

Intended for

**Daventry District Council**

Date

**February, 2016**

Project Number

**UK18-18274**

**DAVENTRY DISTRICT  
SA OF THE GYPSIES,  
TRAVELLERS AND  
TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE  
LOCAL PLAN (PART 2B)  
ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**DAVENTRY DISTRICT  
SA OF THE GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING  
SHOWPEOPLE LOCAL PLAN (PART 2B) ISSUES AND  
OPTIONS**

Project No. **UK18-18274**  
 Issue No. **04**  
 Date **24/02/2016**  
 Made by **Emma Jones**  
 Checked by **Bram Miller**  
 Approved by **Lesley Vining**

Made by: 

Checked/Approved by: 

*This report has been prepared by Ramboll Environ with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, and taking account of the Services and the Terms agreed between Ramboll Environ and the Client. This report is confidential to the Client, and Ramboll Environ accepts no responsibility whatsoever to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known, unless formally agreed by Ramboll Environ beforehand. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk. Ramboll Environ disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the agreed scope of the Services.*

**Version Control Log**

Revision	Date	Made by	Checked by	Approved by	Description
A	18/01/2016	EJ	BM	LV	Draft report
B	29/01/2016	EJ	BM	LV	Draft report
1	04/02/2016	EJ	BM	LV	Report to client
Ramboll Environ 8 The Wharf Bridge Street Birmingham B1 2JS United Kingdom +44 121 616 2180	17/02/2016	EJ	BM	LV	Report to client
	22/02/2016	EJ	BM	LV	Report to client
	24/02/2016	EJ	BM	LV	Final report to client

SA of the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan (Part 2B) issues and options  
Daventry District

UK18-18274

## CONTENTS

<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background	1
1.2	This Report	1
1.3	Stages of the SA	1
1.4	Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan (Part 2b) for Daventry District	1
1.5	How to Comment on the Report	2
1.6	Next Steps in the Process	2
<b>2.</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY OF THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS ASSESSMENT PROCESS</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Introduction	3
2.2	Defining Reasonable Alternatives	3
2.3	Assessing reasonable alternatives	1
<b>3.</b>	<b>RESULTS OF THE ISSUES ASSESSMENT PROCESS</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Introduction	6
3.2	Difficulties encountered in the assessment	6
3.3	Summary of the Results of the SA	6

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

The preparation of the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan (Part 2b) for Daventry District is being subject to an integrated sustainability appraisal (SA) and strategic environmental assessment (SEA) in line with the requirements of Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 1633: The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations). In English planning practice this combined assessment is referred to as a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The SA process is being managed by Ramboll Environ using a team of consultants experienced in strategic appraisal of local authority spatial planning documents. The purpose of the SA is to promote sustainable development by integrating sustainability considerations into the plan making process at all relevant stages including when considering alternative approaches to developing the plan (the issues and options stage).

## 1.2 This Report

This document presents the findings of the SA of the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan (Part 2b) for Daventry District, Issues and Options Consultation paper (formal Regulation 18 consultation).

This report does not constitute an environmental report (in the English planning system called a SA report) under the SEA regulations. At the issues and options stage it is good practice to produce fairly brief reports which can then be developed into the formal (regulation compliant) SA report at a draft plan stage.

## 1.3 Stages of the SA

There are a number of stages to SA and these are shown below:

- **Completed stages:** An SA scoping report was published in January 2013. This was a joint scoping report which addressed the sustainability issues related to the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan for Daventry District; the South Northamptonshire Settlements and Development Management Local Plan; and the West Northamptonshire Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People Allocations Local Plan (please note that it has since been decided not to produce a joint Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan but one for each district including Daventry District). The scoping report includes baseline information, review of relevant plans and identification of significant sustainability issues for the three plans. From all of the information collected, an SA framework, or set of sustainability objectives, was developed, against which the various components of the plans will be appraised. This report was updated in September 2014 to take into account comments from consultees;
- **This stage:** The production of an issues and options SA report (this report) which outlines the results of the SA of the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan (Part 2b) for Daventry District, Issues and Options Consultation paper (formal Regulation 18 consultation);
- **Future stages:** The appraisal of the draft plan (December 2016) and appraisal of the Proposed Submission document (August 2017).

## 1.4 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan (Part 2b) for Daventry District

Daventry District Council is committed to the preparation of a Local Plan (Part 2b) which seeks to meet the identified accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Where collective reference is made to these groups, they are called 'travelling communities'.

The Council is preparing the Plan in order to ensure that it meets the requirements of Government policy to meet the accommodation needs of travelling communities in Daventry District. This paper seeks views on the issues and options for the allocation of sites for travelling communities in the District. The consultation will inform the development of a methodology for assessing potential sites for allocation.

This Issues and Options document offers a starting point for discussion on the accommodation needs of travelling communities and the options for the way forward. The paper is seeking the views of all communities within Daventry District, which will help to progress the plan to the next stage. In doing so this consultation also fulfils the requirement of Regulation 18 of the Local Planning Regulations 2012.

### **1.5 How to Comment on the Report**

This report is being published for consultation to assess the issues and options document.

If you have any comments on this report please complete a respond form (available online) and send it to:

- Online: [www.daventrydc.gov.uk/consultation](http://www.daventrydc.gov.uk/consultation)
- By Post: Local Strategy Service, Daventry District Council, Lodge Road, Daventry, Northamptonshire, NN11 4FP
- By e-mail to: [planningpolicy@daventrydc.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@daventrydc.gov.uk)
- Please note that the consultation closes on Friday 29th April 2016.

### **1.6 Next Steps in the Process**

The next step in the preparation of the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan (Part 2b) for Daventry District is the preparation of a draft plan. This is currently scheduled to be consulted on starting in December 2016. At this point in the process the formal SA report will be produced and will be consulted on with the public and stakeholders at the same time as the draft plan.

## 2. METHODOLOGY OF THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS ASSESSMENT PROCESS

### 2.1 Introduction

This stage involves appraisal of the issues and options against the SA framework, taking into account the evidence base. The SEA Regulations make it clear that reasonable alternatives to a plan should be identified and assessed. In addition to this, the SA report should include an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with.

### 2.2 Defining Reasonable Alternatives

As already discussed, a key issue in SA is how alternatives are addressed. The SEA Regulations require that the SA report identifies the reasons for selecting the alternatives tested in light of the others available (SEA Regulations Schedule 2 (8)). In SA practice this is usually understood as having two meanings:

1. Discuss why it was 'reasonable' to select the alternatives that were developed to be tested; and
2. Discuss why the preferred approach was selected in light of the SA of alternatives.

The first of these can be included in this issues and options SA report for the issues that have been considered so far (although many SA practitioners do not address this until the formal SA report). However, until the Council has developed its draft plan, it is not possible to address the second meaning identified above.

In the interests of putting in place a clear audit trail for the SA, Table 2.1 outlines for each relevant issue<sup>1</sup>, why the alternatives were selected. The final column of this table cannot be filled in until the formal SA report stage. However, it is included here for completeness. This table will evolve as the plan and the SA processes evolve.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that not all of the issues addressed in the Issues and Options Consultation Paper have been included in this table. This is because many of the issues merely raise questions to the consultees or are administrative planning issues which relate to how policies might be drafted. Therefore, they do not constitute a planning issue that could be expected to have reasonable alternatives or do not define alternatives that would have materially different sustainability effects.

<b>Table 2.1: Reason for selecting alternatives</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Alternatives identified</b>	<b>Outline reasons for selecting alternatives</b>	<b>Outline reason for selecting the preferred approach</b>
Issue 1 – Site Allocation	<p>There is a need to provide residential pitches within Daventry District by 2029. Should all 18 pitches be allocated within the Part 2b Local Plan or should some be allowed to come through normal development management processes, that is planning applications?</p> <p>Option 1: All pitches should be allocated in the Local Plan Part 2b</p> <p>Option 2: A proportion of the requirement is allocated and the remaining pitches come through development management processes.</p>	<p>Option 1 – Provides a high degree of certainty that needs will be met.</p> <p>Option 2 – May provide greater flexibility longer across the plan period.</p>	This column will be completed as part of the formal SA report.
Issue 2 – Policy H6 Site Criteria	<p>Alternatives were not identified for this issue. Policy H6 of the West Northants Joint Core Strategy sets out criteria to be taken into account when making site allocations and determining planning applications for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision. Further guidance is provided in the Site Design Criteria contained in the draft Housing SPD; it is intended to incorporate those criteria into the Part 2b Local Plan.</p>	<p>The criteria included in the Housing SPD are comprehensive in their coverage of issues related to traveller issues so it is not considered necessary for the Local Plan Part 2b to include anything further regarding the criteria.</p> <p>They have been tested as part of the SA to ensure that they address all relevant sustainability issues</p>	
Issue 3 – Site Size – Gypsy and Traveller	<p>There is a need to provide 18 residential pitches within Daventry District to 2029. What site sizes should be considered for this provision?</p> <p>Option 1: Sites should be provided for 4-6 Pitches</p> <p>Option 2: Sites should be provided in a range of sizes up to 15 pitches</p> <p>Option 3: Other</p>	<p>Option 1 - Is considered to be an appropriate size to accommodate a single household, as evidenced within the TANS report.</p> <p>Option 2 - Reflects the maximum suggested site size set out within the emerging Housing SPD.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to test</p>	

