to provide the diversity of habitats and species above ground, and also contributes towards meeting aggregate demand.
- 1.18 Areas of the Borough lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

- 1.19 Wokingham has 16 Conservation Areas and 6 English Heritage Registered Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. There are also 670 listed buildings (Grade I: 9, Grade II: 38, Grade II*: 580 and other: 3) and 18 Scheduled Monuments.
- 1.20 The Berkshire Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) currently includes over 1000 archaeological sites existing within the Borough. In addition, there is a wealth of archaeology sites existing within Wokingham that are currently undesignated but which form an important part of the Borough's heritage.
- 1.21 In developing the GTLP the Council has had regard to these issues and will seek appropriate mitigation measures, such as ensuring any development proposed through the GTLP has regard to the NPPF, the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and advice from the Environment Agency.
- 1.22 With regard to heritage, the GTLP will seek to protect local heritage assets as well as nationally protected listed buildings.
- 1.23 The sustainability objectives of the Council's Development Plan recognise the impact that these draft issues and options may have upon the Borough, and any reasonable alternatives that would accord with the Core Strategy and the Managing Development Delivery (MDD) Local Plan have been assessed against these objectives.

The Role of the Sustainability Appraisal

Sustainable Development

- 1.24 In order to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal, it is important to understand what is meant by the term Sustainable Development. This is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which provides the national planning policy context within which local authorities produce their own planning policy documents. In the NPPF Sustainable Development is defined as:

“meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”
- 1.25 There is a need to balance economic growth with the requirement to ensure that environmental and social requirements are met (and protected where applicable). This key principle will be incorporated in the Sustainability Appraisal of the GTLP.
- 1.26 To ensure the concept of sustainable development is integrated into all land-use plans, they must be subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which requires that economic, environmental and social matters are taken into account. This process will include a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) which is designed to provide a strategic level of environmental protection.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

- 1.27 The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) required under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 is embedded in the Sustainability Appraisal of the GTLP in line with government guidance (ODPM 2004). The SEA is a system of incorporating environmental considerations in plans and strategies and is in conformity with the European Union Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).
- 1.28 The GTLP will need to be in conformity with the Council's adopted Core Strategy and the MDD Local Plan and as such reasonable alternatives will need to be in conformity.
- 1.29 SEAs are more environmentally focused considerations. The sections of the Sustainability Appraisal which deal specifically with environmental assessment are Objectives 10-19 of the Council's Sustainability Objectives.
- 1.30 A SEA places more emphasis on evidencing strategic alternatives and a prediction of impacts from the chosen option. A SA takes a more objective-led approach. The combined SA/SEA will incorporate sustainability and environmental issues into the strategic decision-making process to ensure consistent quality policies and results are delivered on the ground.
- 1.31 This integration will ensure that future development meets the needs of people living and working in an area, whilst at the same time ensuring that it is sited in such a way as to protect the environment.

Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

- 1.32 The SA has a key role in providing a sound evidence base for the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan (GTLP) and forms an integrated part of the plan preparation process. Sustainability Appraisal informs the evaluation of alternative options for site allocation and policy formulation. As part of this process all documents produced as part of the Wokingham Borough Development Plan have to be subjected to a SA. Sustainability Appraisal provides a powerful means of proving to decision makers and the public that the plan is the most appropriate given reasonable alternatives. SAs are a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) and SEAs are required by European Directive EC/2001/42, which was transposed into UK law by the Environmental Assessment Regulations for Plans and Programmes (July 2004).
- 1.33 The introduction of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) resulted in many planning guidance updates. It is important to keep track of

changes in policy throughout the SA /SEA, thus keeping the process iterative and current.

1.34 The overall aims of this SA/SEA are to:

- **Make the Local Plan as sustainable as possible** by integrating sustainable development into the strategy-making process, influencing all stages of plan development.
- **Provide a high level of environmental protection and balance considerations** (environmental, economic and social) in the plan's preparation.
- **Allow the public and stakeholders to input into its production** through consulting on the SA process at different stages.
- **Provide an environmental, social and economic audit** at appropriate levels.

Limitations

1.35 Appraisal of policies is rarely straightforward and the outcome may include considerable levels of uncertainty. The following levels of uncertainty must be taken into account when looking at the results:

- **Scientific uncertainties** – variability in data and collection measures will always exist to a greater or lesser degree.
- **Natural variability** – there is often considerable natural variability in sustainability issues, for example the weather and people's actions.
- **Lack of precision** – environmental, social and economic issues can be difficult to quantify or measure with a high degree of accuracy.
- **Uncertainty about exact implementation** – with a 'broad-brush' strategy it is difficult to assess to a high degree of detail.

Updated Approved SA Scoping Report for the Wokingham Development Plan and related documents

1.36 The Council has an adopted Scoping Report (2010) for the production of Wokingham Development Plan. This document is iterative and is updated following consultation on documents produced under the Local Plan. The term Local Development Framework (LDF) is no longer used but it was a non-statutory term used to describe a folder of documents, which included all the Local Development Documents (LDDs).

1.37 It is this updated Scoping Report which incorporates the SA/SEA to be applied in assessing the impacts of the GTLP.

1.38 The Wokingham Development Plan Scoping Report:

- Sets the scene and context of the SA/SEA within the Development Plan process
- Describes the SA/SEA process
- Allows an effective input and buy-in from consultees
- Undertakes Stage A of the SA/SEA process (setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope).
- Provides an assessment methodology for appraising and predicting likely significant impacts in the later assessment stages: Stage B (developing and refining options) and Stage C (appraising the effects of the plan).

1.39 The updated Development Plan Scoping Report consists of a main body of the text and five appendices (which are summarised as follows):

The main body of the text consists of:

- **An introduction** which includes a list of previous consultations undertaken on the scoping report
- **Section 2** which gives a definition of sustainable development
- **Section 3 which** explains the borough's Development Plan and lists the Local Development Framework Spatial Objectives (Objectives A-M)
- **Section 4 which** explains sustainability appraisals (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) including the stages of a SA. This consultation covers Stage B (Developing and refining options and assessing effects)
- **Sections 5 -11** which indicate how the Borough's Development Plan Scoping Report achieves tasks A1-A4 of the Government's Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (ODPM Sept 2005). Task A1 identifies other relevant plans programmes and sustainability objectives. Task A2 Develops baseline data. Task A3 identifies sustainability issues and environmental problems. Task A4 develops the SA framework incorporating SEA objectives.

Appendix 1 of the updated Development Plan Scoping Report

1.40 This is the more detailed review of the policies, plans and programmes that will influence the GTLP and SA/SEA process. The options and reasonable alternatives for the GTLP and the SA/SEA are framed in the context of national, regional and local objectives and strategic planning, transport,

environmental, social and economic policies. Therefore a comprehensive review of all relevant Policies, Plans and Programmes (PPPs) was carried out as part of the SA/SEA Scoping process. This ensured that the objectives were not in conflict with those in other PPPs. It also highlights areas of potential conflict which may need to be addressed, for example meeting development needs whilst achieving other objectives such as enhancing biodiversity and heritage assets.

Appendix 2 of the updated Development Plan Scoping Report

1.41 This gives information on baseline data, indicators and trends. This section in particular is iterative and updates will be made to this section throughout the lifetime of the Wokingham Development Plan and related documents.

Appendix 3 of the updated Development Plan Scoping Report

1.42 This appendix identifies the key wildlife sites within 15km of the Borough's boundary (Natura 2000 Sites) and indicates that the Council has undertaken screening under the 2010 Habitat Regulations.

Appendix 4 of the updated Development Plan Scoping Report

1.43 This is a glossary of terms used within the Development Plan Scoping Report for undertaking the Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating SEA) for the Wokingham Development Plan, including this consultation on the Preferred Options for the GTLP.

Appendix 5 of the updated Development Plan Scoping Report

1.44 This appendix is the reports of consultation and the Council's response on the consultation on the Updated Development Plan Scoping Report and the GTLP Scoping Reports.

Methodology

1.45 There are various stages in producing both the SA and the Local Plan. The correlation between the generic stages is set out in Table 1.

Table 1: The Different Stages of Sustainability Appraisal

LOCAL PLAN STAGE 1 – Pre-production/Evidence Gathering
SA Stages and Tasks
<p>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives. • A2: Collecting baseline information. • A3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems. • A4: Developing the SA framework • A5: Consulting on the scope of the SA.

LOCAL PLAN STAGE 2 – Production
SA Stages and Tasks
Stage B: Developing and refining draft options and assessing effects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B1: Testing the Plan objectives against the SA framework. • B2: Developing the Plan options. • B3: Predicting the effects of the Plan. • B4: Evaluating the effects of the Plan. • B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects. • B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Plans.
Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C1: Preparing the SA Report
Stage D: Consulting on the draft options of the Plan and SA Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D1: Public participation on the draft options of the Plan and the SA Report. • D2(i): Appraising significant changes.
Stage E: Developing preferred options and assessing effects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E1: Assessing responses from consultation (stage D). • E2: Developing preferred options. • E3: Predicting the effects of the Plan. • E4: Evaluating the effects of the Plan. • E5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects. • E6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Plans
Stage F: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F1: Preparing the SA Report
Stage G: Consulting on the preferred options of the Plan and SA Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G1: Public participation on the preferred options of the Plan and the SA Report. (WE ARE HERE) • G2(i): Appraising significant changes.
LOCAL PLAN Stage 4: Examination
SA Stages and Tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G2(ii): Appraising significant changes resulting from representations.
LOCAL Plan Stage 5: Adoption and Monitoring
SA Stages and Tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G3: Making decisions and providing information
Stage H: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H1: Finalising aims and methods for monitoring. • H2: Responding to adverse effects.

1.46 Stage B of the SA/SEA seeks the appraisal of the themes and options. Having undertaken the SA/SEA of the options and alternatives of the GTLP, the outcomes are:

- **Summary of sustainability factors in Issue A – Options to meet Gypsy and Traveller Need**

Social and economic – The preferred option is option f (a flexible hybrid approach consisting of a mix of options a-e) as this is most likely to achieve the Council’s social sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where this option scores less well this could generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance. Of the alternative options, these would all have disadvantages if used exclusively; for example, those that do not involve the creation of new sites (option c) are less able to meet the requirements of objective 1

(meeting housing need), objective 8 (improve accessibility to services) and objective 9 (reduce road congestion and pollution). The intensification of existing sites (options a and b) could also raise issues with respect to ensuring safe and secure environment in line with objective 3.

Environmental – The alternative options which involve increasing the capacity of existing sites (options a and b) are more able to meet the requirements of objective 10 (re-use of previously developed land) and objective 13 (protect the countryside and historic environment) than other approaches (though most of the environmental objectives are not relevant to the other options concerning existing sites (options d and e)). Alternative option c (new sites) has capacity to design in environmentally sustainable solutions but also has the potential for greater initial impact on the landscape in the short and medium term (objective 13), though this could be mitigated through the site selection/application process. It is considered that by using a mix of these approaches, preferred option f is the most likely to achieve the Council's environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council's preferred option is option f. This will allow for the flexible use of a range of approaches to address site supply depending on the context and will enable the local authority to tailor its response to use the most sustainable alternative(s) in each case.

- **Summary of sustainability factors in Issue B – Size of allocated Gypsy and Traveller sites**

Social and economic – The preferred option is option c (sites up to 15 pitches) as this is most likely to achieve the Council's social and economic sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Any impacts could generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance, and it will help to achieve objective 1 (meeting housing need) by allowing development up to the size that is considered generally reasonable for creating manageable and liveable sites. The other alternative options - which include up to 5 pitches or up to 10 pitches (options a and b) - are less able to meet the requirements of objective 1 as they would limit the capacity of larger sites and require provision of more sites overall. Option d (16 pitches and over) is generally considered to have a more negative score because very large sites are considered to be less able to facilitate community cohesion.

Environmental – Alternative options a and b (the smaller sites) and c and d (the larger sites) mostly score the same in achieving the Council's environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Smaller sites would have less visual impact on landscape character (objectives 13 and 19) but may be less likely to achieve sustainable features (objectives 14 and 18) due to cost, and vice versa for the larger sites. However, where the options a-c score less well this can generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council's preferred option is option c. This will allow a flexible approach to site provision (from smaller to larger sites as appropriate) whilst limiting the development of very large sites that might be less able to provide a socially or environmentally sustainable solution to meeting need.

- **Summary of sustainability factors in issue C – Geographical Distribution of Gypsy and Traveller Sites**

Social and economic – Alternative option a is most likely able to achieve objective 1 and objective 5 (creating and sustaining vibrant and locally distinctive communities), whilst options bi - biv may limit the ability to achieve social objectives 8 and 9. Option c would not seek to influence the distribution of sites through policy and therefore scores more neutrally on some objectives, as applications could potentially be made in more sensitive areas. However, each site would be assessed on its own individual merits with regard to policy and unacceptable applications refused / any impacts potentially mitigated.

Environmental - The options mostly score the same in achieving the Council's environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where the options score less well in the short term this can generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy and national policy guidance, though it is noted that alternative option a (following existing site distribution) could result in long term cumulative environmental impacts from the potential 'clustering' of sites. As above, option c scores more neutrally on some objectives, as each site would be assessed on its own individual merits and therefore uncontrolled distribution would not result from this approach.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council's preferred option is option c. Site distribution will be managed through allocation of appropriate sites in the GTLP and the ongoing assessment of site suitability through planning applications (where if an application for a site is in an unsuitable location, it can be refused). By not imposing controls, this option is best placed to provide sustainable sites without placing any requirement on unsuitable parts of the Borough and avoiding any potential long term impact of 'clustering' on the local landscape and infrastructure.

- **Summary of sustainability factors in Issue D – Phasing the Allocation of Gypsy and Traveller Sites**

Social and economic – The preferred option is option b (no phasing) as this is most likely to achieve the Council's social sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Option b could meet the requirements of objective 1 (meeting housing need) as it allows a more flexible approach to site allocation/delivery in response to

need. The alternative option (option a – to phase allocation) is less flexible and therefore less likely to meet objective 1 in the short and medium term, when any need arising could potentially be met by unphased site allocations.

Environmental - The two options mostly score the same in achieving the Council's environmental sustainability objectives, though only preferred option b covers the short, medium and long term. Impacts can generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council's preferred option is option b. Not phasing site delivery will allow for more flexibility to deal with applications for sites as these are made (based on the overall allocation of sufficient sites to meet Wokingham's identified need).

- **Summary of sustainability factors in issue E – Allocation of Reserve Gypsy and Traveller Sites**

Social and economic - Alternative option a – allocation of reserve Gypsy and Traveller sites - is most likely to achieve the Council's social sustainability objectives in the long term. Where the option scores less well this could be mitigated through the site selection process and applications, having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance. However, option b – not allocating reserve sites – could also meet objective 1 and other social objectives in the long term provided that sufficient sites are allocated to meet identified need.

Environmental - The two options have similar scores in the Council's environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where both options score less well this can generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council's preferred option is option b. Not allocating reserve sites would not affect the ability of the GTLP to deliver sufficient sustainable sites to meet need through appropriate allocation and also potentially windfalls (where these are acceptable in planning terms).

- **Summary of sustainability factors in issue F – Approach to allocating Travelling Showpeople sites**

Social and economic – Option a – allocating sites for Travelling Showpeople - scores positively in all of the relevant categories of the Council's social sustainability objectives, particularly objective 1 (meeting housing need). Option b - not allocating Travelling Showpeople sites - has a generally neutral score in the medium/long term. Whilst objective 1 is initially negative, the March 2015 GTAA has indicated that there is no current need for sites; if there was such a need then option a would be more sustainable (as suitable sites could be identified through the site selection/allocation

process) but as it stands the GTAA has identified that this option is not relevant at the current time. In future if a need was identified then option b (no allocation) does not prevent windfall applications from meeting that need where suitable.

Environmental – Options a and b score mostly positive in all of the relevant categories of the Council's environmental sustainability objectives. It is recognised that many of the impacts could be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance in any planning application for a site for Travelling Showpeople.

- **Summary of sustainability factors in issue G: Approach to allocating transit sites for Gypsy and Travellers**

Social and economic – Alternative option a – allocating transit sites - scores positively in all of the relevant categories of the Council's social sustainability objectives, particularly objective 1 (meeting housing need). Option b - not allocating transit sites - has a generally neutral (both positive and negative) score, based on the fact that whilst there is a potential risk of a greater number of unauthorised encampments if there is no (or not enough) transit provision in the Borough, this can be balanced against the existence of other effective methods for addressing transit need (such as the provision of flexible space on existing or new sites for visiting families, or pitches large enough to accommodate visitors). Such methods would have a broadly positive impact that would balance the inherent challenges of seeking appropriate sites for transit allocation.

Environmental – Again Option a scores generally positively and option b neutrally in all of the relevant categories of the Council's environmental sustainability objectives. However, it is acknowledged that the nature of an allocated transit site would mean that it is present even if not occupied, with a potentially longer-term impact on character. This impact could be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance, as could possible windfall applications for transit sites. Consideration of other methods under option b (provision of flexible space for visitors on existing/new sites) would have a more positive impact in environmental terms as these will occupy either existing developed land or be planned as part of appropriate site allocations/applications with suitable mitigation.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council's preferred option is option b. Not allocating transit sites would not automatically lead to an increase in authorised encampments, as the possibility of windfall sites being approved and also the use of methods to provide space for temporary occupation on existing sites or new sites would enable any need to be addressed. This could be assisted by the inclusion of a criteria-based policy in the GTLP. In the long term the use of various methods to 'design in' transit provision could be more sustainable and effective than site allocation.

- **Summary of sustainability factors in issue H: Approach to site layout, safety and management**

Social and economic – The preferred option is option a (including a specific policy on site layout, safety and management in the GTLP) as this is most likely to achieve the Council's social and economic sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where the option scores less well this could generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance. Option a is more likely to have a more positive effect than the alternative option b in meeting the requirements of objective 3 (safe and secure environments) and objectives 8 and 9 (improve accessibility and highway safety).

Environmental – Preferred option a generally scores more positively in achieving the Council's environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term – especially objectives 13, 15 and 19 (impact on countryside character, waste management and positive contribution to environment and heritage). In other areas scoring is neutral or not relevant. Alternative option b scores less well – in light of the non-specific nature of the existing guidance - but in some cases this could be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council's preferred option is option a. The new policy would have a specific local emphasis which would provide greater opportunity to maintain and enhance the sustainability of new and existing sites in the Borough.

- **Summary of sustainability factors in issue I: Approach to demarcation of site/pitch boundaries and landscaping**

Social and economic – The preferred option is option a (including a policy on demarcation of boundaries and landscaping in the GTLP) as this is most likely to achieve the Council's social and economic sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where this option scores less well, this is generally mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance. Option a is more likely to have a more positive effect than the alternative option b in meeting the requirements of objective 3 (safe and secure environments) and objective 4 (improve health and wellbeing of the population).

Environmental – Preferred option a generally scores more positively in achieving the Council's environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term – especially objectives 13 and 19 (impact on countryside character and positive contribution to environment and heritage). In other areas scoring is neutral or not relevant. Option b scores less well – due to the non-specific nature of the existing guidance – but in some cases this could be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council's preferred option is option a. The new policy would have a specific local emphasis which would provide greater opportunity to maintain and enhance the sustainability of new and existing sites in the Borough.

- **Summary of sustainability factors in issue J: Standards for amenity buildings**

Social and economic – The preferred option is option a (including a policy on amenity buildings in the GTLP) as this is most likely to achieve the Council's social and economic sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where the option scores less well this is generally mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance. Option a could help meet social objective 1 (to make provision for local housing).

Environmental – Preferred option a is most likely to achieve the Council's environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Scoring is positive, neutral or not relevant. Where the option scores less well in the short term this can generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy and national policy guidance. Option a will help meet objective 14 (sustainable use of resources). Alternative option b scores less well – due to the non-specific nature of the existing guidance – but in some cases this could be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council's preferred option is option a. The new policy would cover a number of issues and have a specific local emphasis which would provide greater opportunity to maintain and enhance the sustainability of new and existing sites in the Borough.

- **Summary of sustainability factors in issue K: Approach to retaining Gypsy and Traveller sites**

This issue is split into two parts: firstly, whether the Council should seek to retain Gypsy and Traveller sites for that use only, and secondly, whether the Council should seek to ensure that a site is restored to its former condition if its use by Gypsies and Travellers ceases.

Retention:

Social and economic – Alternative options a, b and d (that the Council should seek to protect Gypsy and Traveller Sites through use of planning conditions and/or legal agreements, or a hybrid of options) are all likely to achieve the Council's social and economic sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. However, options a, b and d are more likely to have a more positive effect than the alternative option c in meeting the requirements of objective 1 (provision of housing), objective 4 (health and well-being) and objective 7 (educational attainment), with option d

offering the most flexibility. Option c scores less as there is a possible loss of Gypsy sites if they are not retained in a manner that is enforceable e.g. a planning condition.

Environmental – Scoring on the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives is either neutral or not relevant.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option d, as this would combine all of the three alternative options (use of planning conditions, legal agreements and GTLP policy). One or a mix of these options could then be used as appropriate to secure sustainable site retention, thus avoiding any potential negative impact of relying on just one approach.

Restoration:

Social and economic: The alternative options relating to the restoration of sites once the use by Gypsies and Travellers has ceased mostly score neutral or not relevant in terms of social and economic sustainability.

Environmental – Alternative options a and b mostly score the same in achieving the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where relevant, scoring is neutral or positive. Alternative option c scores less as there is a possible failure to restore Gypsy sites if this is not required in a manner that can be more readily enforced.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option d, as this would combine all of the three alternative options (use of planning conditions, legal agreements and GTLP policy). One or a mix of these options could then be used as appropriate to secure sustainable site restoration, thus avoiding any potential negative impact of relying on just one approach.

1.47 The Council has also undertaken an SA/SEA of existing sites and those put forward for consideration for inclusion in the GTLP. This is available as a separate document and is being consulted on at the same time as the Preferred Options.

Chapter 2 - Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA)) of the GTLP (Preferred Options)

- 2.1 This SA/SEA appraises the options and themes in the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan. The Council has assessed the impact of the GTLP and concluded that an Environmental Report will be necessary to comply with SEA requirements. The Environmental Report will be produced as part of the further iteration of the SA (incorporating an SEA) once the authority has identified the Preferred Option for each of the issues. As advised by Government guidance, the SEA is incorporated into the overall SA of the draft GTLP. The Council considers that the Environmental Objectives within the sustainability appraisal (Objectives 10-19) are the relevant objectives for undertaking the SEA.
- 2.2 The SA/SEA tests these options and alternatives against the set of objectives within the Scoping Report for the ‘Sustainability Appraisal including a Strategic Environmental Assessment’ (SEA). It considers any potential impact of the suggested options and alternatives of the issues raised in the Preferred Options for the GTLP and possible mitigation measures against the Council’s 22 Sustainability Objectives. The Options are appraised over short (2015-2016), medium (2017 to 2019) and long term (after 2019).
- 2.3 The Draft Options for the GTLP covers a number of issues. These are:
- **Issue A** Options to meet Gypsy and Traveller Need
 - **Issue B** Size of allocated Gypsy and Traveller sites
 - **Issue C** Geographical Distribution of Gypsy and Traveller Sites
 - **Issue D** Phasing the Allocation of Gypsy and Traveller Sites
 - **Issue E** Allocation of Reserve Gypsy and Traveller Sites
 - **Issue F** Approach to allocating Travelling Showpeople Sites
 - **Issue G** Approach to allocating transit sites for Gypsies and Travellers
 - **Issue H** Approach to site layout, safety and management
 - **Issue I:** Approach to demarcation of site/pitch boundaries and landscaping
 - **Issue J** Standards for private/communal buildings
 - **Issue K** Approach to retaining Gypsy and Traveller Sites
- 2.4 The alternative options appraised in the SA/SEA are the “reasonable alternatives” that are considered available to address each of the issues listed.

