

Local Plan Partial Review Issues and Options Consultation Schedule



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?

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	Get rid of these sites. They have no place in the centre of a modern city. The space should be used to provide housing for the elderly; a school; accommodation for nurses etc.	<p>The council has a duty to assess the needs of all parts of the community including for Travellers. Stable Way is a long established site which has existed since 1974 and is the only Traveller site which provides for the accommodation needs of this community in the Borough. Closing the site would displace existing families who would require re-provision elsewhere in a Borough which is subject to extensive coverage of Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings and is constrained by the limited opportunities for new development and high land values.</p> <p>A Call for Sites was undertaken as part of the Issues and Options Consultation, no sites were forthcoming for Traveller use. Suggestions for sites that could be investigated further were sought from residents of the Traveller site within the Borough as part of a supplementary survey to finalise the GTANA. Suggested sites will be assessed in a Sites Appraisal Study.</p> <p>A Site Appraisal Study to identify potential suitable additional sites is being undertaken jointly by RBKC and LBHF. This will include assessing the potential opportunity to provide additional accommodation at the existing Stable Way site.</p>
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	No – this seems a reasonable approach	Noted.
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (Trevor Harvey)	LBHF support the methodology, data and conclusions.	Noted.
St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum (Henry Peterson)	<p>Section 11 Gypsy and Traveller accommodation</p> <p>The StQW Forum has not had the time to study the review of alternatives to the current site at Stable Way. This has never been a good location (beneath an elevated roundabout) and the Forum would support re-location if an acceptable alternative can be found.</p>	<p>Stable Way is a long established site which has existed since 1974 and is the only Traveller site which provides for the accommodation needs of this community in the Borough. Closing the site would displace existing families who would require re-provision elsewhere in a Borough which is subject to extensive coverage of Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings and is constrained by the limited opportunities for new development and high land values.</p> <p>A Call for Sites was undertaken as part of the Issues and Options Consultation, no sites were</p>

Name	Comment	Council's Response
		forthcoming for Traveller use. Suggestions for sites that could be investigated further were sought from residents of the Traveller site within the Borough as part of a supplementary survey to finalise the GTANA. Suggested sites will be assessed in a Sites Appraisal Study. A Site Appraisal Study to identify potential suitable additional sites is being undertaken jointly by RBKC and LBHF. This will include assessing the potential for opportunity to provide additional accommodation at the existing Stable Way site.

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?

Name	Comment	Selected Option	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	They currently occupy an enormous site that could be used for social housing.	No	This response is not relevant to the issue of assessing needs of Gypsies and Travellers.
Sonia Richardson		Yes	Noted.
J Neville		Don't Know	Noted.
John Eagle		No	See Council's response above
Victoria and Albert Museum (Steve Hyde)		Don't Know	See Council's response above
Bell Cornwell LLP (Simon Avery)		Yes	Noted.
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)		Yes	Noted.
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (Trevor Harvey)	Needs should continue to be assessed separately to general housing needs, at least until the emerging Housing and Planning Bill becomes an Act and amends (assuming this is the case) the Housing Act 2004. Once the Housing and Planning Act becomes statute it would be appropriate to review the assessment.		See Council's response above.
Cllr Judith Blakeman		Yes	Noted.

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?

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	In a borough which has to prioritise its use of scarce resources, it seems insane to be devoting all these chapters to this sub-sub-sub-section of residents who pay no council tax; and are not registered voters etc. Give the space over to housing for the elderly; nurses accommodation etc.	This response does not relate to meeting identified unmet need. Paragraph 9 in Policy B of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that "Local Planning Authorities should set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers as defined in Annex 1 and plot targets for travelling showpeople as defined in Annex 1 which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in their area,

Name	Comment	Council's Response
		<p>working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities.”</p> <p>Closing the site would displace existing families who would require re-provision of accommodation elsewhere in a Borough which is subject to extensive coverage of Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings and is constrained by the limited opportunities for new development and high land values.</p> <p>A Site Appraisal Study to identify potential suitable additional sites is being undertaken jointly by RBKC and LBHF. This will include assessing the potential opportunity to provide additional accommodation at the existing Stable Way site.</p>
Bell Cornwell LLP (Simon Avery)	No	Noted.
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	No	Noted.
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (Trevor Harvey)	LBHF wish to continue to work jointly with RBKC on this issue.	<p>RBKC shares the commitment to continue working jointly. Both local planning authorities are subject to the Duty to Cooperate. This places a legal duty on local planning authorities to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of local plan preparation in the context of strategic cross boundary matters. Given the location and history of Stable Way, Gypsy and Traveller accommodation has been identified as a Duty to Cooperate issue where joint working is necessary. A joint Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment has already been prepared by LBHF and RBKC. This is currently being finalised by the local planning authorities to take account of the updated Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Joint working will need to continue in relation to meeting identified unmet need to fulfil the Duty to Cooperate. A joint Site Appraisal Study to identify any potential suitable additional sites in both local planning authority areas is being undertaken. The study includes assessing the potential opportunity to provide additional accommodation at the existing Stable Way site.</p>
Cllr Judith Blakeman	There is scope to extend the current Travellers' Site to provide more dwellings to meet identified and future need.	<p>A joint Site Appraisal Study to identify any potential suitable additional sites in both local planning authority areas is being undertaken. The study includes assessing the potential opportunity to provide additional accommodation at the existing Stable Way site.</p>

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.

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	No	Noted.

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	No view	Noted.
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (Trevor Harvey)	LBHF are unaware of any suitable sites, but will work with RBKC on this issue.	Please See Council's response to LBHF comment on Issue 2, Question 1.

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

Name	Comment	Council's Response
Charles Bezoari Elder	No sites should be allocated to this purpose.	Paragraph 9 in Policy B of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that "Local Planning Authorities should set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers as defined in Annex 1 and plot targets for travelling showpeople as defined in Annex 1 which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in their area, working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities." Closing the site would displace existing families who would require re-provision of accommodation elsewhere in a Borough which is subject to extensive coverage of Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings and is constrained by the limited opportunities for new development and high land values.
Kensington Society (Michael Bach)	No	Noted.
Greater London Authority Development (Stewart Murray)	Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation The Mayor welcomes the borough's aim to address the accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers.	Noted.