<b>Table 2.1: Reason for selecting alternatives</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Alternatives identified</b>	<b>Outline reasons for selecting alternatives</b>	<b>Outline reason for selecting the preferred approach</b>
		an option that does not include the provision of any sites because the Plan is required to demonstrate how it will meet identified needs.	
Issue 4 – Site location – Gypsy and Traveller	<p>Should existing sites within Daventry District be extended to accommodate the identified need or should need be accommodated on new sites?</p> <p>Option 1: Expand existing sites to accommodate need</p> <p>Option 2: Identify additional sites</p> <p>Option 3: Combinations of options 1 and 2</p>	<p>Option 1 – Whilst the TANS approach indicates that expanding existing sites is not the preferred option planning applications have been received to expand existing sites within the District.</p> <p>Option 2 – As a consequence of the TANS report not recommending expanding existing sites, new sites will need to be identified.</p> <p>Option 3 – The TANS report supports Option 2 however recent demand, demonstrated through a planning application for the site in Arthingworth Parish supports Option 1.</p>	
Issue 5 – Site Tenure	<p>What tenure should be considered</p> <p>Option 1: Owned by individuals for occupation by a single or extended family</p> <p>Option 2: Privately rented – perhaps owned and managed by the Gypsy and Traveller community</p> <p>Option 3: Managed by a Registered Provider or local authority</p> <p>Option 4: Other</p>	<p>Option 1- The TANS reports this as the most favourable option amongst the Traveller Community</p> <p>Option 2- This option is being operated on the Justin Park site.</p> <p>Option 3- This would allow greater control of the site but would have</p>	

<b>Table 2.1: Reason for selecting alternatives</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Alternatives identified</b>	<b>Outline reasons for selecting alternatives</b>	<b>Outline reason for selecting the preferred approach</b>
		<p>potential resource implications</p> <p>Option 4- This allows an alternative option to be put forward</p>	
Issue 6 – Emergency Stopping Places	<p>Policy H6 of the West Northants Joint Core Strategy sets out a requirement for a single emergency stopping place within the District. How large should it be?</p> <p>Option 1: The Emergency stopping place should contain 1-4 pitches</p> <p>Option 2: The Emergency stopping place should contain 5-8 pitches</p> <p>Option 3: Other.</p>	<p>Both Option 1 and Option 2 are considered to represent reasonable options for different site sizes.</p> <p>Option 3 provides the opportunity for an alternative site size option to be presented</p>	
Issue 8 – Site location – Travelling Showpeople	<p>Should existing sites within Daventry District be extended to accommodate the identified need of Travelling Showpeople or should need be accommodated on new sites?</p> <p>Option 1: Expand existing sites to accommodate need</p> <p>Option 2: Identify additional sites. If so, should these sites be identified in close proximity to Woodford Halse?</p> <p>Option 3: Combinations of options 1 and 2 – please outline.</p>	<p>Option 1- as set out in the TANS report the need is arising from an existing site</p> <p>Option 2- this is considered to be a reasonable alternative to expanding the existing site.</p> <p>Option 3- this provides the opportunity for a combination of options 1 and 2 which may present a further alternative.</p>	
Issue 11 – Major Development Sites	<p>What additional policy (ies) should this plan contain to bring forward the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites on major development sites including housing?</p> <p>Option 1: Developers should provide a proportion of Gypsy</p>	<p>Option 1 – This is in accordance with Policy H1 of the West Northants Joint Core Strategy.</p>	

<b>Table 2.1: Reason for selecting alternatives</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Alternatives identified</b>	<b>Outline reasons for selecting alternatives</b>	<b>Outline reason for selecting the preferred approach</b>
	<p>and Traveller sites on major developments including housing within the District.</p> <p>Issue 1a What scale of development should trigger this requirement? 250 houses?</p> <p>Issue 1b In what circumstances should Gypsy and Traveller pitches count towards the affordable housing provision on such sites?</p> <p>Option 2: Developers should provide commuted sums where provision for Gypsy and Traveller pitches cannot be made on a major development site.</p> <p>Option 3: Other</p>	<p>Option 2 – This is a reasonable alternative to making provision on site.</p> <p>Option 3- this provides the opportunity for an alternative approach to be provided.</p>	

## 2.3 Assessing reasonable alternatives

### 2.3.1 How is sustainability defined?

The scoping stage of the SA (as referred to in Section 1.3) resulted in the production of a SA framework which will be used to test the sustainability of the plan. This is shown in Table 2.1. The SA framework sets out those factors that are considered to be important in defining and testing sustainability for this plan.

<b>Table 2.2: SA framework</b>	
<b>SA objectives</b>	<b>Appraisal questions to be used as a guide. Will the plan lead to...?</b>
<b>1. Air quality and noise</b>	
SO1a: Reduce the need to travel, facilitate modal shift and minimise congestion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An increased dependence on car use?</li> <li>• Improvements in access to good public transport?</li> <li>• Impacts on traffic congestion hotspots (particularly transit sites)?</li> <li>• Location of new development in areas of high noise levels or poor air quality?</li> <li>• Location of potentially noisy activities (for example transit sites) in areas which are sensitive to noise?</li> </ul>
SO1b: Reduce the numbers of people who are affected by air and noise pollution	
<b>2. Archaeology and cultural heritage</b>	
SO2a: Protect and enhance designated and undesignated heritage assets and their setting, including listed buildings, scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, conservation areas and other archaeological sites, monuments, structures, buildings and historic landscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that affects heritage assets?</li> <li>• Well-designed development that is well</li> </ul>
<b>3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna</b>	
SO3a: Conserve and enhance the structure and function of habitats, the integrity of designated and undesignated sites, and conservation status of species SO3b: Enhance and protect greenspace networks and habitat connectivity, including river and stream corridors, to assist in species migration and dispersal SO3c: Increase the land area of UK Biodiversity Action Plan habitats within the area SO3d: Maintain and improve the conservation status of selected non-designated nature conservation sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoidance of net loss, damage to, or fragmentation of, and enhancement of designated and undesignated wildlife sites, protected species and priority species / habitats, including those within the Northamptonshire BAP?</li> <li>• Development which enhances the ecological services of the wider area?</li> <li>• Development which incorporates green infrastructure into the design e.g. green corridors, linking open space etc?</li> <li>• Development which supports the aims and objectives of the Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area?</li> </ul>
<b>4. Crime and community safety</b>	
SO4a: To improve community safety, fear of crime and integration of gypsy and traveller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designing out crime and a feeling of security through better design?</li> </ul>

<b>Table 2.2: SA framework</b>	
<b>SA objectives</b>	<b>Appraisal questions to be used as a guide. Will the plan lead to...?</b>
sites with settled communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leisure facilities for young people at the neighbourhood level including consideration of provision as part of large new residential developments?</li> <li>Improved integration between settled communities and traveller communities in terms of use of services, physical relationship and site landscaping?</li> </ul>
<b>5. Education and training</b>	
SO5a: Improve access to education and lifelong learning SO5b: Promote sustainable modes of travel to access education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate supporting educational infrastructure associated with new residential developments?</li> <li>Easier access to education facilities especially by public transport?</li> </ul>
<b>6. Energy and climatic factors</b>	
SO6a: Improve energy efficiency of dwellings, use of low carbon technologies and adaptation to long term climate change SO6b: Increase the local renewable energy generating capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developments incorporating low carbon technologies where appropriate?</li> <li>An increase in energy efficient measures in the design of new developments?</li> <li>A better consideration of climate change adaptation measures?</li> </ul>
<b>7. Health and well being</b>	
SO7a: To improve health and reduce health inequalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved access to healthcare including through sustainable transport means?</li> <li>Adequate supporting health services associated with new residential developments?</li> <li>An improvement in the quality of homes?</li> <li>Better site design for gypsy and travellers sites?</li> </ul>
<b>8. Labour market and economy</b>	
SO8a: Improve access to employment opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An adequate supply of land to meet the requirements of growth sectors?</li> <li>A reduction in travel distances to work and ensuring access to employment by more sustainable modes?</li> <li>A correction of imbalances between residential and employment development to reduce in / out commuting?</li> </ul>
<b>9. Landscape and townscape</b>	
SO9a: Ensure that the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the landscape, and the features within them are conserved and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protection of areas of valued landscape and townscape?</li> </ul>

<b>Table 2.2: SA framework</b>	
<b>SA objectives</b>	<b>Appraisal questions to be used as a guide. Will the plan lead to...?</b>
enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development which considers the existing character, form and pattern of the surrounding area?</li> <li>• Provision of appropriate site screening that does not form too harsh a barrier between the traveller community and the settled community?</li> </ul>
SO9b: Enhance the form and design of the built environment	
<b>10. Material assets</b>	
SO10a: Ensure sites (both permanent and transit sites) meet the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient housing and affordable housing to meet identified needs?</li> <li>• Sufficient sites to meet the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people?</li> </ul>
<b>11. Population and social deprivation</b>	
SO11a: Ensure good access to services SO11b: To reduce spatial inequalities in social opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of appropriate community and social infrastructure?</li> </ul>
<b>12. Soil, geology and land use</b>	
SO12a: Reduce land contamination, and safeguard soil and geological quality and quantity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The remediation of contaminated sites?</li> <li>• Development on brownfield sites?</li> <li>• Development that protects sites valued for their geological characteristics?</li> <li>• Development that protects valued agricultural land?</li> <li>• Development that safeguards minerals?</li> </ul>
<b>13. Waste</b>	
SO13a: To reduce waste generation and disposal, increase recycling and achieve the sustainable management of waste including increasing access to recycling and basic waste facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the amount of waste generated by development?</li> <li>• An increase in waste recovery before final disposal?</li> </ul>
<b>14. Water</b>	
SO14a: improve drainage facilities and clean water provision at sites SO14b: Reduce risk of flooding SO14c: Identify opportunities to implement strategic flood risk management options / measures to reflect the objectives in the River Nene and Great Ouse CFMPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development where adequate water supply, foul drainage, sewage treatment facilities and surface water drainage is available?</li> <li>• Development which supports and corresponds with the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance and the flood risk policies of the EA and LLFA.</li> <li>• Development which incorporates SUDS?</li> <li>• Water efficient design and reduction in water consumption?</li> <li>• The sustainable use of water resources?</li> </ul>

<b>Table 2.2: SA framework</b>	
<b>SA objectives</b>	<b>Appraisal questions to be used as a guide. Will the plan lead to...?</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requirements of the Water Framework Directive River Basin Management Plans being met (incl. improvement of water bodies)?</li> <li>• The maintenance and enhancement of riverside and water based recreational activities?</li> </ul>

### 2.3.2 How does the SA define significance

As part of the SA it is necessary to outline which of the impacts are likely to be significant. To do this in a clear and transparent way a set of significance criteria has been defined for the assessment and every impact has been scored accordingly. The significance criteria that have been used are set out in Table 2.3.

<b>Table 2.3: Significance Criteria</b>		
Score	Description	Symbol
Significant positive impact	The option strongly supports the achievement of the SA Objective and has a major positive effect with relation to characteristics of the effect and the sensitivity of the receptors	++
Minor positive impact	The option generally support the achievement of the SA Objective and has a minor positive effect with relation to characteristics of the effect and the sensitivity of the receptors	+
Neutral	The option does not have an effect on the achievement of the SA Objective	0
Minor negative impact	The option conflicts with the achievement of the SA Objective and has a negative effect with relation to characteristics of the effect and the sensitivity of the receptors	-
Significant negative impact	The option conflicts with the SA Objective and has a negative effect with relation to characteristics of the effect and the sensitivity of the receptors. In addition the future baseline indicates a worsening trend in the absence of intervention	--
Uncertain	It is unclear whether there is the potential for a negative or positive effect on the SA Objective	?

### 2.3.3 Which issues and options were assessed?

The aim of this assessment is to assess the sustainability of the options to enable the Council to further develop the plan in a sustainable manner. Once the draft plan has been developed it will be assessed in more detail.

However, the information presented by the Council in the Issues and Options Consultation Paper is a mix of issues, options and general questions to consultees. Therefore, it is not possible to assess the impacts of every element of the Issues and Options Consultation Paper. A screening exercise has been carried out to ascertain which issues and options are possible to assess. This screening exercise is shown in Appendix 1.

The elements of the Issues and Options Consultation Paper plan that have been appraised are shown below:

- Issue 1 – Site Allocation;
- Issue 2 – Policy H6 Site Criteria;
- Issue 3 – Site Size – Gypsy and Traveller;
- Issue 4 – Site location – Gypsy and Traveller;
- Issue 5 – Site Tenure;
- Issue 6 – Emergency Stopping Places;
- Issue 8 – Site Location – Travelling Showpeople; and
- Issue 11 – Major Development Sites.

## **3. RESULTS OF THE ISSUES ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

### **3.1 Introduction**

The full results of the assessment are shown in Appendix 2. The results have been presented in assessment tables which enables readers to clearly see the performance of the issues and options against each individual SA objective.

SA relies on expert judgement, which is guided by knowledge of the likely impacts of the plan, the baseline data available and responses and information provided by consultees and other stakeholders. A 'precautionary approach' is taken with the worst case scenario being reported in the case of any doubt about potential impacts and mitigation is suggested if there is any doubt as to the impact of the plan.

### **3.2 Difficulties encountered in the assessment**

The main difficulty encountered in the assessment was the lack of detail apparent in some of the options. This is often the case at the issues and options stage and was dealt with by focusing the assessment on providing a general indication of the relative performance of the issues.

### **3.3 Summary of the Results of the SA**

The full results of the appraisal are presented in matrices in Appendix 2. A summary of the results is detailed in Table 3.1.

<b>Table 3.1: SA results</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Summary of performance</b>	<b>Mitigation / Enhancement</b>
Issue 1 – Site Allocation	<p>Option 1 will be positive in delivering sites that are well located in terms of services and minimise the impact on various environmental receptors. However, Option 2 could also score positively because every site given planning permission needs to adhere to what are called “design site criteria” (see Issue 2) or protection is provided through other Local Plan policies and through planning law.</p> <p>However, there is acknowledgement that forward planning is likely to be more positive as Option 1 can plan in a more pro-active way to ensure that settled communities are not being overloaded by the cumulative impact of more than one site. Option 1 can also be more positive in helping to plan educational services that best meet the needs of the children of travelling communities. There is a higher risk with Option 2 that appropriate sites will not come forward. However, Option 2 does give more flexibility in the strategy and there is evidence presented as part of the TANS report that the needs of travelling communities change frequently so a strategy that includes some flexibility would be positive.</p>	None
Issue 2 – Policy H6 Site Criteria	<p>The site criteria are comprehensive in their coverage and will address the issues that need to be addressed when identifying and assessing a potential gypsy and traveller site. Issue 2 scored particularly positively (significant positive) against SO10a: Ensure sites (both permanent sites and transit sites) meet the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people.</p>	None
Issue 3 – Site Size – Gypsy and Traveller	<p>Option 1 (smaller pitches) performed positively with a number of mainly minor positive impacts identified. This is because the traveller community generally feel that smaller sites meet their needs and are better managed. In addition smaller sites are less likely to overwhelm local services and cause tensions with the settled community. Option 1 scored particularly positively (significant positive) against SO10a: Ensure sites (both permanent sites and</p>	<p>It is not possible to assess against many of the SA criteria as they are locationally specific and can only be assessed once potential site locations are known. These criteria have been scored as uncertain and it will be important that once potential sites are identified as part of the Local Plan process they are subject to comparative assessment.</p> <p>If larger sites are developed measures will need to be put in place to</p>

<b>Table 3.1: SA results</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Summary of performance</b>	<b>Mitigation / Enhancement</b>
	<p>transit sites) meet the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people.</p> <p>Option 2 (larger sites) performed less well scoring mainly minor negative impacts. This is because the traveller community has stated that it does not want larger sites so these will not meet their needs.</p>	<p>ensure that residents are happy with the site before development takes place and strict management measures will be needed to ensure that impacts on the traveller community and the settled community are managed. The criteria included in the Housing SPD would help to mitigate these impacts but it needs to be acknowledged in future Local Plan documents that larger sites are more difficult to manage.</p>
Issue 4 – Site location – Gypsy and Traveller	<p>As the TANS report has shown, the preferred size for permanent/residential sites is 4-6 pitches so this is more likely to meet the needs of travelling communities. This would seem to suggest that it is better to find new sites rather than extend existing sites (especially if this would mean they go over the optimum site size). However, the majority of people living on sites in Daventry have lived there for more than 5 years and over half said they did not intend to move in the future. 34% of respondents to the survey indicated that they have family members who require separate accommodation. Due to the fact that respondents emphasised the necessity for travelling communities to live close to family members, this need would seem to suggest that extensions to sites (as long as they do not become too large) would also be positive in certain circumstances. This is a complex picture which would seem to suggest that a strategy of just extending sites or just developing new sites would not meet the needs of travelling communities. A strategy which includes a combination of new and extended sites would be the most positive. In addition, there is evidence that travellers' needs change frequently so a strategy that includes some flexibility would be positive.</p>	<p>It is not possible to assess against many of the SA criteria as they are locationally specific and can only be assessed once potential site locations are known. These criteria have been scored as uncertain and it will be important that once potential sites are identified as part of the Local Plan process they are subject to comparative assessment including comparing new sites against extension of existing sites.</p> <p>There is a need to consider the crime and disorder implications of expanding existing sites and the perceptions of crime and disorder (if possible) if this is the strategy taken forward.</p> <p>There should be caution with regard to extending too many sites past the preferred pitch number of 4-6 pitches as smaller sites are less likely to overwhelm local services and potentially cause issues with good management.</p> <p>If larger sites are developed measures will need to be put in place to ensure that residents are happy with the site before development takes place and strict management measures will be needed to ensure that impacts on the traveller community and the settled community are managed. The criteria included in the Housing SPD would help to mitigate these impacts but it needs to be acknowledged in future Local Plan documents that larger sites are more difficult to manage, therefore caution needs to be exercised when planning to extend sites.</p>
Issue 5 – Site Tenure	<p>Although the preferred accommodation type for many Gypsy and Traveller families may be small sites located on land owned by</p>	<p>There needs to be an awareness of the fact that although the ideal for most traveller families is that they live on small sites owned by</p>

<b>Table 3.1: SA results</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Summary of performance</b>	<b>Mitigation / Enhancement</b>
	<p>themselves, the focus group consulted as part of the TANS report acknowledged difficulties in Gypsies and Travellers either buying or developing land for new accommodation. Alternatives were suggested such as local authorities selling or leasing land to families or encouraging Registered Providers (RPs) to play a greater role in providing or managing site. It is likely that a mix of these options is the best strategy to practically meet the needs of traveller families. Tenure may have some impacts on how well sites are managed (and consequential impacts on waste and pollution) and Option 3 is likely to perform better in this regard.</p>	<p>themselves, this has acknowledged difficulties and that a mix of these options is the best strategy to practically meet the needs of traveller families.</p>
Issue 6 – Emergency Stopping Places	<p>There is the potential for sites to have a more significant impact if they are larger but this is very locationally specific (the location and the sensitivity of the likely receptors) this cannot be assessed at this stage. The impact of the stopping place will be assessed before it is granted planning permission.</p> <p>Countywide Traveller Unit data (as quoted in the TANS) shows that there has been an increase in the number of unauthorised caravan days during the period April-September 2012. However, over half of all unauthorised caravan days in West Northamptonshire during the period April 2012 to October 2012 were due to the movements of three families - combined with evidence derived from stakeholders this suggests the need for emergency stopping places rather than transit sites. Both of the options would assist in meeting this need. However, the evidence quoted above in relation to the fact that the issues have generally been caused by family groups seems to suggest that smaller stopping places would meet needs better than larger ones. In addition, consultation carried out as part of the TANS report indicated that large sites can be difficult to manage. The secondary impact of this could be issues with waste, pollution and drainage / water supply which could pose health and pollution risks. However, care needs to be taken with smaller sites that they have all the infrastructure they need to be run safely and cleanly. The conclusion</p>	<p>If larger sites are developed strict management measures will be needed to ensure that impacts on the traveller community and the settled community are managed. The criteria included in the Housing SPD would help to mitigate these impacts but it needs to be acknowledged in future Local Plan documents that larger sites are more difficult to manage.</p> <p>The impact of an emergency stopping place will be assessed before grant of planning permission.</p>

<b>Table 3.1: SA results</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Summary of performance</b>	<b>Mitigation / Enhancement</b>
	is that Option 1 performs more positively and scores significantly positively against SO4a: To improve community safety, fear of crime and integration of gypsy and traveller sites with settled communities and SO10a: Ensure sites (both permanent sites and transit sites) meet the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people.	
Issue 8 – Site Location – Travelling Showpeople	<p>The survey of travelling showpeople that was carried out for the TANS report surveyed a small sample of travelling showpeople at the Woodford Halse yard and families living adjacent to the equipment depot. Generally the families are satisfied with the location of the plots. However, they would like better access to services and closer amenities for children. However, they also acknowledged that both yards benefit from quiet locations in the village and close to the local schools. This suggests that extending existing sites (Option 1) could be positive with regard to a number of criteria related to access. With regard to additional sites, access to services by foot, cycle or public transport are part of the Housing SPD site criteria so this will be positive for new sites (Option 2). With regard to Option 3 any strategy that introduces flexibility will be positive.</p> <p>With regard to meeting the needs of travelling showpeople, the plots are multi use plots – they are used to store equipment (fairly large equipment which has been increasing in size over recent years) and also accommodation. However, a key issue is that there is lack of space in the current yards because of an increase in the size of fairground equipment. Therefore, the key issue is whether there is space to extend the current sites in such a way that will meet needs (both need for storage and need for accommodation). This is something that should be addressed in the responses to this Issues and Options Consultation. Therefore, it is currently uncertain whether the options will help to address this need.</p>	<p>It is not possible to assess against many of the SA criteria as they are locationally specific and can only be assessed once potential site locations are known. These criteria have been scored as uncertain and it will be important that once potential sites are identified as part of the Local Plan process they are subject to comparative assessment including comparing new sites against extension of existing sites.</p> <p>The issue of whether the options will help to meet the needs to travelling showpeople should be addressed in the responses to this Issues and Options Consultation. Once this issue is clearer (and the locations of potential sites are known, a comparative assessment of the site options can be undertaken.</p>
Issue 11 – Major Development Sites	Both options would be broadly positive in providing sites that meet the needs of travelling communities. Option 1 has the potential to	It is not possible to assess against many of the SA criteria as they are locationally specific and can only be assessed once potential site

<b>Table 3.1: SA results</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Summary of performance</b>	<b>Mitigation / Enhancement</b>
	perform slightly better with regard to integration with settled communities as traveller communities would be developed as part of major developments. However, this is very much dependent on the location of the traveller sites and how they are integrated with settled communities.	locations are known. These criteria have been scored as uncertain and it will be important that once potential sites are identified as part of the Local Plan process they are subject to comparative assessment

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **SCREENING OF THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**How the SA has addressed each issue is listed below. Greyed out rows are those where it is considered that SA is not needed.**

<b>Element of the Plan</b>	<b>SA Approach</b>
<p><b>Issue 1 – Site Allocation</b></p> <p>There is a need to provide residential pitches within Daventry District by 2029. Should all 18 pitches be allocated within the Part 2b Local Plan or should some be allowed to come through normal development management processes that is planning applications?</p> <p>Option 1: All pitches should be allocated within the Local Plan Part 2b</p> <p>Option 2: A proportion of the requirement is allocated and the remaining pitches come through development management processes. If this should be the approach how many pitches should be allocated in the Local Plan?</p>	The options have been subject to SA
<p><b>Issue 2 – Policy H6 Site Criteria</b></p> <p>Policy H6 of the West Northants Joint Core Strategy sets out criteria to be taken into account when making site allocations and determining planning applications for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision. Further guidance is provided in the Site Design Criteria contained in the draft Housing SPD; it is intended to incorporate those criteria into the Part 2b Local Plan. It is not considered necessary for the Local Plan Part 2b to include anything further regarding the criteria.</p> <p>Do you agree? If not, what should be included in the Local Plan?</p>	The combined criteria have been subject to SA.
<p><b>Issue 3 – Site Size – Gypsy and Traveller</b></p> <p>There is a need to provide 18 residential pitches within Daventry District to 2029. What site sizes should be considered for this provision?</p> <p>Option 1: Sites should be provided for 4-6 Pitches</p> <p>Option 2: Sites should be provided in a range of sizes up to 15 pitches</p> <p>Other – please outline</p>	The options have been subject to SA
<p><b>Issue 4 – Site location – Gypsy and Traveller</b></p> <p>Should existing sites within Daventry District be extended to accommodate the identified need or should need be accommodated on new sites?</p> <p>Option 1: Expand existing sites to accommodate need</p> <p>Option 2: Identify additional sites</p> <p>Option 3: Combinations of options 1 and 2 – please outline</p>	The options have been subject to SA
<p><b>Issue 5 – Site Tenure</b></p>	The options have been subject to SA

Element of the Plan	SA Approach
<p>What tenure should be considered</p> <p>Option 1: Owned by individuals for occupation by a single or extended family</p> <p>Option 2: Privately rented – perhaps owned and managed by the Gypsy and Traveller community</p> <p>Option 3: Managed by a Registered Provider or local authority</p> <p>Option 4: Other – please outline</p>	
<p><b>Issue 6 – Emergency Stopping Places</b></p> <p>Policy H6 of the West Northants Joint Core Strategy sets out a requirement for a single emergency stopping place within the District. How large should it be?</p> <p>Option 1: The Emergency stopping place should contain 1-4 pitches</p> <p>Option 2: The Emergency stopping place should contain 5-8 pitches</p> <p>Option 3: Other. Please give an alternative option</p>	The options have been subject to SA
<p><b>Issue 7 – Mixed Planning use Traveller Sites</b></p> <p>It is not considered necessary for the Local Plan Part 2b to include an additional policy on mixed use traveller sites. Do you agree?</p>	SA is not needed. This is an administrative issue
<p><b>Issue 8 – Site location – Travelling Showpeople</b></p> <p>Should existing sites within Daventry District be extended to accommodate the identified need of Travelling Showpeople or should need be accommodated on new sites?</p> <p>Option 1: Expand existing sites to accommodate need</p> <p>Option 2: Identify additional sites. If so, should these sites be identified in close proximity to Woodford Halse?</p> <p>Option 3: Combinations of options 1 and 2 – please outline.</p>	The options have been subject to SA.
<p><b>Issue 9 – Rural Areas and the Countryside</b></p> <p>It is proposed to following national Policy C when allocating sites in the Part 2b Local Plan and, include a development management policy, which embeds the principle for dealing with any other sites which may need to be considered. Do you agree?</p>	SA is not needed. This is an administrative issue
<p><b>Issue 10 – Rural Exception Sites</b></p> <p>It is not considered necessary for the Local Plan Part 2b to include a specific policy on Rural Exception Sites. Do you agree?</p>	SA is not needed. This is an administrative issue

Element of the Plan	SA Approach
<p><b>Issue 11 – Major Development Sites</b></p> <p>What additional policy (ies) should this plan contain to bring forward the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites on major development sites including housing?</p> <p>Option 1: Developers should provide a proportion of Gypsy and Traveller sites on major developments including housing within the District.</p> <p>Issue 1a What scale of development should trigger this requirement? 250 houses?</p> <p>Issue 1b In what circumstances should Gypsy and Traveller pitches count towards the affordable housing provision on such sites?</p> <p>Option 2: Developers should provide commuted sums where provision for Gypsy and Traveller pitches cannot be made on a major development site.</p> <p>Option 3: Other – please outline.</p>	<p>The options have been subject to SA.</p>
<p><b>Issue 12 – Duty to Cooperate</b></p> <p>Are there any issues arising under the duty to cooperate and that have not already been addressed that the Gypsies Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan (Part 2b) should consider? In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there discussions needed with any person or organisation?</li> <li>• Is there need that should be addressed and that is not capable of being met in another area?</li> </ul>	<p>SA is not needed. This is an administrative issue</p>
<p><b>Issue 13 – Other issues</b></p> <p>Are there any other issues the Gypsies Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan (Part 2b) should consider?</p>	<p>N/A</p>

## **APPENDIX 2 RESULTS OF THE ASSESSMENT**

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 1 – Site Allocation</b>			
There is a need to provide residential pitches within Daventry District by 2029. Should all 18 pitches be allocated within the Part 2b Local Plan or should some be allowed to come through normal development management processes, that is planning applications?			
Option 1: All pitches should be allocated in the Local Plan Part 2b			
Option 2: A proportion of the requirement is allocated and the remaining pitches come through development management processes.			
<b>SA objective</b>	<b>Impact of the options</b>		<b>Commentary and comparison of options (including if appropriate nature and spatial extent of potential impacts, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility)</b>
	1	2	
SO1a: Travel SO1b: Air and noise pollution	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: Through forward planning (Option 1) it should be possible to deliver sites that are well located in terms of sustainable travel and access to services. Therefore, Option 1 will score positively. Option 2 could also score positively, however, because every site given planning permission needs to adhere to what are called “design site criteria” (see Issue 2). These criteria consider access to services through public transport, meaning that any site that is developed should score positively before it is given planning permission.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO2a: Archaeology and cultural heritage SO3a: Habitats SO3b: Greenspace SO3c: BAP habitats SO3d: Non-designated sites	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: Through forward planning (Option 1) it should be possible to deliver sites that have fewer impacts on issues such as heritage and biodiversity. Therefore, Option 1 will score positively. Option 2 could also score positively, however, because although these issues aren’t addressed in the design site criteria, protection for heritage and biodiversity issues is provided through other Local Plan policies and through planning law any site that is developed should adhere to these policies before it is given planning permission.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO4a: Crime and community safety	++	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: Research undertaken as part of the TANS report<sup>2</sup> showed that increasing site provision is the most effective way of dealing with unauthorized development and encampments and the social issues that this causes. Therefore, any way of increasing site provision should be positive in this regard. Forward planning through site allocation will be positive by ensuring that the impacts are addressed before any site is allocated. Therefore, Option 1 will score positively. Option 2</p>

<sup>2</sup> RRR Consultancy (April 2013): West Northamptonshire Travellers Accommodation Needs Survey (TANS) 2013.

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 1 – Site Allocation</b>			
			<p>could also score positively, however, as Housing SPD criteria (which need to be adhered to before any site is given planning permission) address safety of residents through unsafe access, air and noise pollution and flood risk. There are a large number of detailed criteria related to site design which should safeguard traveller communities (for example, criteria related to fire safety, traffic calming, safe lighting, emergency service access etc). The Housing SPD criteria do not address the impact on settled communities. However, this is addressed in the criteria included in Policy H6. What Option 1 can do in a more pro-active way, however, is to ensure that certain settled communities are not being overloaded by the cumulative impact of more than one site. Therefore, Option 1 does score more positively than Option 2.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
<p>SO5a: Access to education</p> <p>SO5b: Sustainable modes of travel to education</p>	++	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>Through forward planning (Option 1) it should be possible to deliver sites that are well located in terms of sustainable travel and access to services (including education services). Therefore, Option 1 will score positively. Option 2 could also score positively, however, because every site given planning permission needs to adhere to what are called "design site criteria" (see Issue 2). These criteria consider access to services through public transport, meaning that any site that is developed should score positively before it is given planning permission. However, what Option 1 can provide is more strategic thinking about the services that travelling communities need and how this may impact upon settled communities. For example, whether travelling communities need access to a certain school (as this is better equipped to deal with the children of the travelling community) or whether it is better to not overload certain schools / communities. Therefore, Option 1 scores more positively with regard to this criteria.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
<p>SO6a: Energy efficiency, low carbon technologies and adaptation</p> <p>SO6b: Renewable energy</p>	0	0	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>The options will have a neutral effect on the SA objective</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO7a: Health and health inequalities	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>Through forward planning (Option 1) it should be possible to deliver sites that are well located in terms of sustainable travel and access to services (including health services). Therefore, Option 1 will score positively. Option 2 could also score positively, however, because every site given planning permission needs to adhere to what are called "design site</p>

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 1 – Site Allocation</b>			
			<p>criteria” (see Issue 2). These criteria consider access to services through public transport, meaning that any site that is developed should score positively before it is given planning permission.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO8a: Access to employment	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: Through forward planning (Option 1) it should be possible to deliver sites that are well located in terms of sustainable travel and access to services (including employment). Therefore, Option 1 will score positively. Option 2 could also score positively, however, because every site given planning permission needs to adhere to what are called “design site criteria” (see Issue 2). Adequate access to schools, health services and other community facilities within reasonable travelling distance and by foot, car or public transport is included as a criterion. This should have a secondary positive impact in relation to employment sites as employment opportunities are likely to be in the same places as the above.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO9a: Landscape SO9b: Built environment	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: Through forward planning (Option 1) it should be possible to deliver sites that have fewer impacts on issues such as landscape and the built environment. Therefore, Option 1 will score positively. Option 2 could also score positively, however, because although these issues aren’t addressed in the design site criteria, protection for landscape and the built environment is provided through other Local Plan policies and through planning law any site that is developed should adhere to these policies before it is given planning permission.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO10a: Housing	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: Option 1 will be more positive in ensuring that sites are allocated in the best places for travelling communities. There is a higher risk with Option 2 that appropriate sites will not come forward. However, Option 2 does give more flexibility in the strategy and there is evidence presented as part of the TANS report that the needs of travelling communities change frequently so a strategy that includes some flexibility would be positive.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO11a: Access to services SO11b: Social opportunities	+	+	<p>See assessment against SO1a</p>