- 2.5 In undertaking this SA/SEA of the options the Council has appraised each issue individually. A summary of the appraisal is provided to assess which options are likely to be the most sustainable.
- 2.6 The Council has also undertaken an SA/SEA of existing sites and those put forward for consideration for inclusion in the GTLP. This will be available as a separate document.
- 2.7 The Council is consulting on the SA/SEA of the GTLP Preferred Options for the GTLP from 4th June to 30th July 2015. Comments can be submitted by e-mail to GTLP@wokingham.gov.uk or by writing to Land Use and Transport, P.O. Box 157, Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1WR.

WOKINGHAM BOROUGH SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES

SOCIAL	1. To make provision for local housing needs by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent sustainably constructed and affordable home
	2. To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to public well-being, the economy and the environment by ensuring no inappropriate development in any areas at risk of flooding and use sustainable drainage solutions and other solutions in line with advice from the Environment Agency where necessary.
	3. Safe and secure environment
	4. To improve the health and well-being of the population.
	5. To create and sustain vibrant and locally distinctive communities
	6. To reduce poverty and social exclusion
	7. To raise educational attainment, skills and training opportunities
	8. To improve accessibility to services, amenities and facilities in particular by safe walking and cycling routes
	9. To reduce road congestion and pollution levels on the local and strategic road network (SRN) by improving travel facilities and choices including safe walking and cycling routes and public transport
ENVIRONMENTAL	10. To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously developed land, existing buildings, including the re-use of resources and remediation of previously developed land
	11. To minimise impacts arising from pollution and improve and prevent where possible
	12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity, including wildlife and river corridors and networks and to maximise opportunities for building in beneficial features for biodiversity including limiting the impact of climate change.
	13. To protect and enhance the Borough's countryside and historic environment
	14. To sustainably use resources (including renewable and non-renewable resources)
	15. To address waste by: reducing and minimising waste as a priority, re-use then recycle, compost or energy recovery
	16. To maintain, and, where appropriate improve water quality (including groundwater and surface water) and to achieve sustainable water resource management of both surface and groundwater flows.
	17. To maintain and where appropriate improve soil quality, and to ensure land affected by contamination is remediated to a condition suitable for use
	18. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources in the Borough

ECONOMIC	19. Appropriate new development makes a positive contribution or makes no material harm to the character, environment, landscape and heritage within the Borough
	20. To ensure high and stable levels of employment
	21. To encourage 'smart' economic growth
	22. Maintaining a buoyant and competitive economy with a range of jobs without adversely affecting the quality of life

The Options are appraised over short (2015-2016), medium (2017 to 2019) and long term (after 2019). Alternatives will need to be in conformity with the Core Strategy and the MDD Local Plan.

Chapter 2: Preferred Options Appraisal

Issue A: Options to meet Gypsy and Traveller Need

The preferred option for this issue was derived from responses to the GTLP Draft Options Paper consultation that took place from 7th August to 2nd October 2014 and the results of the updated GTAA (March 2015) as well as recent applications/development on existing sites and internal discussions.

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue A: Option f – Hybrid of all approaches (expansion of existing sites, increase pitch numbers, allocate new sites, grant planning permission for existing sites, remove personal occupancy conditions)			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	-	✓	✓✓	Would meet objective in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS)
2	0	-/✓	-/✓	Development should be in accordance with NPPF Technical Guidance, Policy CP1 of Core Strategy, MDD Policy TB10 and advice from Environment Agency and Council's SFRA
3	-	✓	✓✓	Safety/security would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
4	-	✓	✓✓	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
5	✓	✓	✓✓	Meets objective in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD.
6	-	✓	✓✓	Would help reduce social exclusion. Proposals/applications to be considered with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.
7	✓	✓	✓	Provision of a settled base allows more children access to schools
8	-	✓	✓	Opportunities to improve access to services and facilities. Development to be assessed in line with

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

ⓧ
ⓧⓧ

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue A: Option f – Hybrid of all approaches (expansion of existing sites, increase pitch numbers, allocate new sites, grant planning permission for existing sites, remove personal occupancy conditions)			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
				Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
9	-	✓	✓	Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land
11	-	-/✓	-/✓	Scope to minimise pollution (depending on nature of development)
12	-	-/✓	-/✓	Scope to minimise impact on local biodiversity (depending on nature of development). Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.
13	-	-/✓	-/✓	May impact on countryside and historic environment, but there is potential for mitigation. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	-	-/✓	-/✓	Scope for sustainable development with regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
15	-	-/✓	-/✓	Scope to provide appropriate facilities for recycling/waste with regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
16	-	-/✓	-/✓	Scope to provide appropriate drainage with regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
17	-	-/✓	-/✓	Scope to provide appropriate remediation with regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue A: Option f – Hybrid of all approaches (expansion of existing sites, increase pitch numbers, allocate new sites, grant planning permission for existing sites, remove personal occupancy conditions)			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
				Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
18	-	-/✓	-/✓	Scope to consider energy efficiency on sites with regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
19	-	-/✓	-/✓	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment, but could be mitigated. Proposals to be informed by policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option				Alternative Option			
	Issue A: Option a – Expansion of existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites (i.e. making the site larger)				Issue A: Option b – Increasing the number of pitches on existing sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long	Short		Med	Long		
1	-	-/✓	✓	Meets objective, but risk of encroachment into countryside. Proposals to be assessed in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-	-/✓	-/✓	Meets objective but may be limited potential to accommodate additional pitches on existing sites. Proposals to be line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
2	0	0	0		0	0	0	
3	-	✓	✓	Safety/security would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.	-	-/x	-/x	Increasing capacity i.e. intensification could increase risk of fire – see issue 8. Role of Core Strategy Policy CP3 and DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide in ensuring this is addressed.

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

✗ Negative
✗✗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue A: Option a – Expansion of existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites (i.e. making the site larger)				Alternative Option Issue A: Option b – Increasing the number of pitches on existing sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
4	-	-/✓	-/✓	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide. Could enhance well-being through improved layout of existing site, provision of amenity space	-	-/x	-/x	Increased number of pitches may impact well-being - would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide
5	✓	✓	✓	Could meet objective in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	✓	✓	✓	Could meet objective in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
6	-	-/✓	-/✓	Possibly could help to reduce social exclusion. Regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.	-	-/✓	-/✓	Possibly could help to reduce social exclusion. Regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.
7	0	✓	✓	Provision of a settled base allows more children access to schools	0	✓	✓	Provision of a settled base allows more children access to schools
8	-	-	-	Some limited opportunities to improve access to services and facilities – depends on nature of existing site. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-	-	-	Some limited opportunities to improve access to services and facilities – depends on nature of existing site. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
9	-	-/✓	-/✓	Depends on nature of existing site; may be scope for highway improvements as part of application. Development to be in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-	-/x	-/x	Increase in number of pitches using local roads/access may cause adverse impact. Development to be in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land	✓	✓	✓	Includes previously developed land
11	0	0	0		0	0	0	

✓✓ Very Positive
 ✓ Positive
 - Neutral (Positive and Negative)
 0 Not Relevant

☒ Negative
 ☒☒ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue A: Option a – Expansion of existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites (i.e. making the site larger)				Alternative Option Issue A: Option b – Increasing the number of pitches on existing sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
12	-	-	-	Possible additional impact on local biodiversity. Need for appropriate mitigation and landscaping. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.	-	-	-	Possible additional impact on local biodiversity. Need for appropriate mitigation and landscaping. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.
13	-	-/x	-/x	May increase impact on countryside and historic environment through site enlargement. Could be mitigated by landscaping. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS	-	-/✓	-/✓	Less likelihood of encroachment – pitches contained within existing site. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	0	0		0	0	0	
15	0	0	0		0	0	0	
16	0	0	0		0	0	0	
17	0	0	0		0	0	0	
18	0	0	0		0	0	0	
19	-	-	-	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Proposals to be informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26	-	-	-	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Proposals to be informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0		0	0	0	
21	0	0	0		0	0	0	
22	0	0	0		0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue A: Option c – Allocation of new sites				Alternative Option Issue A: Option d – Examining whether existing sites which do not benefit from full planning permission, are suitable to be granted planning permission			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
1	✓	✓	✓	Meets objective. Proposals to be assessed in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-✓	-/✓✓	-/✓✓	Meets objective. Applications to regularise sites to be assessed in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
2	0	-	-	Development proposals should be in accordance with NPPF Technical Guidance, Policy CP1 of Core Strategy, MDD Policy TB10 and advice from Environment Agency and Council's SFRA	0	0	0	
3	-	✓	✓✓	Safety and security would be considered in design of new developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.	-	-/✓	-/✓	May be opportunity to enhance existing sites through application
4	-	✓	✓✓	Health and well-being would be considered in design of new developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.	-	-	-	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
5	✓	✓	✓✓	Appropriate sites will meet objective in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	✓	✓	✓	Meets objective where existing sites are appropriate to be granted permission in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
6	-	-/✓	-/✓✓	Appropriate sites could help reduce social exclusion (Policy CP2 of Core Strategy)	✓	✓	✓	Authoring existing sites would help reduce social exclusion (Policy CP2 of Core Strategy)
7	-	✓	✓	Provision of a settled base allows	✓	✓	✓	Provision of a settled base allows more

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
⊗⊗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue A: Option c – Allocation of new sites			Comments/mitigation	Alternative Option Issue A: Option d – Examining whether existing sites which do not benefit from full planning permission, are suitable to be granted planning permission			Comments/mitigation
	Compatibility score				Compatibility score			
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
				more children access to schools				children access to schools
8	-	✓	✓	Selection of appropriate sites could improve access to services and facilities. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-	-	-	Limited opportunities to improve access to services and facilities – depends on nature of existing site. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
9	-	✓	✓	Development proposals to be in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-	✓	✓	Depends on nature of existing site; may be scope for highway improvements as part of application. Development to be in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land	✓	✓	✓	Includes previously developed land
11	0	0	0		0	0	0	
12	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity. Appropriate mitigation could be achieved through site selection/ applications. Development to be in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity. Need for appropriate mitigation and landscaping. Development to be in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.
13	-	-/✓	✓	New sites would impact countryside and historic environment. Could be mitigated through site selection and by landscaping in applications. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core	-	-/✓	-/✓	Impact on countryside and historic environment already taking place – could be improved on appropriate sites by additional landscaping etc. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
⊗⊗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue A: Option c – Allocation of new sites			Comments/mitigation	Alternative Option Issue A: Option d – Examining whether existing sites which do not benefit from full planning permission, are suitable to be granted planning permission			Comments/mitigation
	Compatibility score				Compatibility score			
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
				Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS				
14	0	✓	✓✓	Greater opportunity to design in sustainable features, having regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	-	-/✓	May be limited scope for improvements. Applications to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
15	0	✓	✓	Scope for provision of waste/recycling facilities. Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	-	-/✓	May be limited scope for improvements. Applications to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
16	0	✓	✓	Scope for provision of drainage/SUDs etc. on new sites. Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	-	-/✓	May be limited scope for improvements. Applications to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
17	0	✓	✓	Brownfield sites can be appropriately remediated before development. Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	0	0	Limited opportunities on existing sites.
18	0	✓	✓	Scope for provision of renewable technology. Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and	0	0	0	Limited opportunities on existing sites.

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue A: Option c – Allocation of new sites			Comments/mitigation	Alternative Option Issue A: Option d – Examining whether existing sites which do not benefit from full planning permission, are suitable to be granted planning permission			Comments/mitigation
	Compatibility score				Compatibility score			
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
				Construction SPD				
19	-	✓	✓✓	New sites could be planned to have positive impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Proposals to be informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26	-	-/✓	-/✓	Existing impact on character, landscape and historic environment could be improved through planning application. Applications to be informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0		0	0	0	
21	0	0	0		0	0	0	
22	0	0	0		0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue A: Option e – Review of personal occupancy planning conditions on existing sites so that anyone within the GRT community can occupy those sites			Comments/mitigation
	Compatibility score			
	Short	Med	Long	
1	-/✓	-/✓✓	-/✓✓	Would meet objective in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
2	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
3	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
4	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
5	✓	✓	✓	Meets objective in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue A: Option e – Review of personal occupancy planning conditions on existing sites so that anyone within the GRT community can occupy those sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
6	-	✓	✓	If acceptable, could help reduce social exclusion with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.
7	✓	✓	✓	Provision of a settled base allows more children access to schools
8	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
9	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
10	✓	✓	✓	Includes previously developed land
11	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
12	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
13	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
14	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
15	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
16	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
17	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
18	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
19	0	0	0	Not relevant – existing authorised sites only
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue A: Option e – Review of personal occupancy planning conditions on existing sites so that anyone within the GRT community can occupy those sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
22	0	0	0	

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue A – Options to meet Gypsy and Traveller Need

Social and economic – The preferred option is option f (a flexible hybrid approach consisting of a mix of options a-e) as this is most likely to achieve the Council’s social sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where this option scores less well this could generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance. Of the alternative options, these would all have disadvantages if used exclusively; for example, those that do not involve the creation of new sites (option c) are less able to meet the requirements of objective 1 (meeting housing need), objective 8 (improve accessibility to services) and objective 9 (reduce road congestion and pollution). The intensification of existing sites (options a and b) could also raise issues with respect to ensuring safe and secure environment in line with objective 3.

Environmental – The alternative options which involve increasing the capacity of existing sites (options a and b) are more able to meet the requirements of objective 10 (re-use of previously developed land) and objective 13 (protect the countryside and historic environment) than other approaches (though most of the environmental objectives are not relevant to the other options concerning existing sites (options d and e)). Alternative option c (new sites) has capacity to design in environmentally sustainable solutions but also has the potential for greater initial impact on the landscape in the short and medium term (objective 13), though this could be mitigated through the site selection/application process. It is considered that by using a mix of these approaches, preferred option f is the most likely to achieve the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option f. This will allow for the flexible use of a range of approaches to address site supply depending on the context and will enable the local authority to tailor its response to use the most sustainable alternative(s) in each case.

Issue B: Size of Gypsy and Traveller sites

The preferred option for this issue was derived from responses to the GTLP Draft Options Paper consultation that took place from 7th August to 2nd October 2014 and the results of the updated GTAA (March 2015).

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue B: Option c – Sites of up to 15 pitches			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	-	✓	✓✓	Meets objective. Recommended capacity in line with DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
2	0	0	0	
3	-	-/✓	-/✓	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
4	0	-	-	
5	0	-/✓	✓	Larger sites may be better able to sustain vibrant and distinctive communities (up to a point)
6	-	-	-	Possibly could help reduce social exclusion with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.
7	0	0	0	
8	0	0	0	
9	0	0	0	
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land. Larger sites would represent more efficient land use.
11	0	0	0	
12	-	-	-	
13	-	-	-	Larger sites will have greater

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue B: Option c – Sites of up to 15 pitches			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
				impact on countryside and historic environment, though this could be mitigated. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS.
14	0	0	0	
15	-	-	-	
16	-	-	-	
17	0	0	0	
18	-	-/✓	-/✓	Larger sites may be better able to incorporate energy efficiency measures. Proposals to be assessed with regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
19	-	-	-	Larger sites are more likely to have impact on character, landscape and historic environment, though this could be mitigated. Proposals to be informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option				Alternative Option			
	Issue B: Option a – Sites of up to 5 pitches				Issue B: Option b – Sites of up to 10 pitches			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long	Short		Med	Long		

✓✓ Very Positive
 ✓ Positive
 - Neutral (Positive and Negative)
 0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
 ⊗⊗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue B: Option a – Sites of up to 5 pitches				Alternative Option Issue B: Option b – Sites of up to 10 pitches			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
1	-	-/✓	✓	Meets objective in line with DCLG’s Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide, but would be limited – require more sites/extensions overall. However, most existing sites can only accommodate small additions	-	-/✓	✓	Meets objective but would be more limited – require more sites overall. In line with DCLG’s Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
2	0	0	0		0	0	0	
3	-	-	-	Proposals would be considered taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide. Smaller sites more likely to be secure	-	-	-	Proposals would be considered taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide. Smaller sites more likely to be secure
4	0	0	0		0	0	0	
5	-	-	-	Smaller sites may be more insular/contained (likely to be single families?)	-	-/✓	-/✓	Larger sites may be better able to sustain vibrant and distinctive communities
6	-	-	-	Possibly could help reduce social exclusion with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.	-	-	-	Possibly could help reduce social exclusion with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.
7	0	0	0		0	0	0	
8	0	0	0		0	0	0	
9	0	0	0		0	0	0	
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land. Larger sites would represent more efficient land use.
11	0	0	0		0	0	0	
12	-	-	-		-	-	-	
13	-	-/✓	-/✓	Small sites likely to have less impact on countryside and historic environment. Impact could be	-	-/✓	-/✓	Smaller sites may have less impact on countryside and historic environment. Impact could be mitigated. Development

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

✗ Negative
✗✗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue B: Option a – Sites of up to 5 pitches				Alternative Option Issue B: Option b – Sites of up to 10 pitches			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
				mitigated. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS				to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	0	0		0	0	0	
15	-	-	-		-	-	-	
16	-	-	-		-	-	-	
17	0	0	0		0	0	0	
18	-	-/x	-/x	Small sites may be less able to incorporate energy efficiency measures due to cost	-	-	-	
19	-	-/✓	-/✓	Small sites would have less impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Impact could be mitigated. Informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26	-	-/✓	-/✓	Smaller sites may have less impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Impact could be mitigated. Informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0		0	0	0	
21	0	0	0		0	0	0	
22	0	0	0		0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue B: Option d – Sites of 16 pitches and over			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	-	✓	✓✓	Even though this meets objective, it would exceed the recommended capacity stated in DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
2	0	0	0	
3	x	x	x	More sites may not provide an environment which is safe and secure compared to smaller sites with fewer pitches. Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
4	0	x	x	Sites that are too large may be detrimental to health/well-being of occupants
5	0	x	x	If site is too large may be considered to be harmful to the approach of sustainability objective 5 (together with the requirements of Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3 which emphasise the importance of appropriate scale n context and integration)
6	-	-	-	Possibly could help reduce social exclusion with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.
7	0	0	0	
8	0	0	0	
9	0	0	0	
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land. Larger sites would represent more

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue B: Option d – Sites of 16 pitches and over			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
				efficient land use.
11	0	0	0	
12	-	-	-	
13	-	-	-/x	Larger sites will have greater impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS. May be harder to successfully mitigate impact on large sites
14	0	0	0	
15	-	-/x	-/x	Large sites may have greater issues in terms of addressing waste – scale of requirement for disposal facilities versus greater capacity for recycling measures
16	-	-/x	-/x	Large sites may have more issues in terms of drainage – but better able to incorporate schemes like SUDs
17	0	0	0	
18	-	-/✓	-/✓	Large sites may be better able to incorporate energy efficiency. Proposals to be assessed with regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
19	-	-/x	-/x	Large sites are more likely to have impact on character, landscape and historic environment, which may not be easy to mitigate. Proposals to be informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue B: Option d – Sites of 16 pitches and over			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
22	0	0	0	

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue B – Size of allocated Gypsy and Traveller sites

Social and economic – The preferred option is option c (sites up to 15 pitches) as this is most likely to achieve the Council’s social and economic sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Any impacts could generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance, and it will help to achieve objective 1 (meeting housing need) by allowing development up to the size that is considered generally reasonable for creating manageable and liveable sites. The other alternative options - which include up to 5 pitches or up to 10 pitches (options a and b) - are less able to meet the requirements of objective 1 as they would limit the capacity of larger sites and require provision of more sites overall. Option d (16 pitches and over) is generally considered to have a more negative score because very large sites are considered to be less able to facilitate community cohesion.

Environmental – Alternative options a and b (the smaller sites) and c and d (the larger sites) mostly score the same in achieving the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Smaller sites would have less visual impact on landscape character (objectives 13 and 19) but may be less likely to achieve sustainable features (objectives 14 and 18) due to cost, and vice versa for the larger sites. However, where the options a-c score less well this can generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option c. This will allow a flexible approach to site provision (from smaller to larger sites as appropriate) whilst limiting the development of very large sites that might be less able to provide a socially or environmentally sustainable solution to meeting need.



Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant



Negative
Very Negative

Issue C: Geographical distribution of Gypsy and Traveller Sites

The preferred option for this issue was derived from responses to the GTLP Draft Options Paper consultation that took place from 7th August to 2nd October 2014, as well as assessment of previous/current applications and appeals for sites, mapping of the existing distribution of sites in the Borough, and the figures derived from the 2015 GTAA.

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue C: Option c – Do not have a policy on site distribution			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	-	-/x	-/x	Could meet objective but cannot control whether local needs are met. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
2	0	0	0	
3	0	0	0	
4	-	-	-	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
5	-	-/x	-/x	Less potential to meet objective. Sites would be judged in line with policy CP2 of Core Strategy and TB10 of MDD
6	-	-/x	-/x	Less ability to ensure reduction in social exclusion with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.
7	0	0	0	
8	-	-/x	-/x	Less opportunity to improve access to services and facilities. Development to be in line with Policy CP1 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
9	-	-/x	-/x	Less opportunity to reduce traffic/congestion, but could be partly offset by need to comply with Policy CP1 and CP6 of Core Strategy (improving travel facilities)
10	-	-/x	-/x	Sites may not be on previously developed land – no way to require this.
11	-	-/x	-/x	Sites could be located in AQMA

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

ⓧ
ⓧⓧ

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue C: Option c – Do not have a policy on site distribution			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
12	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity; could be mitigated. Development to be in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.
13	-/x	-/x	-/x	Greater likelihood of impact on countryside and historic environment, especially in certain areas e.g. Green Belt. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	0	0	
15	0	0	0	
16	0	0	0	
17	0	0	0	
18	0	0	0	
19	-	-/x	-/x	Possible adverse impact on character, landscape and historic environment through development in certain sensitive areas. Applications to be informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option				Alternative Option			
	Issue C: Option a – Use the existing distribution as a guide for future Gypsy and Traveller development				Issue C: Option b – More equal distribution: i) Split sites evenly between each parish			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long	Short		Med	Long		
1	✓	✓	✓	Meets objective. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Meets objective. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

✗ Negative
✗✗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue C: Option a – Use the existing distribution as a guide for future Gypsy and Traveller development			Comments/mitigation	Alternative Option Issue C: Option b – More equal distribution: i) Split sites evenly between each parish			Comments/mitigation
	Compatibility score				Compatibility score			
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
2	0	0	0		0	0	0	
3	0	0	0		0	0	0	
4	-	-	-	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.	-	-	-	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
5	✓	✓	✓	Meets objective. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD.	✓	✓	✓	Meets objective. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD.
6	-	-	-	Possibly could help reduce social exclusion with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.	-	-	-	Possibly could help reduce social exclusion with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.
7	0	0	0		0	0	0	
8	-	-	-	Possible limited opportunities to improve access to services and facilities. Development to be in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-	-	-	Possible limited opportunities to improve access to services and facilities. Development to be in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
9	-	-	-	Development to be in line with Policies CP1 and CP6 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-	-	-	Development to be in line with Policies CP1 and CP6 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0		0	0	0	
12	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity; could be mitigated. Development to be in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity; could be mitigated. Development to be in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
⊗⊗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue C: Option a – Use the existing distribution as a guide for future Gypsy and Traveller development				Alternative Option Issue C: Option b – More equal distribution: i) Split sites evenly between each parish			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
				SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.				measures in line with CP8.
13	-	-	-/x	May impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS	-	-	-	May impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	0	0		0	0	0	
15	0	0	0		0	0	0	
16	0	0	0		0	0	0	
17	0	0	0		0	0	0	
18	0	0	0		0	0	0	
19	-	-	-/x	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Proposals to be informed by policies TB21, TB24-26	-	-	-	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Proposals to be informed by policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0		0	0	0	
21	0	0	0		0	0	0	
22	0	0	0		0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue C: Option b – More equal distribution: ii) Split sites in proportion to the population of the Parish				Alternative Option Issue C: Option b – More equal distribution: iii) Split sites in proportion to the area of the Parish			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
1	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Meets objective. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Meets objective. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
2	0	0	0		0	0	0	
3	0	0	0		0	0	0	
4	-	-	-	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.	-	-	-	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
5	✓	✓	✓	Meets objective. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD.	✓	✓	✓	Meets objective. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD.
6	-	-	-	Possibly could help reduce social exclusion with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.	-	-	-	Possibly could help reduce social exclusion with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.
7	0	0	0		0	0	0	
8	-	✓	✓	Possible opportunities to improve access to services and facilities. Development to be in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-	-	-	Possible limited opportunities to improve access to services and facilities. Development to be in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
9	-	✓	✓	Development to be in line with Policies CP1 and CP6 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS	-	-	-	Development to be in line with Policies CP1 and CP6 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0		0	0	0	
12	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity; could be mitigated. Development to be in line with	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity; could be mitigated. Development to be in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

✗ Negative
✗✗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue C: Option b – More equal distribution: ii) Split sites in proportion to the population of the Parish				Alternative Option Issue C: Option b – More equal distribution: iii) Split sites in proportion to the area of the Parish			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
				Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.				TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.
13	-	-	-	May impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS	-	-	-	May impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	0	0		0	0	0	
15	0	0	0		0	0	0	
16	0	0	0		0	0	0	
17	0	0	0		0	0	0	
18	0	0	0		0	0	0	
19	-	-	-	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Proposals to be informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26	-	-	-	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Proposals to be informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0		0	0	0	
21	0	0	0		0	0	0	
22	0	0	0		0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue C: Option b – More equal distribution: iv) Split by number of sites within/adjoining settlements			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	✓	✓	✓✓	Meets objective. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
2	0	0	0	
3	0	0	0	
4	-	-	-	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
5	✓	✓	✓	Meets objective in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD.
6	-	-	-	Possibly could help reduce social exclusion with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.
7	0	0	0	
8	-	✓	✓	Possible opportunities to improve access to services and facilities. Development to be in line with Policy CP1 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
9	-	✓	✓	Development to be in line with Policy CP1 and CP6 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0	
12	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity; could be mitigated.

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
⊗⊗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue C: Option b – More equal distribution: iv) Split by number of sites within/adjoining settlements			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
				Development to be in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.
13	-	-	-	May impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	0	0	
15	0	0	0	
16	0	0	0	
17	0	0	0	
18	0	0	0	
19	-	-	-	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Proposals to be informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue C - Geographical distribution of Gypsy and Traveller Sites

Social and economic – Alternative option a is most likely able to achieve objective 1 and objective 5 (creating and sustaining vibrant and locally distinctive communities), whilst options bi - biv may limit the ability to achieve social objectives 8 and 9. Option c would not seek to influence the distribution of sites through policy and therefore scores more neutrally on some objectives, as applications could potentially be made in more sensitive areas. However, each site would be assessed on its own individual merits with regard to policy and unacceptable applications refused / any impacts potentially mitigated.

Environmental - The options mostly score the same in achieving the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where the options score less well in the short term this can generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy and national policy guidance, though it is noted that alternative option a (following existing site distribution) could result in long term cumulative environmental impacts from the potential ‘clustering’ of sites. As above, option c scores more neutrally on some objectives, as each site would be assessed on its own individual merits and therefore uncontrolled distribution would not result from this approach.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option c. Site distribution will be managed through allocation of appropriate sites in the GTLP and the ongoing assessment of site suitability through planning applications (where if an application for a site is in an unsuitable location, it can be refused). By not imposing controls, this option is best placed to provide sustainable sites without placing any requirement on unsuitable parts of the Borough and avoiding any potential long term impact of ‘clustering’ on the local landscape and infrastructure.



Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant



Negative
Very Negative

Issue D: Phasing the allocation of Gypsy and Traveller Sites

The preferred option for this issue was derived from responses to the GTLP Draft Options Paper consultation that took place from 7th August to 2nd October 2014, the results of the updated GTAA (March 2015) and internal discussions.

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option Issue D: Option b – No phasing			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long	
1	✓	✓	✓	Meets objective with more flexibility (sites can be brought forward at any time), in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy and PPTS
2	0	0	0	
3	0	0	0	
4	0	0	0	
5	0	0	0	
6	✓	✓	✓	Could help reduce social exclusion in more flexible manner
7	0	0	0	
8	✓	✓	✓	Opportunities to improve access to services and facilities in more flexible manner
9	✓	✓	✓	Opportunities to improve road safety/travel choice in more flexible manner
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0	
12	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Impact on local biodiversity could be mitigated. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy, TB23 of MDD and PPTS
13	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	May impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
15	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
16	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
17	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
18	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

✗
✗✗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue D: Option b – No phasing			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
19	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Proposals to be informed by policies TB21, TB-24-26
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue D: Option a – Phasing allocation according to 5 year periods			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	-	-	✓	The current GTAA sets out that there is no need to allocate sites in the short term. Phasing could be used to meet long term need.
2	0	0	0	
3	0	0	0	
4	0	0	0	
5	0	0	0	
6	0	-	✓	Could help reduce social exclusion in long term
7	0	0	0	
8	0	-	✓	Opportunities to improve access to services and facilities in long term
9	0	-	✓	Opportunities to improve road safety/travel choice in long term
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0	
12	0	0	-/✓	Impact on local biodiversity could be mitigated. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy, TB23 of MDD and PPTS
13	0	0	-/✓	May impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be assessed in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	0	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
15	0	0	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
16	0	0	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

ⓧ
ⓧⓧ

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option				Comments/mitigation
	Issue D: Option a – Phasing allocation according to 5 year periods				
	Compatibility score				
Short	Med	Long			
17	0	0	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	
18	0	0	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	
19	0	0	-/✓	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Proposals to be informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26	
20	0	0	0		
21	0	0	0		
22	0	0	0		

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue D – Phasing the allocation of Gypsy and Traveller Sites

Social and economic – The preferred option is option b (no phasing) as this is most likely to achieve the Council’s social sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Option b could meet the requirements of objective 1 (meeting housing need) as it allows a more flexible approach to site allocation/delivery in response to need. The alternative option (option a – to phase allocation) is less flexible and therefore less likely to meet objective 1 in the short and medium term, when any need arising could potentially be met by unphased site allocations.

Environmental - The two options mostly score the same in achieving the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives, though only preferred option b covers the short, medium and long term. Impacts can generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option b. Not phasing site delivery will allow for more flexibility to deal with applications for sites as these are made (based on the overall allocation of sufficient sites to meet Wokingham’s identified need).



Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant



Negative
Very Negative

Issue E: Allocation of Reserve Gypsy and Traveller Sites

The preferred option for this issue was derived from responses to the GTLP Draft Options Paper consultation that took place from 7th August to 2nd October 2014, the results of the updated GTAA (March 2015) and the approach to allocating conventional housing sites taken in policy SAL03 (Allocated reserve housing sites) of the MDD Local Plan (February 2014).

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue E: Option b – Do not allocate reserve sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	0	-	-/x	May not meet objective if the Council finds that there is a deficit in the rolling 5 year supply of pitches. Would have to rely on 'windfall' planning applications instead – there is less certainty about the suitability of these sites; may end up having permissions granted at appeal
2	0	-	-	Development should be in accordance with NPPF Technical Guidance, Policy CP1 of Core Strategy, MDD Policy TB10 and advice from Environment Agency and Council's SFRA. There is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
3	0	-	-/✓	Windfall applications would be considered taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide. However, there is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
4	0	-	-/✓	Windfall applications would be considered taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide. However, there is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
5	0	-	-/✓	Windfall sites could help to meet objective in long term, in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS. However, there is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
6	0	-	-/✓	Windfall sites could possibly help reduce social exclusion in long term, with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy. However, there is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
7	0	-	✓	Windfall sites could help educational attainment by providing settled base for children
8	0	-	-/✓	Windfall sites would possibly present opportunities to improve access to services and facilities, in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS. However, there is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
9	0	-	-/✓	Windfall sites could present opportunities to improve highway safety/travel choice, in line with Policy CP6 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS. However, there is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
10	0	-	-/✓	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0	
12	0	-	-/✓	Possible impact on local biodiversity, but scope for mitigation (though may be less flexible than

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue E: Option b – Do not allocate reserve sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
				allocated reserve sites). Development to be in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.
13	0	-	-/✓	Possible impact on local biodiversity, but scope for mitigation (though may be less flexible than allocated reserve sites). Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	-	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
15	0	-	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
16	0	-	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD. However, there is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
17	0	-	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD. However, there is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
18	0	-	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
19	0	-	-/✓	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment, but scope for mitigation through applications. Informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26. However, there is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue E: Option a – Allocate reserve Gypsy and Traveller sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	0	-	✓	The current GTAA sets out that there is no need to allocate additional pitches in the short term. Would help to meet long term supply objective in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
2	-	-	-	Development should be in accordance with NPPF Technical Guidance, Policy CP1 of Core Strategy, MDD Policy TB10 and advice from Environment Agency and Council's SFRA

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			Comments/mitigation
	Issue E: Option a – Allocate reserve Gypsy and Traveller sites			
	Compatibility score			
	Short	Med	Long	
3	0	-	✓	Design of developments on reserve sites would be considered taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
4	0	-	✓	Design of developments on reserve sites would be considered taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
5	0	-	✓	Would help to meet objective in long term, in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
6	0	-	✓	Release of reserve sites could possibly help reduce social exclusion in long term, with regard to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy.
7	0	-	✓	Release of reserve sites could help educational attainment by providing settled base for children
8	0	-	✓	Reserve sites would present opportunities to improve access to services and facilities, in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
9	0	-	✓	Reserve sites would present opportunities to improve highway safety/travel choice, in line with Policy CP6 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS
10	0	-	-/✓	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0	
12	0	-	-/✓	Possible impact on local biodiversity, but scope for mitigation through selection process and applications. Development to be in line with Policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD. Sites close to the SPA would contribute towards avoidance measures in line with CP8.
13	0	-	-/✓	May impact on countryside and historic environment, but scope for mitigation through selection process and applications. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	-	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
15	0	-	✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
16	0	-	✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
17	0	-	✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
18	0	-	-/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

✗ Negative
✗✗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option				Comments/mitigation
	Issue E: Option a – Allocate reserve Gypsy and Traveller sites				
	Compatibility score				
Short	Med	Long			
19	0	-	✓	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment, but scope for mitigation through selection process and applications. Informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26	
20	0	0	0		
21	0	0	0		
22	0	0	0		

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue E – Allocation of Reserve Gypsy and Traveller Sites

Social and economic - Alternative option a – allocation of reserve Gypsy and Traveller sites - is most likely to achieve the Council’s social sustainability objectives in the long term. Where the option scores less well this could be mitigated through the site selection process and applications, having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance. However, option b – not allocating reserve sites –could also meet objective 1 and other social objectives in the long term provided that sufficient sites are allocated to meet identified need.

Environmental - The two options have similar scores in the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where both options score less well this can generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option b. Not allocating reserve sites would not affect the ability of the GTLP to deliver sufficient sustainable sites to meet need through appropriate allocation and also potentially windfalls (where these are acceptable in planning terms).



Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant



Negative
Very Negative

Issue F: Approach to allocating Travelling Showpeople sites

The preferred option for this issue was derived from responses to the GTLP Draft Options Paper consultation that took place from 7th August to 2nd October 2014 and the results of the updated GTAA (March 2015).

Sustainability Objective	Issue G: Option a – Allocate Travelling Showpeople sites				Issue G: Option b – Do not allocate sites for Travelling Showpeople			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
1	0	0/✓	0/✓✓	At present no need is identified. But if need arose in future site allocation would meet this objective, in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy and Policy TB10 of the MDD.	0	-	-	At present no need is identified. Any possible future need for Travelling Showpeople would have to be met through windfall planning applications (no allocated supply) subject to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy and Policy TB10 of the MDD. Risk that applications are unacceptable/no suitable sites can be found – increase in unauthorised encampments and overcrowded sites
2	0	0/✓	0/✓	Appropriate sites could be chosen outside Flood Zones	0	-	-	Sites applications would be assessed in accordance with policies in the development plan.
3	0	0/✓	0/✓	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide. Safer environment for occupants if sites are allocated	0	0/-	0/-	Would be considered in design of windfall developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide. Overcrowded sites and unauthorised stopping places less likely to be safe for occupants
4	0	0/✓	0/✓	May be positive impact on health-well-being – no need for unauthorised encampments	0	0/-	0/-	May be negative impact on health-well-being – unauthorised encampments / overcrowding could result. Windfall sites could achieve objective but less certainty of suitability
5	0	0/✓	0/✓	Allocated sites could help to meet objective, in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS.	0	0/✓	0/✓	Windfall sites could help to meet objective, in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of MDD and PPTS. However, there is less certainty about

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
⊗⊗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Issue G: Option a – Allocate Travelling Showpeople sites				Issue G: Option b – Do not allocate sites for Travelling Showpeople			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
								suitability of windfall sites
6	0	0/✓	0/✓	Allocated sites could help achieve reduction in social exclusion – avoid stigma for occupants of unauthorised encampments	0	0/-	0/-	Unauthorised encampments increase tensions between settled and Travelling community – issue of social exclusion. Windfall sites could achieve objective but less certainty of suitability
7	0	0	0		0	0	0	
8	0	0/✓	0/✓	Allocation of suitable sites will improve access to services	0	0/-	0/-	No site allocation may have adverse impact on access to services. Windfall sites could achieve objective but less certainty of suitability
9	0	0/✓	0/✓	Allocation of suitable sites will improve travel choice/road safety	0	0/-	0/-	No site allocation may have adverse impact on travel choice/road safety. Windfall sites could achieve objective but less certainty of suitability
10	0	0	0	May not involve previously developed land	0	0	0	Windfall sites may not involve previously developed land
11	0	0/✓	0/✓	Less likelihood of pollution resulting from unauthorised encampments or overcrowding	0	0/-	0/-	Greater likelihood of pollution from overcrowded/unauthorised sites. But could be mitigated through planning applications
12	0	0/✓	0/✓	Any impact on biodiversity could be mitigated on allocated sites (policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD)	0	0/-	0/-	Harm to biodiversity could be mitigated through windfall planning application (policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD) but less certainty of suitability
13	0	0/✓	0/✓	Visual impact of sites could be mitigated if appropriate sites are allocated. (Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3, TB21 of MDD, Borough Design Guide)	0	0/-	0/-	More likelihood of harmful impact on countryside and heritage resulting from unauthorised encampment. Could be mitigated through planning application (Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3, TB21 of MDD, Borough Design Guide) but less certainty of suitability
14	0	0/✓	0/✓	Greater opportunity for	0	0/-/x	0/-	Less opportunity for sustainable

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

✗ Negative
✗✗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Issue G: Option a – Allocate Travelling Showpeople sites				Issue G: Option b – Do not allocate sites for Travelling Showpeople			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
				sustainable development on allocated sites (policy CP1 of Core Strategy, CC04 of MDD and Sustainable Design)				development on windfall sites (policy CP1 of Core Strategy, CC04 of MDD and Sustainable Design)
15	0	0/✓	0/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	0/✓	0/✓	Provision can be made as part of a planning application but less certainty of suitability on windfall sites. Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
16	0	0/✓	0/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	0/✓	0/✓	Provision can be made as part of a planning application but less certainty of suitability on windfall sites. Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
17	0	0/✓	0/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	0/✓	0/✓	Provision can be made as part of a planning application but less certainty of suitability on windfall sites. Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
18	0	0/✓	0/✓	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	0/✓	0/✓	Provision can be made as part of a planning application but less certainty of suitability on windfall sites. Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
19	0	0/✓	0/✓	Allocation of appropriate sites is more likely to meet this objective, subject to MDD policies TB21, TB24-26	0	0/-x	0/-	Unauthorised encampments or unsought applications are more likely to cause material harm to character/environment. Could be mitigated through planning application (subject to MDD policies

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Issue G: Option a – Allocate Travelling Showpeople sites			Issue G: Option b – Do not allocate sites for Travelling Showpeople			Comments/mitigation
	Compatibility score			Compatibility score			
	Short	Med	Long	Short	Med	Long	
							TB21, TB24-26) but less certainty of suitability
20	0	0	0	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue F – Approach to allocating Travelling Showpeople sites

Social and economic – Option a – allocating sites for Travelling Showpeople - scores positively in all of the relevant categories of the Council’s social sustainability objectives, particularly objective 1 (meeting housing need). Option b - not allocating Travelling Showpeople sites - has a generally neutral score in the medium/long term. Whilst objective 1 is initially negative, the March 2015 GTAA has indicated that there is no current need for sites; if there was such a need then option a would be more sustainable (as suitable sites could be identified through the site selection/allocation process) but as it stands the GTAA has identified that this option is not relevant at the current time. In future if a need was identified then option b (no allocation) does not prevent windfall applications from meeting that need where suitable.

Environmental – Options a and b score mostly positive in all of the relevant categories of the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives. It is recognised that many of the impacts could be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance in any planning application for a site for Travelling Showpeople.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option b. No need has been identified in the updated GTAA (March 2015) and not allocating Travelling Showpeople sites would not affect the ability of the GTLP to deliver sufficient sustainable sites to meet need through future applications (where these are acceptable in planning terms).

Issue G: Approach to allocating transit sites for Gypsies and Travellers

The preferred option for this issue was derived from responses to the GTLP Draft Options Paper consultation that took place from 7th August to 2nd October 2014 and the results of the updated GTAA (March 2015), as well as further research on alternative approaches to addressing any temporary requirements.

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue G: Option b – Do not allocate transit sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	0	-	-	Any possible future need for transit sites would have to be met through windfall planning applications (not allocated supply) subject to Policy CP2 of Core Strategy and Policy TB10 of the MDD. Risk that no suitable sites can be found – but other methods are also available to address transit issue (such as provision of flexible space on sites) and a criteria-based policy could be created to address this issue.
2	0	-	-	Risk of future need and lack of allocation resulting in sites in Flood Zone – but this can be mitigated by policy
3	0	-	-	Would be considered in design of developments and in line with policy and guidance
4	0	-	-	Unauthorised encampments / overcrowding could result if no transit sites provided. Windfall sites could achieve objective but less certainty of suitability; however there are other methods that could be used to address this requirement on existing/new sites and policy can be developed on this basis.
5	0	0	0	
6	0	-	-	Unauthorised encampments increase tensions between settled and travelling community, even when temporary – issue of social exclusion for GRT. Windfall sites could achieve objective but less certainty of suitability. Provision of transit space on existing/new sites could enhance community cohesion but may also lead to issues; however, the temporary nature of any visitors could mitigate this.
7	0	0	0	
8	0	-	-	No transit site allocation may have adverse impact on access to services. Windfall sites could achieve objective but less certainty of suitability. Provision of transit space on existing/new sites could enhance access to services for visitors.
9	0	-	-	No transit site allocation may have adverse impact on travel choice/road safety. Windfall sites could achieve objective but less certainty of suitability. . Provision of transit space on existing/new sites could enhance impact on the road network.
10	0/-	0/-	0/-	May not involve previously developed land

✓✓ Very Positive
 ✓ Positive
 - Neutral (Positive and Negative)
 0 Not Relevant
 ☹ Negative
 ☹☹ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue G: Option b – Do not allocate transit sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
11	0	-	-	Greater likelihood of pollution from sites with more occupants – though this is less likely to have a medium/long term cumulative impact when some of the occupants are there on a temporary basis.
12	0	0	0	Temporary nature of transit is less likely to have significant impact on biodiversity. Any harm could be mitigated through planning application (policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD) but less certainty of suitability
13	0	0/-	0/-	More likelihood of harmful impact on countryside and heritage resulting from unauthorised encampment – however temporary in nature. Windfall sites could have mitigation but less certainty of suitability (Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3, TB21 of MDD, Borough Design Guide). The use of parts of existing sites is less likely to have an impact.
14	0	0	0	
15	0	0/-	0/-	Windfall sites could have facilities but less certainty of suitability; existing sites would have existing facilities
16	0	0/-	0/-	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD. However, there is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
17	0	0/-	0/-	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD. However, there is less certainty about suitability of windfall sites
18	0	0	0	
19	0	0/-	0/-	Unauthorised encampments or unsought applications are more likely to cause material harm to character/environment. Windfall sites could include mitigation (subject to MDD policies TB21, TB24-26) but there is less certainty about their suitability. The use of parts of existing sites is less likely to have an impact.
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Issue G: Option a – Allocate transit sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long	
1	0	0/✓	0/✓	At present no need is identified. But if need arose in future this would meet objective, in line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy and Policy TB10 of the MDD.
2	0	0/✓	0/✓	Appropriate sites could be chosen outside Flood Zones

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Issue G: Option a – Allocate transit sites			Comments/mitigation
	Compatibility score			
	Short	Med	Long	
3	0	0/✓	0/✓	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide. Safer environment for occupants if transit sites are allocated
4	0	0/✓	0/✓	May be positive impact on health-well-being – no need for unauthorised encampments
5	0	0	0	
6	0	0/✓	0/✓	Reduction in social exclusion – avoid stigma for occupants of unauthorised encampments
7	0	0	0	
8	0	0/✓	0/✓	Allocation of suitable sites will improve temporary access to services
9	0	0/✓	0/✓	Allocation of suitable sites will improve travel choice/road safety
10	0/-	0/-	0/-	May not involve previously developed land
11	0	0/✓	0/✓	Allocated sites mean less likelihood of pollution resulting from unauthorised encampments or overcrowding
12	0	0/✓	0/✓	Temporary nature of transit is less likely to have significant impact on biodiversity – but this could be mitigated on allocated sites (policy CP7 of Core Strategy and TB23 of MDD)
13	0	-	-	Visual impact of transit sites could be mitigated if appropriate sites are allocated (Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3, TB21 of MDD, Borough Design Guide)
14	0	0	0	
15	0	0/✓	0/✓	Allocation of appropriate sites can include facilities for waste
16	0	0/-	0/-	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
17	0	0/-	0/-	Proposals to have regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
18	0	0	0	
19	0	-	-	Allocation of appropriate sites is more likely to meet this objective, subject to MDD policies TB21, TB24-26, although site will be present even when unoccupied (thus having a greater medium/long term impact on character)
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue G – Approach to allocating transit sites for Gypsies and Travellers

Social and economic – Alternative option a – allocating transit sites - scores positively in all of the relevant categories of the Council’s social sustainability objectives, particularly objective 1 (meeting housing need). Option b - not allocating transit sites - has a generally neutral (both positive and negative) score, based on the fact that whilst there is a potential risk of a greater number of unauthorised encampments if there is no (or not enough) transit provision in the Borough, this can be balanced against the existence of other effective methods for addressing transit need (such as the provision of flexible space on existing or new sites for visiting families, or pitches large enough to accommodate visitors). Such methods would have a broadly positive impact that would balance the inherent challenges of seeking appropriate sites for transit allocation.

