

# Local Plan Partial Review Issues and Options Consultation Summary



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF  
KENSINGTON  
AND CHELSEA

## Section 11: Gypsy and Traveller accommodation

### Issue 1: Need

#### Question 1

Do you have any comments to make on the methodology, data and conclusions of the Draft GTANA?

#### 3 responses. Key points:

- Get rid of these sites
- Relocate site
- Methodology is supported and seems reasonable

#### Question 2

Despite the change in definition of Gypsies and Travellers in the PPTS to exclude those Travellers who no longer travel (and emerging changes in the Housing and Planning Bill), should the Council continue to assess the needs of Gypsies and Travellers separately to general housing need?

#### 9 responses. Key points:

- Most answered “yes”, some answered “no”
- Site could be used for social housing

### Issue 2: Supply

#### Question 1

In advance of the Draft GTANA being completed in light of comments received as part of this consultation, do you have any suggestions for how the Council (and LBHF) should seek to meet any identified unmet need?

#### 6 responses. Key points:

- Use site for older people’s homes, nurses’ accommodation etc
- LBHF wish to continue to work jointly with RBKC on this issue
- There is scope to extend the existing site
- The existing site is not a good location, beneath an elevated roundabout

## Question 2

Are there any sites that should be considered as a site allocation as part of the Local Plan Partial Review for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation? If so, please complete the Call for Sites section of the Consultation Response Form.

### 3 responses (+ Discussion Group). Key points:

- No sites suggested
- Gypsy and Traveller Discussion Group:
  - Reconfiguring the site may result in some residents moving to smaller pitches and some moving to larger pitches
  - Concerns over practicality of expanding the existing site
  - Residents would prefer to stay close to families on the site
  - Concerns over air pollution on the existing site
  - Concern expressed over possible negative connotations of existing Local Plan policy CH2(s)(ii) “use of the site would have no significant detrimental effect on the amenity of occupiers of adjoining land”

Do you have any other comments, issues or options (reasonable alternatives) you would like to raise regarding this section?

### 3 responses. Key points:

- No sites should be allocated for this use
- The Mayor of London welcomes the Council’s aim to address the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers