

<b>MAYOR AND CABINET</b>		
<b>Report Title</b>	Gypsy and Traveller Site(s) Local Plan Update	
<b>Key Decision</b>	Yes	Item No.
<b>Ward</b>	All	
<b>Contributors</b>	Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration and Executive Director for Customer Services	
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	Date: 15 March 2018

## **1. Summary**

- 1.1 At a meeting of Mayor and Cabinet on 17 November 2017, the Mayor resolved (amongst other things) to (b) note that officers consider that Pool Court is currently the preferred site and (c) instruct officers to further investigate the following matters in relation to the potential Pool Court site and report back to Mayor and Cabinet: (i) the potential phased delivery of a traveller site, (ii) the incorporation of current public highway land in to a site and (ii) re-location assistance that could be offered to the existing scaffolding business. Following consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel, the Mayor at a meeting of Mayor and Cabinet on 6 December 2017 instructed officers to also do a cost comparison of both sites, in addition to other bricks and mortar sites, before a decision is made.
- 1.2 This report sets out further investigations into the above issues and concludes that Pool Court is the preferred location for a residential traveller site. It recommends that the Mayor and Cabinet agree this and instructs officers to continue to explore the possible acquisition of the eastern parcel of land from Network Rail.

## **2. Purpose**

- 2.1 This report outlines the findings of the further investigations in to the suitability of the potential Pool Court site following consideration of the Mayor and Cabinet in November and December 2017. It then makes recommendations on the way forward for identifying and delivering a residential traveller site.
- 2.2. The Part 2 report contains commercially sensitive information relating to the comparative costs of providing six pitches on the potential Pool Court and New Cross sites.

## **3. Recommendations**

- 3.1 The Mayor is recommended to:

- 3.1.1 Note the contents of the Consultation Statement (October 2017) (Appendix 1), including the main issues raised and officer response to them and the findings of the Integrated Impact Assessment (March 2018) (Appendix 2).
- 3.1.2 Note the commercially sensitive information contained in Part 2 of this report in relation to the comparative costs of providing six pitches on the potential Pool Court and New Cross Sites.
- 3.1.3 Approve the Pool Court site as the preferred location for a residential traveller site.
- 3.1.4 Approve the following documents for statutory public consultation:
  - GTSLP Preferred Site Consultation Report ( Appendix 3) and
  - Integrated Impact Assessment (March 2018) (Appendix 2).
- 3.1.5 Instruct officers to seek the acquisition of the eastern land parcel from Network Rail.
- 3.1.6 Note the assistance that the Council could give to the existing business to help it relocate to a suitable alternative site.
- 3.1.7 Request that Full Council do the same to approve the documents specified in 3.1c for public consultation.

#### **4. Policy Context**

4.1 The contents of this report are consistent with the Council's policy framework. When the GTSLP is adopted it will become part of Lewisham's 'development plan' and will contribute to the implementation of each of the Council's ten priorities as follows:

- community leadership and empowerment
- young people's achievement and involvement
- clean, green and liveable
- safety, security and a visible presence
- strengthening the local economy
- decent homes for all
- protection of children
- caring for adults and older people
- active, healthy citizens
- inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity

4.2 The GTSLP will help give spatial expression to the Sustainable Community Strategy (Shaping Our Future) (SCS), which was prepared by the Local Strategic Partnership and adopted by the Council in May 2008. The Plan will also play a role in the implementation of the SCS vision '*Together we will make Lewisham the best place to live, work and learn*' and all of the six strategic priorities, which are:

- Ambitious and achieving – where people are inspired and supported to fulfil their potential

- Safer – where people feel safe and live free from crime, antisocial behaviour and abuse
- Empowered and responsible – where people are actively involved in their local area and contribute to supportive communities
- Clean, green and liveable – where people live in high quality housing and can care for their environment
- healthy, active and enjoyable – where people can actively participate in maintaining and improving their health and well-being
- Dynamic and prosperous – where people are part of vibrant communities and town centres, well connected to London and beyond

## **5. Background and summary of process**

- 5.1 Duty to consider Need. The Housing and Planning Act (2016) includes a duty (under Section 8 of the 1985 Housing Act) for local authorities to consider the needs of “people residing in or resorting to their district with respect to the provision of sites on which caravans can be stationed.”
- 5.2 Earlier site searches. Following the closure in 2009 of a former site in Thurston Road, Lewisham does not have any sites for the gypsy and traveller community. The Council did grant planning permission in 2008 for five pitches on a site in Church Grove, Ladywell. However, this permission was not acted upon and this site is due to be developed for ‘bricks and mortar’ housing. The Council adopted its Core Strategy in June 2011. Policy 2 identifies criteria for selecting sites and envisaged that site(s) would be identified through a Sites Allocation DPD. However, it did not prove possible to include a site(s) in the Council’s Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP). At the Examination in to the SALP, the Council confirmed its intention to bring forward a separate GTSLP. The Council began preparing a GTSLP in March 2013. However, other priorities meant that things did not progress as planned and preparation on the Local Plan halted.
- 5.3 Needs Assessment. The Council commissioned a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), which was published in June 2015. This established the need for 6 pitches in the borough up to 2031. In August 2015, the Government published revised national guidance in the form of a new Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). In order to ensure that the Council has a robust assessment of current and future need that takes account of the new definition, an update to the GTAA was commissioned. The Update (August 2016) identifies the continuing need for 6 pitches in the borough up to 2031. It also identifies additional need for ‘non-Lewisham’ households who meet the new definition and which the Council should work with neighbouring boroughs to provide housing solutions.
- 5.4 Search Parameters & Site Selection Criteria. At its meeting on 13 January 2016, Mayor and Cabinet approved consultation arrangements on the preparation of a Gypsy and Traveller Site(s) Local Plan (GTSLP) (including

scope, search parameters, site selection criteria and timetable for identifying a site or sites). It also approved consultation on the associated Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. Following consultation carried out by the Planning Service, at its meeting on 13 July 2016, Mayor and Cabinet approved the final Search Parameters and Site Selection Criteria (see Appendix 1).

- 5.5 Identification of Potential Sites. Based on draft Search Parameters, which were subsequently approved), officers in Strategic Housing and Asset Management identified a list of all Council assets (land and buildings) of 0.24ha in size and above from Council ownership data by reviewing the Council's asset registers. This generated a list of approx. 780 sites. Officers then applied Site Selection Criterion 1 (Effective and efficient use of public assets) and this resulted in 5 potential Council-owned sites being identified. A private landowner also put its site forward for consideration during Stage 1 and this was included on the following long-list of 6 sites:  
A - Land on Westbourne Drive SE23;  
B - Land off Turnham Road, SE4;  
C - New Cross Social Club & adjoining land, Hornshay Street, SE15;  
D - Land at R/O 46-116 Baizdon Road SE3;  
E - Land at Pool Court, SE6; and  
F - Land at St Mildred's Road, Hither Green, SE12.
- 5.6 Planning officers applied Site Selection Criteria 2 to 10 to the long-list of sites. In doing so, officers drew on the results of engagement with officers across the Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group and the Metropolitan Police, together with the findings of a highway and access feasibility study and flood risk studies and the Integrated Impact Assessment (combing Sustainability Appraisal and Equalities Analysis Assessment). This resulted in two potential sites being identified: New Cross Social Club & adjoining land and Land at Pool Court.
- 5.7 Consultation on Potential Sites. At its meeting on 7 September 2016, Mayor and Cabinet approved a GTSLP Potential Site(s) Report and Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) for statutory public consultation. The Potential Site(s) Report identified two alternative potential residential traveller sites. These were: New Cross Social Club and adjoining land, Hornshay Street, SE15 and Land at Pool Court, SE6. Public consultation was carried out on these sites and the IIA during a six-week period in October and 30 November 2016.
- 5.8 Further Investigations and Way Forward. Officers carefully considered comments on the two potential sites and investigated issues raised. At its meeting on 17 November 2017, Mayor and Cabinet resolved to (a) note the contents of the Consultation Statement, including the main issues raised and officer response to them and the findings of the Integrated Impact Assessment; (b) note that officers consider that Pool Court is currently the preferred site; (c) instruct officers to further investigate the following matters in relation to the potential Pool Court site and report back to Mayor and Cabinet: (i) the potential phased delivery of a traveller site, (ii) the incorporation of

current public highway land in to a site and (ii) re-location assistance that could be offered to the existing scaffolding business; and (d) inform those that commented on the Potential Sites Consultation Report of these decisions. Following consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel on 28 November 2017, the Mayor and Cabinet on 6 December 2017 instructed officers to also do a cost comparison of both sites, in addition to other bricks and mortar sites before a decision is made.

## **6. Informing consultees**

- 6.1 In January 2018, the Strategic Planning Manager wrote to all those people that commented on the Potential Sites Consultation Report (October 2016) and/or the Integrated Impact Assessment of the Mayor and Cabinet's resolutions of November 2017.

## **7. Phased Delivery**

- 7.1. The Potential Sites Consultation Report (October 2016) notes that for practical and financial reasons, the Council expects to deliver all of the six or more pitches on a chosen site in one go. However, the eastern part of the potential site is currently owned by Network Rail, which was intending to include the land in a wider package of commercial sites for disposal to a development company. Given this and following the Mayor and Cabinet decision in November 2017, officers have investigated whether a Pool Court site could be delivered in two phases, with at least three pitches being on site on the Council-owned land by 2021 and at least three further pitches being developed on the eastern land parcel by 2026 (when the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment notes estimates that they will be needed).
- 7.2. The potential Phase 1 LBL-owned land comprises approx. 0.15ha that could be accessed directly from Pool Court. The potential Phase 2 land (currently owned by Network Rail) comprises approx. 0.16ha that could be accessed from Fordmill road and/or Pool Court. The Phase 2 land is up to approx. 2m lower than the Phase 1 land. A high-level Masterplan and Capacity Study (March 2018) commissioned by officers considers the physical practicalities of developing the potential site in two phases, taking account of information currently available (including a topographical survey of the Council-owned parcel) and assuming that pitches are set back 8m from the Ravensbourne River and 5m in from the western boundary – to take account of flooding, river wall maintenance and potential ecological enhancement issues.
- 7.3 The study identifies pros and cons associated with three scenarios for delivering pitches on the Phase 2 land and identifies challenges associated with level changes and accommodating large lorries to deliver static caravans in terms of sequencing and the need for removal fences between pitches. However, it demonstrates that the Phase 2 land could be developed to link with a Phase 1 site to form a larger integrated traveller site for six pitches and ultimately that a phased approach is technically feasible.

- 7.4. Notwithstanding the findings of the study, officers still consider that a combined site should be delivered at Pool Court delivering all of the six pitches in one phase, with vehicular access from Fordmill Road as indicated in the illustrative masterplan accompanying the Potential Sites Consultation Report (October 2016).
- 7.5 In February 2018, Network Rail informed the Council that it has decided to exclude this land from the sale of its commercial estate, subject to approval from its relevant Board. This decision is welcomed by officers and will allow the Council to seek the acquisition of this land from Network Rail and will enable timely site assembly and delivery of all six required pitches on a unified site.

## **8. Incorporation of Highway Land**

- 8.1 The Council's Highways Department has confirmed that the Masterplan and Capacity Study (March 2018) demonstrates to their satisfaction that stopping up of 5.5m of the hammer-head turning area at the northern end of Pool Court (leaving a 5m length in place) could occur without impacting on the servicing/access requirements of the existing residents of Pool Court. However, whilst the inclusion of area could help reduce fly-tipping, which regularly takes place, it is not essential to deliver a site. Officers therefore do not recommend at this time that this land is included in the site and no further discussions have been had with the current owner (London and Quadrant Housing Association).

## **9. Re-location Assistance**

- 9.1 The majority of the eastern Network Rail owned land parcel is currently occupied by RHS Site Services, a Scaffolding company, and officers have met with representatives of the company as part of investigating what assistance the Council could offer to help this company re-locate to an alternative suitable site.
- 9.2 It should be noted that RHS Site Services would need to make its own arrangements and meet its own costs of relocating to a suitable alternative site in the event that Network Rail or a future owner of the site terminated its current lease arrangements. However, given its objective of supporting local businesses and in recognition of the company's current business model (choosing to recruit employees from local disadvantaged groups), the Council could choose to assist in relocation in the event that it acquires the eastern land parcel and develops it as part of a traveller site. This could take the form of the following: (a) a one-off goodwill financial contribution (discretionary) to assist towards relocation costs (amount to be determined); (b) LBL Economy and Partnerships officers helping in the site search, ongoing tracking of the market to assist with identifying relocation sites and inclusion on the Council's

Construction Hub database for future site opportunities, and (c) providing some free planning pre-application advice from LBL Planning officers.

## 10. Cost Comparison

- 10.1 Following consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel, Mayor and Cabinet instructed officers to do a cost comparison of both sites, in addition to other bricks and mortar sites before a decision is made.
- 10.2 Officers have carried out a high-level comparison of the likely costs of providing six traveller pitches on the potential Pool Court site and 6 pitches on the potential New Cross site. This compared a number of site assembly and design and construction factors for the two sites. Details are set out in the Part 2 Report. The study concludes that overall the Hornshay Street site is likely to be the marginally more expensive of the two sites to deliver. It is important to note that these figures represent informed estimates given the information available at this stage.
- 10.3 Given the robust site selection process that resulted in the two potential sites, outlined in 5.5 and 5.6, officers are confident that there are no other sites in the borough that would meet the 10 Site Selection Criteria. As such, there are no other Council-owned sites that are earmarked for bricks and mortar housing that would also be suitable for a traveller site. This makes comparing the costs of one or both of the potential traveller sites with the costs of providing pitches on other bricks and mortar sites difficult. Nevertheless, officers have carried out a comparison of developing the two identified potential traveller sites for general needs housing.
- 10.4. Officers consider that the eastern land parcel of the Pool Court site is not suitable for general needs housing in isolation and have focused exclusively on the western parcel of land in the Council's ownership. Without undertaking design work, this comparison cannot respond to specific site conditions in detail and officers have applied the appropriate indicative residential density ranges referred to London Plan (2016) Policy 3.4, as set out in Table 1 below. This takes account of the size of the site, its public transport accessibility (PTAL), character and average number of habitable rooms per unit to provide an indicative assessment of development potential. In both cases, it has been assumed that housing contains 3.1 – 3.7 habitable rooms per unit and that development takes place at the upper end of the indicative density range.

**Table 1: Bricks and Mortar Development Potential**

	<b>Pool Court</b>	<b>New Cross</b>
Size of site (ha)	0.15	0.31
PTAL rating	2	2
Character	Suburban	Urban
Habitable rooms/unit	3.1-3.7	3.1-3.7
Units per hectare (top of range)	80	145
Potential number of units	12	45

- 10.5. The New Cross site is in the Core Strategy's Regeneration and Growth Area and is in an area on the cusp of transformational change (adjacent to the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area and close to the proposed Surrey Canal Station on London Overground and a proposed Old Kent Road station on the Bakerloo Line Extension). The two possible stations are within 960m of the site (the threshold for PTAL purposes) and the site's PTAL can be expected to increase in the future. If this increased to PTAL level 4 or above, the site's development potential could increase. Applying most of the same criteria as above, but this time applying the middle of the indicative density range for PTAL 4-6, this would suggest a potential for 55 dwellings.
- 10.6. It is clear that both sites therefore have some development potential which would be lost as a result of bringing forward either site as a traveller site. However, officers consider the New Cross site to be more suitable for higher-density general needs housing than the Pool Court site. As such, the New Cross site represents a more significant strategic asset than the Council owned land at Pool Court with a significantly greater bricks and mortar development potential.