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 1 – Site Allocation</b>			
SO12a: Land and soil SO13a: Waste SO14a: Drainage and clean water	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: The plan will lead to an increase in traveller sites which could increase contamination, waste generation and pollution etc. However, in the absence of the plan traveller sites will continue to be developed that are possibly not as well managed. Therefore, the plan can potentially score positively if sites are likely to be well managed. The secondary impact of this could be issues with waste, pollution and drainage / water supply which could pose health and pollution risks. However, they are not likely to have an overall negative impact because of the criteria included in the Housing SPD which need to be met before sites are allocated. These include strict criteria related to site services / facilities and health and safety.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO15a: Flooding SO15b: Strategic flood risk management	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: Through forward planning (Option 1) it should be possible to deliver sites that void flood risk. However Option 2 will score positively as well because the Housing SPD criteria address safety of residents through flood risk. There are a large number of detailed criteria related to site design which should safeguard communities</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 2 – Policy H6 Site Criteria</b>		
Policy H6 of the West Northants Joint Core Strategy sets out criteria to be taken into account when making site allocations and determining planning applications for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision. Further guidance is provided in the Site Design Criteria contained in the draft Housing SPD; it is intended to incorporate those criteria into the Part 2b Local Plan. It is not considered necessary for the Local Plan Part 2b to include anything further regarding the criteria.		
<b>SA objective</b>	<b>Impact of the criteria</b>	<b>Commentary and comparison of options (including if appropriate nature and spatial extent of potential impacts, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility)</b>
SO1a: Travel	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>Adequate access to schools, health services and other community facilities within reasonable travelling distance and by foot, car or public transport is included as a criterion in the Housing SPD and this will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO1b: Air and noise pollution	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>The criteria aim to provide sites with access to services by means other than private vehicle and this should have positive impacts on air quality. With regard to the impacts of traveller sites on noise and nuisance, the Housing SPD criteria state that there should be no significant adverse impact on amenity. These criteria also address poor air quality and noise and ensuring travelling communities are not exposed to poor air quality and unacceptable noise.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO2a: Archaeology and cultural heritage	0	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>This is not addressed as part of the site criteria. However, protection for heritage issues is provided through other Local Plan policies and through planning law.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO3a: Habitats SO3b: Greenspace SO3c: BAP habitats SO3d: Non-designated sites	0	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>This is not addressed as part of the site criteria. However, protection for habitats and species is provided through other Local Plan policies and through planning law.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 2 – Policy H6 Site Criteria</b>		
SO4a: Crime and community safety	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: The Housing SPD criteria address safety of residents through unsafe access, air and noise pollution and flood risk. There are a large number of detailed criteria related to site design which should safeguard traveller communities (for example, criteria related to fire safety, traffic calming, safe lighting, emergency service access etc). The Housing SPD criteria do not address the impact on settled communities. However, this is addressed in the criteria included in Policy H6.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO5a: Access to education SO5b: Sustainable modes of travel to education	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: Adequate access to schools, health services and other community facilities within reasonable travelling distance and by foot, car or public transport is included as a criterion in the Housing SPD. The detailed site design criteria also consider whether communal facilities are needed which could be used by the education service.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO6a: Energy efficiency, low carbon technologies and adaptation SO6b: Renewable energy	0	<p>Summary and comparison of options: The option will have a neutral effect on the SA objective.</p>
SO7a: Health and health inequalities	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: In addition the site design criteria in the Housing SPD consider mobility standards under Part M Building Regulations which will help to safeguard the health of less mobile residents.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO8a: Access to employment	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: Adequate access to schools, health services and other community facilities within reasonable travelling distance and by foot, car or public transport is included as a criterion in the Housing SPD. This should have a secondary positive impact in relation to employment sites as employment opportunities are likely to be in the same places as the above. There are also criteria included in the Housing SPD to ensure that travelling showpeople have adequate space to work.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO9a: Landscape SO9b: Built environment	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: The Housing SPD criteria address visual impact and the character of the surrounding landscape. Appropriate landscaping and boundaries should be provided.</p>

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 2 – Policy H6 Site Criteria</b>		
		Mitigation / Enhancement: None
SO10a: Housing	++	<p>Summary and comparison of options: The Housing SPD criteria include consideration of meeting the required needs and phasing of provision for pitches. More detailed site design criteria (within the Housing SPD criteria) with regard to needs, demographics, privacy etc will help to meet the needs of travelling communities.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO11a: Access to services SO11b: Social opportunities	+	See assessment against SO1a
SO12a: Land and soil	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: The Housing SPD criteria include detailed design criteria which address adequate drainage, waste disposal and sewage disposal. This should ensure that the risk of land contamination and pollution is minimised.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO13a: Waste	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: The Housing SPD criteria include detailed design criteria which address waste disposal and this includes recycling provision.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO14a: Drainage and clean water	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: The Housing SPD criteria include consideration of adequate water supply and appropriate means of sewage disposal.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO15a: Flooding SO15b: Strategic flood risk management	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: The Housing SPD criteria address safety of residents through flood risk. There are a large number of detailed criteria related to site design which should safeguard communities</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 3 – Site Size – Gypsy and Traveller</b>			
There is a need to provide 18 residential pitches within Daventry District to 2029. What site sizes should be considered for this provision? Option 1: Sites should be provided for 4-6 Pitches Option 2: Sites should be provided in a range of sizes up to 15 pitches			
<b>SA objective</b>	<b>Impact of the options</b>		<b>Commentary and comparison of options (including if appropriate nature and spatial extent of potential impacts, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility)</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	
SO1a: Travel	?	?	<p>Summary and comparison of options: It is not possible to assess against this criteria at this stage of the plan process. Further details regarding potential site locations will be required.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: It is not possible to assess against many of the SA criteria as they are locationally specific and can only be assessed once potential site locations are known. These criteria have been scored as uncertain and it will be important that once potential sites are identified as part of the Local Plan process they are subject to comparative assessment</p>
SO1b: Air and noise pollution SO2a: Archaeology and cultural heritage SO3a: Habitats SO3b: Greenspace SO3c: BAP habitats SO3d: Non-designated sites	?	?	See assessment against SO1a
SO4a: Crime and community safety	+	-	<p>Summary and comparison of options: Research undertaken as part of the TANS report<sup>3</sup> showed that increasing site provision is the most effective way of dealing with unauthorized development and encampments and the social issues that this causes. Consultation associated with the TANS report shows that the preferred size for permanent/residential sites is 4-6 pitches, which tend to have fewer inter-family tensions and are therefore easier to manage. Smaller sites are also more likely to cause fewer</p>

<sup>3</sup> RRR Consultancy (April 2013): West Northamptonshire Travellers Accommodation Needs Survey (TANS) 2013.

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 3 – Site Size – Gypsy and Traveller</b>			
			<p>tensions with the settled community.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: If larger sites are developed measures will need to be put in place to ensure that residents are happy with the site before development takes place and strict management measures will be needed to ensure that impacts on the traveller community and the settled community are managed. The criteria included in the Housing DPD would help to mitigate these effects but it needs to be acknowledged in future Local Plan documents that larger sites are more difficult to manage.</p>
<p>SO5a: Access to education</p> <p>SO5b: Sustainable modes of travel to education</p>	+	-	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>The nomadic lifestyle of Travelling communities can adversely impact on children’s educational attainment<sup>4</sup>. Nonetheless, there is good evidence that the relationship between local schools and Gypsy and Traveller families has improved in recent years (TANS report). Smaller pitches are less likely to overwhelm local education services. There is the potential for large sites to change the nature of small local schools due to the numbers of children that may need to be accommodated.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: See SO4.</p>
<p>SO6a: Energy efficiency, low carbon technologies and adaptation</p> <p>SO6b: Renewable energy</p>	0	0	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>The options will have a neutral effect on the SA objective</p>
SO7a: Health and health inequalities	+	-	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>Despite relatively scarce research being undertaken on the Gypsy and Traveller lifestyle, existing research points to poor health and educational opportunities and poor mental health can be a particular issue.<sup>5</sup> As can be seen from above, the preferred pitch size is 4-6 so this would be more positive for people’s wellbeing and integration with the settled community. In addition, smaller pitches are less likely to overwhelm local health services. The consultation carried out as part of the TANS report indicated that large sites can be difficult to manage. The secondary impact of this could be</p>

<sup>4</sup> See Levinson, Martin P. & Sparkes, Andrew C. (2003), *Gypsy Masculinities and the School–Home Interface: exploring contradictions and tensions*, British Journal of Sociology of Education, Vol. 24, No. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Parry et al (2004) *The Health Status of Gypsies and Travellers in England*, University of Sheffield located at: [http://www.shef.ac.uk/polopoly\\_fs/1.43713!/file/GT-report-summary.pdf](http://www.shef.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.43713!/file/GT-report-summary.pdf)

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 3 – Site Size – Gypsy and Traveller</b>			
			issues with waste, pollution and drainage / water supply which could pose health and pollution risks.  Mitigation / Enhancement: See SO4
SO8a: Access to employment	?	?	See assessment against SO1a
SO9a: Landscape SO9b: Built environment	?	?	There is the potential for smaller sites to potentially have less impact. However, assessment against this issue is also very much dependent on the site location so please see the assessment against SO1a.
SO10a: Housing	++	-	Summary and comparison of options: The preferred size for permanent/residential sites is 4-6 pitches so this is more likely to fully meet the needs of travelling communities.  Mitigation / Enhancement: See SO4
SO11a: Access to services SO11b: Social opportunities	?	?	See assessment against SO1a
SO12a: Land and soil SO13a: Waste SO14a: Drainage and clean water	+	0	Summary and comparison of options: The plan will lead to an increase in traveller sites which could increase contamination, waste generation and pollution etc. However, in the absence of the plan traveller sites will continue to be developed but in a less planned and well managed way. Therefore, the plan can potentially score positively if sites are likely to be well managed. The consultation carried out as part of the TANS report indicated that large sites can be difficult to manage. The secondary impact of this could be issues with waste, pollution and drainage / water supply which could pose health and pollution risks. However, they are not likely to have an overall negative impact because of the criteria included in the Housing SPD which need to be met before sites are allocated. These include strict criteria related to site services / facilities and health and safety. With regard to smaller sites they are generally more likely to be well managed and score more positively. Care needs to be taken with smaller sites that they have all the infrastructure they need to be run safely and cleanly. However, this should be the case because of the criteria included in the Housing SPD which need to be met before sites are allocated. These include strict criteria related to site services / facilities and health and safety. Overall, Option 1 (smaller sites) are felt to be more positive.  Mitigation / Enhancement: See SO4

Daventry District

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 3 – Site Size – Gypsy and Traveller</b>			
SO15a: Flooding	?	?	See assessment against SO1a
SO15b: Strategic			
flood risk management			

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 4 – Site location – Gypsy and Traveller</b>			
Should existing sites within Daventry District be extended to accommodate the identified need or should need be accommodated on new sites? Option 1: Expand existing sites to accommodate need Option 2: Identify additional sites			
<b>SA objective</b>	<b>Impact of the options</b>		<b>Commentary and comparison of options (including if appropriate nature and spatial extent of potential impacts, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility)</b>
	1	2	
SO1a: Travel	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options: The survey of residents that was carried out for the TANS report surveyed a sample of travelling communities at various sites in Daventry (N.B there are currently approx. 25 pitches in Daventry and all are privately owned). This found that the majority of residents (over 90%) stated that access to services such as shops and post offices was easy or OK. This could be positive in reducing the need to travel if sites are located near to public transport. This suggests that extending existing sites could be positive.</p> <p>With regard to new sites, access to services by foot, cycle or public transport are part of the Housing SPD site criteria so this will be positive for new sites.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO1b: Air and noise pollution	?	?	<p>Summary and comparison of options: It is not possible to assess against this criteria at this stage as it is locationally specific. Once potential new sites are known it should be possible to undertake a comparative assessment of new sites compared with expansion of existing sites.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: It is not possible to assess against many of the SA criteria as they are locationally specific and can only be assessed once potential site locations are known. These criteria have been scored as uncertain and it will be important that once potential sites are identified as part of the Local Plan process they are subject to comparative assessment including comparing new sites against extension of existing sites.</p>
SO2a: Archaeology and cultural heritage	?	?	See assessment against SO1b
SO3a: Habitats SO3b: Greenspace SO3c: BAP habitats SO3d: Non-	?	?	See assessment against SO1b

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 4 – Site location – Gypsy and Traveller</b>			
designated sites			
SO4a: Crime and community safety	-	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>Research undertaken for the TANS report found that smaller sites tend to have fewer inter-family tensions and are therefore easier to manage. Smaller sites are also more likely to cause fewer tensions with the settled community. Some consultees on the TANS report advised against the expansion of existing social rented and private sites as large sites can be difficult to manage. There is a need to consider crime and disorder implications of expanding existing sites. Therefore, the impact of only expanding existing sites is likely to be negative. The impact of smaller sites could be positive if careful thought is given to the impact on safety and crime (both for the traveller communities and settled communities).</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: There is a need to consider the crime and disorder implications of expanding existing sites and the perceptions of crime and disorder (if possible) if this is the strategy taken forward.</p>
SO5a: Access to education SO5b: Sustainable modes of travel to education	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>The survey of residents that was carried out for the TANS report surveyed a sample of travelling communities at various sites in Daventry. This found that the majority of residents stated that access to education services was easy or OK (100% said access was easy or OK for primary schools and 91.3% for secondary schools). This suggests that extending existing sites could be positive<sup>6</sup>. However, there should be caution with regard to extending too many sites past the preferred pitch size of 4-6 pitches as smaller sites are less likely to overwhelm local education services.</p> <p>With regard to new sites, access to schools is part of the Housing SPD site criteria so this will be positive for new sites.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: There should be caution with regard to extending too many sites past the preferred pitch size of 4-6 pitches as smaller sites are less likely to overwhelm local education services.</p>
SO6a: Energy efficiency, low carbon technologies and adaptation SO6b: Renewable energy	0	0	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>The options will have a neutral effect on the SA objective</p>

<sup>6</sup> Please note that since this survey was undertaken the closure of Baybrooke Primary School (which was located close to the Justin Park traveller site) might have had an effect on these access to education results

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 4 – Site location – Gypsy and Traveller</b>			
SO7a: Health and health inequalities	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>The survey of residents that was carried out for the TANS report surveyed a sample of travelling communities at various sites in Daventry. This found that the majority of residents (92%) stated that access to health services was easy or OK. This suggests that extending existing sites could be positive</p> <p>With regard to new sites, access to health services is part of the Housing SPD site criteria so this will be positive for new sites. The results of the assessment of issue 3 should also be noted here with regard to preferred pitch size. Smaller pitch sizes are likely to be more positive for people's wellbeing and integration with the settled community. In addition, smaller pitches are less likely to overwhelm local health services.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: There should be caution with regard to extending too many sites past the preferred pitch size of 4-6 pitches as smaller sites are less likely to overwhelm local health services.</p>
SO8a: Access to employment	?	?	See assessment against SO1b
SO9a: Landscape SO9b: Built environment	?	?	See assessment against SO1b
SO10a: Housing	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>Overall, both options will score positively as they both seek to provide additional accommodation to meet identified needs. However, the extent to which they meet these needs is a complex picture. As the TANS report has shown, the preferred size for permanent/residential sites is 4-6 pitches so this is more likely to meet the needs of travelling communities. This would seem to suggest that it is better to find new sites rather than extend existing sites (especially if this would mean they go over the optimum pitch size). However, the majority of people living on sites in Daventry have lived there for more than 5 years, satisfaction rates are fairly high and over half said they did not intend to move in the future. 34% of respondents to the survey indicated that they have family members who require separate accommodation. Due to the fact that respondents emphasised the necessity for travelling communities to live close to family members, this need would seem to suggest that extensions to sites (as long as they do not become too large) would also be positive in certain circumstances. This is a complex picture which would seem to suggest that a strategy of just extending sites or just developing new sites would not fully meet the needs of travelling communities. A strategy which includes a combination of new and extended sites would be the most positive. In addition, there is evidence that travelling communities need change frequently so a strategy that includes some flexibility would be positive.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: There should be caution exercised in extending sites are above the preferred size for</p>