Environmental – Again Option a scores generally positively and option b neutrally in all of the relevant categories of the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives. However, it is acknowledged that the nature of an allocated transit site would mean that it is present even if not occupied, with a potentially longer-term impact on character. This impact could be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance, as could possible windfall applications for transit sites. Consideration of other methods under option b (provision of flexible space for visitors on existing/new sites) would have a more positive impact in environmental terms as these will occupy either existing developed land or be planned as part of appropriate site allocations/applications with suitable mitigation.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option b. Not allocating transit sites would not automatically lead to an increase in authorised encampments, as the possibility of windfall sites being approved and also the use of methods to provide space for temporary occupation on existing sites or new sites would enable any need to be addressed. This could be assisted by the inclusion of a criteria-based policy in the GTLP. In the long term the use of various methods to ‘design in’ transit provision could be more sustainable and effective than site allocation.



Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant



Negative
Very Negative

Issue H: Approach to site layout, safety and management

The preferred option for this issue was derived from responses to the GTLP Draft Options Paper consultation that took place from 7th August to 2nd October 2014, as well as internal discussions.

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			Comments/mitigation	Alternative Option			Comments/mitigation
	Issue H: Option a – Include a policy with specific standards and approach to site layout, safety and management				Issue H: Option b - Rely on existing guidance			
	Compatibility score				Compatibility score			
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
1	0	0	0		0	0	0	
2	0	0	0		0	0	0	
3	✓	✓	✓✓	Would meet the objective through consideration of safety and security in site layout and management. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	✓	✓	✓	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
4	0	-/✓	-/✓	Could possibly help meet this objective through improved site safety/management. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	0	-	-	Could meet this objective – but less scope to require details/secure compliance
5	0	0	0		0	0	0	
6	0	0	0		0	0	0	
7	0	0	0		0	0	0	
8	✓	-/✓	-/✓	May help meet the objective by increasing accessibility to emergency services on site.	-	-	-	Could meet this objective – but less scope to require details/secure compliance
9	✓	✓	✓	Possibly help meet the objective by increasing safe access/road safety. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing	-	-	-	Could meet this objective – but less scope to require details/secure compliance

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

✗ Negative
✗✗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			Alternative Option				
	Issue H: Option a – Include a policy with specific standards and approach to site layout, safety and management			Issue H: Option b - Rely on existing guidance				
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long	Short		Med	Long		
				planning documents				
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0		0	0	0	
12	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity. Need for appropriate mitigation and landscaping	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity. Need for appropriate mitigation and landscaping
13	-	-/✓	-/✓	May enhance countryside character and historic environment – site layout could preserve existing landscape features e.g. trees. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS	-	-	-	May impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	0	0		0	0	0	
15	-	✓	✓	Site layout/management – make provision for waste collection/refuse vehicles etc. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	0	0	0	Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
16	0	0	0		0	0	0	
17	0	0	0		0	0	0	
18	0	0	0		0	0	0	
19	-	-/✓	✓	Sympathetic site layout/pitch size could impact on character, landscape and historic environment e.g. less overcrowding. The policy will	-	-	-	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

✗ Negative
✗✗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			Alternative Option				
	Issue H: Option a – Include a policy with specific standards and approach to site layout, safety and management			Issue H: Option b - Rely on existing guidance				
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long	Short		Med	Long		
				provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents				
20	0	0	0	Regard to Policy TB10(g) of MDD	0	0	0	Regard to Policy TB10(g) of MDD
21	0	0	0	Regard to Policy TB10(g) of MDD	0	0	0	Regard to Policy TB10(g) of MDD
22	0	0	0	Regard to Policy TB10(g) of MDD	0	0	0	Regard to Policy TB10(g) of MDD

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue H – Approach to site layout, safety and management

Social and economic – The preferred option is option a (including a specific policy on site layout, safety and management in the GTLP) as this is most likely to achieve the Council’s social and economic sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where the option scores less well this could generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance. Option a is more likely to have a more positive effect than the alternative option b in meeting the requirements of objective 3 (safe and secure environments) and objectives 8 and 9 (improve accessibility and highway safety).

Environmental – Preferred option a generally scores more positively in achieving the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term – especially objectives 13, 15 and 19 (impact on countryside character, waste management and positive contribution to environment and heritage). In other areas scoring is neutral or not relevant. Alternative option b scores less well – in light of the non-specific nature of the existing guidance - but in some cases this could be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option a. The new policy would cover a number of issues and have a specific local emphasis which would provide greater opportunity to maintain and enhance the sustainability of new and existing sites in the Borough.

Issue I: Approach to demarcation of site/pitch boundaries and landscaping

The preferred option for this issue was derived from responses to the GTLP Draft Options Paper consultation that took place from 7th August to 2nd October 2014, as well as internal discussions. The requirements of policy TB10 of the MDD Local Plan (criteria e and f) are also relevant.

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option Issue I: Option a – Include a policy with specific standards and approach to the demarcation of site/pitch boundaries and landscaping			Comments/mitigation	Alternative Option Issue I: Option b – Rely on existing guidance			Comments/mitigation
	Compatibility score				Compatibility score			
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
1	0	0	0		0	0	0	
2	0	0/✓	✓	Landscaping could include SUDs to reduce flood risk. Development should be in accordance with NPPF Technical Guidance, Policy CP1 of Core Strategy, MDD Policy TB10 and advice from Environment Agency and Council's SFRA	0	0	0	Development should be in accordance with NPPF Technical Guidance, Policy CP1 of Core Strategy, MDD Policy TB10 and advice from Environment Agency and Council's SFRA
3	✓	✓	✓✓	Would meet the objective through consideration of site boundaries (security). The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	✓	✓	✓	Would be considered in design of developments taking account of DCLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide.
4	-	✓	✓	Possibly help meet this objective by reducing overcrowding through unauthorised pitches; protection of privacy. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Possibly help meet this objective – but provides less ability to seek specific design solutions
5	-	-	✓	Possibly help meet this objective – sympathetic layout/landscaping to enhance local distinctiveness.	-	-	-	Possibly help meet this objective – but provides less ability to seek specific design solutions

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

✗ Negative
✗✗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			Comments/mitigation	Alternative Option			Comments/mitigation
	Issue I: Option a – Include a policy with specific standards and approach to the demarcation of site/pitch boundaries and landscaping				Issue I: Option b – Rely on existing guidance			
	Compatibility score				Compatibility score			
Short	Med	Long	Short	Med	Long	Short	Med	Long
				The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents				
6	-	-	-/✓	May be design opportunity to improve integration with other communities – e.g. sympathetic site boundaries. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	-	-	-	May be limited opportunities to improve integration with the other communities – but less ability to seek design solutions
7	0	0	0		0	0	0	
8	0	0	0		0	0	0	
9	0	0	0		0	0/-	0	
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0		0	0	0	
12	-	-/✓	-/✓	Site specific approach to landscaping - possible impact on local biodiversity. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity – less scope to control this. Need for appropriate mitigation and landscaping
13	-	-/✓	✓	Will impact on countryside and historic environment – landscaping can enhance character. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	-	-	-	May impact on countryside and historic environment – less scope to control this. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	0	0		0	0	0	

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			Comments/mitigation	Alternative Option			Comments/mitigation
	Issue I: Option a – Include a policy with specific standards and approach to the demarcation of site/pitch boundaries and landscaping				Issue I: Option b – Rely on existing guidance			
	Compatibility score				Compatibility score			
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
15	0	0	0		0	0	0	
16	0	-/✓	-/✓	Landscaping could include SUDs. Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	0	0	Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
17	0	0	0		0	0	0	
18	0	0	0		0	0	0	
19	-	-/✓	✓	Approach to boundaries and landscaping could have positive impact on character, landscape and historic environment. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	-	-	-	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0		0	0	0	
21	0	0	0		0	0	0	
22	0	0	0		0	0	0	

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue I – Approach to demarcation of site/pitch boundaries and landscaping

Social and economic – The preferred option is option a (including a policy on demarcation of boundaries and landscaping in the GTLP) as this is most likely to achieve the Council’s social and economic sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where this option scores less well, this is generally mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance. Option a is more likely to have a more positive effect than the alternative option b in meeting the requirements of objective 3 (safe and secure environments) and objective 4 (improve health and wellbeing of the population).

Environmental – Preferred option a generally scores more positively in achieving the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term – especially objectives 13 and 19 (impact on countryside character and positive contribution to environment and

✓✓ Very Positive
 ✓ Positive
 - Neutral (Positive and Negative)
 0 Not Relevant
 ☒ Negative
 ☒☒ Very Negative

heritage). In other areas scoring is neutral or not relevant. Option b scores less well – due to the non-specific nature of the existing guidance – but in some cases this could be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council's preferred option is option a. The new policy would cover a number of issues and have a specific local emphasis which would provide greater opportunity to maintain and enhance the sustainability of new and existing sites in the Borough.

✓✓
✓ Very Positive
Positive

-
0 Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗ Negative
Very Negative

Issue J: Standards for amenity buildings

The preferred option for this issue was derived from responses to the GTLP Draft Options Paper consultation that took place from 7th August to 2nd October 2014, as well as internal discussions.

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option Issue J: Option a – Include a policy with specific standards and approach to private/communal buildings				Alternative Option Issue J: Option b – Rely on existing guidance			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
1	✓	✓	✓	Meets objective – provision of amenity blocks part of decent sustainable accommodation.	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Meets objective. Not in line with Policy CC04 of the MDD but would conform to Design Guide (taken from DCLG Good Practice Guide)
2	0	0	0		0	0	0	
3	0	0	0		0	0	0	
4	-	-	-/✓	Provision of amenity buildings is beneficial for health/well-being of site occupants. Having standards for the number of amenity buildings on a site may improve safety. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	-	-	-	Provision of amenity buildings is beneficial for health/well-being of site occupants, but less scope to ask for specific details
5	0	0	0		0	0	0	
6	0	0	0		0	0	0	
7	0	0	0		0	0	0	
8	0	0	0		0	0	0	
9	0	0	0		0	0	0	
10	-	-	-	Existing buildings can be converted to amenity buildings	-	-	-	Existing buildings can be converted to amenity buildings
11	0	0	0		0	0	0	
12	0	0	0		0	0	0	
13	-	✓	✓	Controlling numbers and scale of	x	x	x	More likely to be an impact on

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

✗
✗✗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			Alternative Option				
	Issue J: Option a – Include a policy with specific standards and approach to private/communal buildings			Issue J: Option b – Rely on existing guidance				
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long	Short		Med	Long		
				buildings would reduce impact on countryside and historic environment. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents				countryside and historic environment due to numbers/scale of buildings if subject to existing guidance rather than policy, as cannot control scale/numbers etc. as easily. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	-	✓	✓	Can require more sustainable design/layout. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	-	-	-/x	Cannot require sustainable design of buildings. Issue of relevance of building regulations for static caravans. Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, MDD Policies CC05 & CC06 and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.
15	0	-	-/✓	May be scope for waste disposal facilities. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	-	-	-	Guidance is less prescriptive and lacks as much weight as policy
16	0	0	0		0	0	0	
17	0	0	0		0	0	0	
18	-	-/✓	✓	Can require energy efficient design/ possibly solar panels. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	-	-	-/x	Cannot require any energy efficient measures/renewable energy. Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, MDD Policy CC05 and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
19	-	✓	✓	Controls on number and size of buildings may reduce impact on character, landscape and historic environment. The policy will provide additional guidance which may not be provided by existing planning documents	x	x	x	More likely to impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
⊗⊗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			Alternative Option			
	Issue J: Option a – Include a policy with specific standards and approach to private/communal buildings			Issue J: Option b – Rely on existing guidance			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation			
	Short	Med	Long				
	Short	Med	Long	Short	Med	Long	
20	0	0	0	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue J – Standards for amenity buildings

Social and economic – The preferred option is option a (including a policy on amenity buildings in the GTLP) as this is most likely to achieve the Council’s social and economic sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where the option scores less well this is generally mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance. Option a could help meet social objective 1 (to make provision for local housing).