## **11. Conclusions and Way Forward**

- 11.1 The Masterplan and Capacity Study (March 2018) demonstrates that Pool Court and adjoining land could be delivered as a 6-pitch residential traveller site in two phases, albeit with different vehicular access arrangements than consulted on so far (at least during the first phase). This means that a first phase can be considered to be deliverable and capable of being on-site by 2021, with at least three further pitches being developed on the eastern land parcel by 2026 (when the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment notes estimates that they will be needed). However, officers' preference continues to be for a traveller site to be delivered in one go and it is not recommended at this time that a phased approach to delivery is progressed.
- 11.2. Further investigations show that, whilst not essential for the delivery of a traveller site, a 5.5m length of the turning area at the northern end of Pool Court could be incorporated within a site without impacting on the servicing/access requirements of the existing residents of Pool Court. However, the Masterplan and Capacity Study (March 2018) does not identify this as essential and officers therefore do not at this time recommend that this land is included in the site.
- 11.3 Officers have also met with RHS Site Services (the company that currently occupies the eastern parcel of land) and begun to explore what assistance the Council could offer this company to re-locate if it acquires the eastern land parcel and develops it as part of a traveller site.
- 11.4 Work carried out by officers to compare the likely costs of providing six traveller pitches on the potential Pool Court and New Cross sites is set out in the Part 2 report. It finds that that overall the Hornshay Street site is likely to be the marginally more expensive of the two sites to deliver. It is important to

note that these figures represent informed estimates given the information available at this stage. Officers have also carried out a comparison of developing the two identified potential traveller sites for general needs housing. This finds that the New Cross site to be more suitable for higher-density general needs housing than the Pool Court site. As such, the New Cross site represents a more significant strategic asset than land at Pool Court but both have development potential which would be lost if a traveller site came forward. However, this needs to be balanced against the Council's statutory duty to consider the need for gypsy and traveller sites. As such, whilst there is an 'opportunity cost' from providing a gypsy and traveller site, officers do not consider that this means that the identified sites are unsuitable.

- 11.5 The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) (as updated March 2018) assesses the two potential sites against 16 identified objectives. In summary, the IIA finds that the provision of gypsy and traveller pitches at New Cross Social Club site could have a detrimental effect on health, social inclusion and accessibility to community infrastructure through the loss of a social club and games area space. It also finds that the provision of gypsy and traveller pitches at Pool Court could have a negative effect on landscape, biodiversity, flora and fauna through the loss of open space. The Consultation Statement (October 2017) sets out the results of statutory public consultation on the two potential sites.
- 11.6 The Site Selection Background Paper has been updated to take account of the above and all other material planning considerations. However, officers consider that the findings of the October 2017 Paper remain valid and that the overall scores for the potential sites remain '2-Good' for New Cross and 'potentially 2-Good' for Pool Court. This being the case, officers consider that both potential sites could be suitable for a residential traveller site.
- 11.7 Officers consider that Pool Court is the preferred potential site for the following reasons:
- It is preferred by the Lewisham traveller community;
  - It is more self-contained, without being isolated from the wider community;
  - It is better suited to relatively low-density housing (having a suburban character);
  - It is outside Lewisham's Regeneration and Growth Area and the London Plan Lewisham, Catford and New Cross Opportunity Area where bricks and mortar housing and employment growth is to be focused; and
  - It would not result in the loss or displacement of existing community facilities or housing.
- 11.7 It is therefore recommended that the Mayor notes the contents of the Consultation Statement, including the main issues raised and officer response to them and the findings of the updated Integrated Impact Assessment (March 2018) and approve the Pool Court site as the preferred location for a residential traveller site. It is further recommended that the Mayor approves a Preferred Options consultation report under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)

and consult interested parties on the preferred site. Lastly, it is recommended that an updated IIA Report (March 2018) be approved for consultation at the same time. The Council's Local Development Scheme expects this to take place in the fourth quarter of this year. It also recommended that officers be instructed to seek to negotiate terms for the acquisition of the eastern parcel of land from Network Rail.

## **12. Financial Implications**

- 12.1 This report recommends that the Mayor approves Pool Court as the preferred location for a residential traveller site. Budget provision has been set-aside in the capital programme for delivery of the new site. Further details are contained within the Part 2 report.

## **13. Legal Implications**

- 13.1 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) sets out the main steps in the procedure for the production and adoption of planning documents, as explained in the report.

- 13.2 This report seeks approval of the Pool Court site (including part of the Pool Court highway) as the preferred location for a residential traveller site.

- 13.3 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public-sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

- 13.4 The duty continues to be a "have regard duty", and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the decision maker, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

- 13.5 The Equality and Human Rights Commission provides Technical Guidance on the Public-Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled "Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice". The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling

reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at:

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/>

- 13.6 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:
1. The essential guide to the public-sector equality duty
  2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
  3. Engagement and the equality duty
  4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
  5. Equality information and the equality duty
- 13.7 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at:  
<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>

#### **14. Crime and Disorder Implications**

- 14.1 There are no direct implications relating to crime and disorder issues.

#### **15. Equalities Implications**

- 15.1 The Council's Comprehensive Equality Scheme for 2012-16 provides an overarching framework and focus for the Council's work on equalities and helps ensure compliance with the Equality Act 2010. The proposals set out in this report accord with the Council's Comprehensive Equalities Scheme; particularly as they relating to: 'increasing participation and engagement'.
- 15.2 The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) (August 2016) includes an equalities appraisal to identify equalities impacts and implications of emerging policy options. This assessed both potential sites and was consulted on alongside the Potential Sites Consultation Report. The updated IIA (March 2018) includes an updated equalities appraisal.

#### **16. Environmental Implications**

- 16.1 There are no direct environmental impacts arising from this report.

#### **17. Conclusion**

- 17.1 The Mayor is recommended to:

17.1.1 Note the contents of the Consultation Statement (October 2017) (Appendix 1), including the main issues raised and officer response to

them and the findings of the Integrated Impact Assessment (March 2018) (Appendix 2).

- 17.1.2 Note the commercially sensitive information contained in Part 2 of this report in relation to the comparative costs of providing six pitches on the potential Pool Court and New Cross Sites.
- 17.1.3 Approve the Pool Court site as the preferred location for a residential traveller site.
- 17.1.4 Approve the following documents for statutory public consultation:
- GTSLP Preferred Site Consultation Report ( Appendix 3) and
  - Integrated Impact Assessment (March 2018) (Appendix 2).
- 17.1.5 Instruct officers to seek the acquisition of the eastern land parcel from Network Rail.
- 17.1.6 Note the assistance that the Council could give to the existing business to help it relocate to a suitable alternative site.
- 17.1.7 Request that Full Council do the same to approve the documents specified in 3.1c for public consultation.

## 18. Background documents and originator

Short Title Document	Date	File Location	File Reference	Contact Officer	Exempt
Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004	2004	Laurence House	Planning Policy	David Syme	No
Localism Act 2011	2011	Laurence House	Planning Policy	David Syme	No
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012	2012	Laurence House	Planning Policy	David Syme	No
Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)	2012	Laurence House	Planning Policy	David Syme	No
Planning policy for traveller sites 2015	2015	Laurence House	Planning Policy	David Syme	No
Lewisham Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (as updated)	August 2016	Laurence House	Planning Policy	David Syme	No
Masterplan & Capacity Study	March 2018	Laurence House	Planning Policy	David Syme	No
Site Selection	March	Laurence	Planning	David	No

Background Paper Update	2018	House	Policy	Syme	

If you have any queries on this report, please contact David Syme, Strategic Planning Manager, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor Laurence House, 1 Catford Road, Catford SE6 4RU – telephone 020 8314 7186.

## Appendix 1: Approved Search Parameters & Site Selection Criteria

The approved **Search Parameters** are as follows:

- Council-owned housing land.
- Council-owned non-housing land.
- Private and other publicly owned land – focus on Council owned land, other than, possibly, adjacent land in other ownerships that may be necessary to develop a Council asset.
- For practical considerations of site management and economic considerations the Council consider the need for 6 pitches should be met on a single site.
- Type of site - full range of potential sites, including vacant open land, open land that is in use, vacant and occupied buildings and any combination.
- Size of site - base a search for sites on 400sqm per pitch (average size) (i.e. 0.24ha and larger).
- Location of site – whole borough.

The approved **Site Selection Criteria** are as follows:

Site Selection Criteria	Explanation and application
1. Effective and efficient use of public assets.	(a) Effective use of public assets – Judgement, taking account of existing service commitments and use, running costs, investment requirements, reasonable alternative use(s) for the provision of other services and the Strategic Asset Management Plan (SAMP).  (b) Efficient use of public assets– Judgement, taking account of reasonable alternative use(s) and the Council’s need to minimise opportunity costs and optimise capital receipts.
2. Reasonable access to local shops, services and community facilities in particular schools and health services.	(a) Site within 800m of bus stop and/or station. (b) The following services within 1,500m: (i) Local shop; (ii) Primary School; and (iii) Health facility.
3. Safe and reasonably convenient access to the road network.	(a) Safe vehicular access or capable of creating safe vehicular access for 15m long caravan to/off a public highway. (b) Access for emergency services. (c) Clearance height of 3.7m.
4. Capable of satisfactory provision for parking, turning, service and emergency vehicles.	(a) Judgement (size, and shape of site). (b) Infrequent access needed for 15m long caravan.
5. Mixed residential and business use opportunities.	(a) Mixed-use residential and business use acceptable in principle (b) Any likely adverse impacts are acceptable (assuming environmental permitting regulations, licensing and planning conditions manage activities that could be carried out).
6. Supply of essential services such as water, sewerage and drainage and waste disposal.	Assume all sites have access to all essential services or are capable of being connected (NB cost of doing so may vary and affect deliverability). N.B. All sites to be given a score of ‘Average’ for this criterion.

Site Selection Criteria	Explanation and application
7. Scope for healthy lifestyles and integration.	<p>(a) Opportunities for healthy lifestyles such as adequate landscaping &amp; play areas - Judgement (size, shape of site).</p> <p>(b) High standard design and landscaped which facilitates the integration of the site with the surrounding environment and amenity of the occupiers adjoining the site - Judgement (size and shape of site).</p>
8. Local environmental quality	<p>(a) Contamination – Free from significant contamination or able to be cleaned up (consult LBL Environmental Health) (NB cost of doing so may vary and affect deliverability).</p> <p>(b) Noise – Acceptable internal noise environment (consult LBL Environmental Health)</p> <p>(c) Air quality – Acceptable air quality (consult LBL Environmental Health)</p> <p>(d) Flooding – Reasonable prospect of sequential test and exceptions tests being met (See below)</p>
9. Spatial planning & development management considerations.	<p>(a) Key relevant site-specific development plan policies – both for the site itself and adjoining land</p> <p>(b) Key relevant general policies</p> <p>(c) Key relevant policies in emerging Local Plan and any emerging Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>(d) Key relevant planning guidance</p> <p>(e) Planning history – identification of any key relevant planning history.</p> <p>(f) Summary – overall conclusion, taking account of the above.</p>
10. Deliverability.	<p>Taking account of all of the previous criteria, sites should be:</p> <p>(a) Available now;</p> <p>(b) Offer a suitable location for development; and</p> <p>(c) Be achievable with a realistic prospect that development will be delivered on the site within five years.</p>