Environmental – Preferred option a is most likely to achieve the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Scoring is positive, neutral or not relevant. Where the option scores less well in the short term this can generally be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy and national policy guidance. Option a will help meet objective 14 (sustainable use of resources). Alternative option b scores less well – due to the non-specific nature of the existing guidance – but in some cases this could be mitigated by having regard to policies in the Core Strategy, MDD and national policy guidance.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option a. The new policy would cover a number of issues and have a specific local emphasis which would provide greater opportunity to maintain and enhance the sustainability of new and existing sites in the Borough.

Issue K: Approach to retaining Gypsy and Traveller sites

The preferred option for this issue was derived from responses to the GTLP Draft Options Paper consultation that took place from 7th August to 2nd October 2014, as well as internal discussions and recent changes to Government guidance.

Retention of Gypsy and Traveller Sites:

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue K: Option d – Hybrid of all the other options (ensuring retention of GRT sites by using planning conditions, legal agreements and policy in the GTLP)			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	-/✓	-/✓	✓✓	Meets objective – allows greater flexibility. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of the MDD and PPTS.
2	0	0	0	
3	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to create safe and secure sites if these will remain in GT use indefinitely
4	-	✓	✓	Greater capacity to enhance well-being if sites remain in GT use indefinitely
5	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to create vibrant distinctive communities if sites remain in GT use indefinitely
6	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to reduce social exclusion if sites remain in GT use indefinitely
7	-	✓	✓	Greater capacity to raise educational attainment if sites remain in GT use indefinitely (settled base for children in school)
8	0	0	0	
9	0	0	0	
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0	
12	0	0	0	
13	0	0	0	
14	0	0	0	
15	0	0	0	
16	0	0	0	
17	0	0	0	
18	0	0	0	

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-

0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue K: Option d – Hybrid of all the other options (ensuring retention of GRT sites by using planning conditions, legal agreements and policy in the GTLP)			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
19	0	0	0	
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option				Alternative Option			
	Issue K: Option a – Use of planning condition to control the use of sites				Issue K: Option b – Using legal agreements to control the use of sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long	Short		Med	Long		
1	-	✓	✓✓	Meets objective; easier to enforce. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of the MDD and PPTS.	-	✓	✓✓	Meets objective; easier to enforce but more time-consuming/expensive than condition. In line with Policy CP2 of Core Strategy, TB10 of the MDD and PPTS.
2	0	0	0		0	0	0	
3	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to create safe and secure sites if these will remain in GT use indefinitely	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to create safe and secure sites if these will remain in GT use indefinitely
4	-	✓	✓	Greater capacity to enhance well-being if sites remain in GT use indefinitely	-	✓	✓	Greater capacity to enhance well-being if sites remain in GT use indefinitely
5	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to create vibrant distinctive communities if sites remain in GT use indefinitely	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to create vibrant distinctive communities if sites remain in GT use indefinitely
6	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to reduce social exclusion if sites remain in GT use indefinitely	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to reduce social exclusion if sites remain in GT use indefinitely
7	-	✓	✓	Greater capacity to raise educational attainment if sites remain in GT use indefinitely	-	✓	✓	Greater capacity to raise educational attainment if sites remain in GT use indefinitely (settled base for children in

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
⊗⊗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue K: Option a – Use of planning condition to control the use of sites			Alternative Option Issue K: Option b – Using legal agreements to control the use of sites				
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
				(settled base for children in school)				school)
8	0	0	0		0	0	0	
9	0	0	0		0	0	0	
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0		0	0	0	
12	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity. Need for appropriate mitigation and landscaping	-	-	-	Possible impact on local biodiversity. Need for appropriate mitigation and landscaping
13	-	-	-	May impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS	-	-	-	May impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	0	0	Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	0	0	Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC04 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
15	0	0	0	Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	0	0	Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
16	0	0	0	Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	0	0	Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
17	0	0	0		0	0	0	
18	0	0	0	Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and	0	0	0	Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy, CC05 of the MDD and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
⊗⊗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue K: Option a – Use of planning condition to control the use of sites				Alternative Option Issue K: Option b – Using legal agreements to control the use of sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
				Construction SPD				SPD
19	-	-	-	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26	-	-	-	Possible impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0		0	0	0	
21	0	0	0		0	0	0	
22	0	0	0		0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue K: Option c – Rely on allocation of site in GTLP and associated 'retention' policy in the GTLP			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	-/✓	-/✓	-/✓	Meets objective, but less formal control. Possible loss of gypsy sites if no formal condition/agreement is used.
2	0	0	0	
3	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to create safe and secure sites if these will remain in GT use indefinitely
4	-	✓	✓	Greater capacity to enhance well-being if sites remain in GT use indefinitely
5	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to create vibrant distinctive communities if sites remain in GT use indefinitely
6	-	-/✓	-/✓	Greater capacity to reduce social exclusion if sites remain in GT use indefinitely
7	-	✓	✓	Greater capacity to raise educational attainment if sites remain in GT use indefinitely (settled base for children in school)
8	0	0	0	
9	0	0	0	
10	-	-	-	May not include previously developed land
11	0	0	0	
12	0	0	0	
13	0	0	0	
14	0	0	0	
15	0	0	0	

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
⊗⊗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue K: Option c – Rely on allocation of site in GTLP and associated 'retention' policy in the GTLP			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
16	0	0	0	
17	0	0	0	
18	0	0	0	
19	0	0	0	
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue K – Approach to retaining Gypsy and Traveller sites

Retention:

Social and economic – Alternative options a, b and d (that the Council should seek to protect Gypsy and Traveller Sites through use of planning conditions and/or legal agreements, or a hybrid of options) are all likely to achieve the Council’s social and economic sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. However, options a, b and d are more likely to have a more positive effect than the alternative option c in meeting the requirements of objective 1 (provision of housing), objective 4 (health and well-being) and objective 7 (educational attainment), with option d offering the most flexibility. Option c scores less as there is a possible loss of Gypsy sites if they are not retained in a manner that is enforceable e.g. a planning condition.

Environmental – Scoring on the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives is either neutral or not relevant.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option d, as this would combine all of the three alternative options (planning conditions, legal agreements and GTLP policy). One or a mix of these options could then be used as appropriate to secure sustainable site retention, thus avoiding any potential negative impact of relying on just one approach.



Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant



Negative
Very Negative

Issue K: Approach to retaining Gypsy and Traveller sites (cont.)

Restoration of Gypsy and Traveller Sites:

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue K: Option d – Hybrid of all the other options (ensuring restoration of GRT sites by using planning conditions, legal agreements and policy in the GTLP)			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
1	0	0	0	
2	0	-/✓	-/✓	Restoration may restore/enhance drainage.
3	0	0	0	
4	0	0	0	
5	0	0	0	
6	0	0	0	
7	0	0	0	
8	0	0	0	
9	0	0	0	
10	0	0	0	
11	0	-/✓	✓	Restoration to include remediation of site
12	-	-/✓	✓	Possible impact on local biodiversity – restoration could improve/enhance habitat provision.
13	-	-/✓	✓	Will impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS
14	0	0	0	
15	0	0	0	
16	0	-/✓	✓	Restoration may improve water quality. Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
17	0	-/✓	✓	Restoration may improve soil quality. Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
18	0	0	0	
19	0	-/✓	✓	Possible positive impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26

✓✓ Very Positive
 ✓ Positive
 - Neutral (Positive and Negative)
 0 Not Relevant
 ☒ Negative
 ☒☒ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Preferred Option			
	Issue K: Option d – Hybrid of all the other options (ensuring restoration of GRT sites by using planning conditions, legal agreements and policy in the GTLP)			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option				Alternative Option			
	Issue K: Option a – Use of planning condition to control the restoration of sites				Issue K: Option b – Using legal agreements to control the restoration of sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long	Short		Med	Long		
1	0	0	0		0	0	0	
2	-	-/✓	-/✓	Restoration may restore/enhance drainage.	-	-/✓	-/✓	Restoration may restore/enhance drainage.
3	0	0	0		0	0	0	
4	0	0	0		0	0	0	
5	0	0	0		0	0	0	
6	0	0	0		0	0	0	
7	0	0	0		0	0	0	
8	0	0	0		0	0	0	
9	0	0	0		0	0	0	
10	0	0	0		0	0	0	
11	0	-/✓	✓	Restoration to include remediation of site	0	-/✓	✓	Restoration to include remediation of site
12	-	-/✓	✓	Possible impact on local biodiversity – restoration could improve/enhance habitat provision.	-	-/✓	✓	Possible impact on local biodiversity – restoration could improve/enhance habitat provision.
13	-	-/✓	✓	Will impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and	-	-/✓	✓	Will impact on countryside and historic environment. Development to be in line with Policy CP3 of Core Strategy, TB10 and TB21 of MDD and PPTS

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
⊗⊗ Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue K: Option a – Use of planning condition to control the restoration of sites				Alternative Option Issue K: Option b – Using legal agreements to control the restoration of sites			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long		Short	Med	Long	
				PPTS				
14	0	0	0		0	0	0	
15	0	0	0		0	0	0	
16	0	-/✓	✓	Restoration may improve water quality. Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	-/✓	✓	Restoration may improve water quality. Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
17	0	-/✓	✓	Restoration may improve soil quality. Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD	0	-/✓	✓	Restoration may improve soil quality. Regard to CP1 of the Core Strategy and Council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
18	0	0	0		0	0	0	
19	0	-/✓	✓	Possible positive impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Informed by MDD policies TB21, TB24-26	0	-/✓	✓	Possible positive impact on character, landscape and historic environment. Informed by policies TB21, TB24-26
20	0	0	0		0	0	0	
21	0	0	0		0	0	0	
22	0	0	0		0	0	0	

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option Issue K: Option c – Rely on 'restoration' policy in the GTLP			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
	Short	Med	Long	
1	0	0	0	
2	0	-	-	Possible lack of appropriate restoration if no formal i.e. legal/enforceable requirement
3	0	0	0	

✓✓
✓

Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant

⊗
⊗⊗

Negative
Very Negative

Sustainability Objective	Alternative Option			
	Issue K: Option c – Rely on ‘restoration’ policy in the GTLP			
	Compatibility score			Comments/mitigation
Short	Med	Long		
4	0	0	0	
5	0	0	0	
6	0	0	0	
7	0	0	0	
8	0	0	0	
9	0	0	0	
10	0	0	0	
11	0	0	0	
12	-	-	-	Possible lack of appropriate restoration if no formal i.e. legal/enforceable requirement.
13	-	-	-	Possible lack of appropriate restoration if no formal i.e. legal/enforceable requirement
14	0	0	0	
15	0	0	0	
16	0	-	-/x	Possible lack of appropriate restoration if no formal i.e. legal/enforceable requirement
17	0	-	-/x	Possible lack of appropriate restoration if no formal i.e. legal/enforceable requirement
18	0	0	0	
19	0	-	-/x	Possible lack of appropriate restoration if no formal i.e. legal/enforceable requirement.
20	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	
22	0	0	0	

✓✓ Very Positive
✓ Positive

- Neutral (Positive and Negative)
0 Not Relevant

⊗ Negative
⊗⊗ Very Negative

Summary of sustainability factors in Issue K – Approach to retaining Gypsy and Traveller sites

Restoration:

Social and economic: The alternative options relating to the restoration of sites once the use by Gypsies and Travellers has ceased mostly score neutral or not relevant in terms of social and economic sustainability.

Environmental – Alternative options a and b mostly score the same in achieving the Council’s environmental sustainability objectives in the short, medium and long term. Where relevant, scoring is neutral or positive. Alternative option c scores less as there is a possible failure to restore Gypsy sites if this is not required in a manner that can be more readily enforced.

Outcome - On the basis of the assessment above, the Council’s preferred option is option d, as this would combine all of the three alternative options (use of planning conditions, legal agreements and GTLP policy). One or a mix of these options could then be used as appropriate to secure sustainable site restoration, thus avoiding any potential negative impact of relying on just one approach.



Very Positive
Positive

-
0

Neutral (Positive and Negative)
Not Relevant



Negative
Very Negative