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 4 – Site location – Gypsy and Traveller</b>			
			permanent/residential sites is 4-6 pitches
SO11a: Access to services SO11b: Social opportunities	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>The survey of residents that was carried out for the TANS report surveyed a sample of travelling communities at various sites in Daventry. This found that the majority of residents (over 90%) stated that access to services such as shops and post offices was easy or OK. This suggests that extending existing sites could be positive. With regard to new sites, access to services by foot, cycle or public transport are part of the Housing SPD site criteria so this will be positive for new sites.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO12a: Land and soil SO13a: Waste SO14a: Drainage and clean water	?	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>The plan will lead to an increase in traveller sites which could increase contamination, waste generation and pollution etc. However, in the absence of the plan traveller sites will continue to be developed but in a less planned and well managed way. Therefore, the plan can potentially score positively if sites are likely to be well managed. The consultation carried out as part of the TANS report indicated that large sites can be difficult to manage. Therefore if sites are extended care must be taken to ensure they are not expanded by so much that management becomes difficult. If sites become too big and are not managed properly, the secondary impact of this could be issues with waste, pollution and drainage / water supply which could pose health and pollution risks. However, care needs to be taken with smaller sites to ensure that they have all the infrastructure they need to be run safely and cleanly. This should be the case because of the criteria included in the Housing SPD which need to be met before sites are allocated. These include strict criteria related to site services / facilities and health and safety.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: There should be caution exercised in extending sites are above the preferred size for permanent/residential sites is 4-6 pitches. If larger sites are developed measures will need to be put in place to ensure that residents are happy with the site before development takes place and strict management measures will be needed to ensure that impacts on the traveller community and the settled community are managed. The criteria included in the Housing DPD would help to mitigate these impacts but it needs to be acknowledged in future Local Plan documents that larger sites are more difficult to manage and therefore caution needs to be exercised when planning to extend sites.</p>
SO15a: Flooding SO15b: Strategic flood risk management	?	?	See assessment against SO1a

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 5 – Site Tenure</b>				
What tenure should be considered Option 1: Owned by individuals for occupation by a single or extended family Option 2: Privately rented – perhaps owned and managed by the Gypsy and Traveller community Option 3: Managed by a Registered Provider or local authority				
<b>SA objective</b>	<b>Impact of the options</b>			<b>Commentary and comparison of options (including if appropriate nature and spatial extent of potential impacts, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility)</b>
	1	2	3	
SO1a: Travel SO1b: Air and noise pollution SO2a: Archaeology and cultural heritage SO3a: Habitats SO3b: Greenspace SO3c: BAP habitats SO3d: Non-designated sites	0	0	0	Summary and comparison of options The tenure of the site would have no impact on these SA objectives.  Mitigation / enhancement: None
SO4a: Crime and community safety	+	-	+	Summary and comparison of options Options 1 and 3 may have a more positive impact upon Crime and Community safety. Option 1 would reduce problems that may occur to inter-family tensions whereas sites under Option 3 may be more formally managed due to the involvement of a third party.  Mitigation / enhancement: None
SO5a: Access to education SO5b:	0	0	0	Summary and comparison of options The tenure of the site would have no impact on these SA objective

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 5 – Site Tenure</b>				
Sustainable modes of travel to education				Mitigation / enhancement: None
SO6a: Energy efficiency, low carbon technologies and adaptation SO6b: Renewable energy	0	0	0	Summary and comparison of options The tenure of the site would have no impact on these SA objective  Mitigation / enhancement: None
SO7a: Health and health inequalities	+	-	+	Summary and comparison of options A better managed site with fewer tensions is likely to have an indirect effect on health. Therefore, Options 1 and 3 are likely to score more positively.  Mitigation / enhancement: None
SO8a: Access to employment	0	0	0	Summary and comparison of options The tenure of the site would have no impact on these SA objective  Mitigation / enhancement: None
SO9a: Landscape SO9b: Built environment	0	0	0	Summary and comparison of options The tenure of the site would have no impact on these SA objective  Mitigation / enhancement: None
SO10a: Housing	+	+	+	Summary and comparison of options Although the preferred accommodation type for many Gypsy and Traveller families may be small sites located on land owned by themselves, the focus group consulted as part of the TANS report acknowledged difficulties in Gypsies and Travellers either buying or developing land for new accommodation. Alternatives were suggested such as local authorities selling or leasing land to families or encouraging Registered Providers (RPs) to play a greater role in providing or managing site. It is likely that a mix of these options is the best strategy to practically meet the needs of traveller families.  Mitigation / enhancement: There needs to be an awareness of the fact that although the ideal for most traveller families is that they live on small sites owned by themselves this has acknowledged difficulties and that a mix of these options is the

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 5 – Site Tenure</b>				
				best strategy to practically meet the needs of traveller families.
SO11a: Access to services SO11b: Social opportunities	0	0	0	Summary and comparison of options The tenure of the site would have no impact on these SA objective  Mitigation / enhancement: None
SO12a: Land and soil SO13a: Waste SO14a: Drainage and clean water	-	-	+	Summary and comparison of options Option 3 is likely to result in more formal control over issues such as waste management. Therefore, the effect on pollution and waste is likely to be more positive for Option 3.
SO15a: Flooding SO15b: Strategic flood risk management	0	0	0	Summary and comparison of options The tenure of the site would have no impact on these SA objective  Mitigation / enhancement: None

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 6 – Emergency Stopping Places</b>			
Policy H6 of the West Northants Joint Core Strategy sets out a requirement for a single emergency stopping place within the District. How large should it be? Option 1: The Emergency stopping place should contain 1-4 pitches Option 2: The Emergency stopping place should contain 5-8 pitches			
<b>SA objective</b>	<b>Impact of the options</b>		<b>Commentary and comparison of options (including if appropriate nature and spatial extent of potential impacts, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility)</b>
	1	2	
SO1a: Travel SO1b: Air and noise pollution	?	?	Summary and comparison of options There is the potential for sites to have a more significant impact if they are larger but this is very locationally specific (the location and the sensitivity of the likely receptors) this cannot be assessed at this stage. The impact of the stopping place will be assessed before it is granted planning permission.  Mitigation / Enhancement: The impact of the stopping place will be assessed before it is granted planning permission.
SO2a: Archaeology and cultural heritage SO3a: Habitats SO3b: Greenspace SO3c: BAP habitats SO3d: Non-designated sites	?	?	See assessment against SO1
SO4a: Crime and community safety	++	+	Summary and comparison of options Research undertaken as part of the TANS report <sup>7</sup> showed that increasing site provision is the most effective way of dealing with unauthorized development and encampments and the social issues that this causes. Both of the options would do this by ensuring that there are adequate emergency stopping places. However, smaller sites are often easier to manage and smaller sites are also less likely to cause tensions with the settled community.  Mitigation / Enhancement: None

<sup>7</sup> RRR Consultancy (April 2013): West Northamptonshire Travellers Accommodation Needs Survey (TANS) 2013.

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 6 – Emergency Stopping Places</b>			
SO5a: Access to education SO5b: Sustainable modes of travel to education	0	0	See assessment against SO1
SO6a: Energy efficiency, low carbon technologies and adaptation SO6b: Renewable energy	0	0	The size of emergency stopping places will not have an impact on this objective.
SO7a: Health and health inequalities	?	?	See assessment against SO1
SO8a: Access to employment	?	?	See assessment against SO1
SO9a: Landscape SO9b: Built environment	?	?	See assessment against SO1
SO10a: Housing	++	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>Countywide Traveller Unit data (as quoted in the TANS) shows that there has been an increase in the number of unauthorised caravan days during the period April-September 2012. However, over half of all unauthorised caravan days in West Northamptonshire during the period April 2012 to October 2012 were due to the movements of three families - combined with evidence derived from stakeholders this suggests the need for emergency stopping places rather than transit sites. Both of the options would assist in meeting this need. However, the evidence quoted above in relation to the fact that the issues have generally been caused by family groups seems to suggest that smaller stopping places would meet needs better than larger ones. Although emergency stopping places are meant to be used for short term stays (less than 28 days), it can be argued that there may be similar tensions arising on larger temporary sites as have been discussed for residential sites. Smaller sites are also more likely to cause fewer tensions with the settled community.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO11a: Access to services SO11b: Social opportunities	0	0	See assessment against SO1

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 6 – Emergency Stopping Places</b>			
SO12a: Land and soil SO13a: Waste SO14a: Drainage and clean water	?	?	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>The consultation carried out as part of the TANS report indicated that large sites can be difficult to manage. The secondary impact of this could be issues with waste, pollution and drainage / water supply which could pose health and pollution risks. However, care needs to be taken with smaller sites that they have all the infrastructure they need to be run safely and cleanly. This should be the case because of the criteria included in the Housing SPD which need to be met before sites are allocated. These include strict criteria related to site services / facilities and health and safety.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: If larger sites are developed strict management measures will be needed to ensure that impacts on the traveller community and the settled community are managed. The criteria included in the Housing DPD would help to mitigate these impacts but it needs to be acknowledged in future Local Plan documents that larger sites are more difficult to manage.</p>
SO15a: Flooding SO15b: Strategic flood risk management	0	0	See assessment against SO1

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 8 – Site location – Travelling Showpeople</b>				
Should existing sites within Daventry District be extended to accommodate the identified need of Travelling Showpeople or should need be accommodated on new sites?				
Option 1: Expand existing sites to accommodate need				
Option 2: Identify additional sites. If so, should these sites be identified in close proximity to Woodford Halse?				
Option 3: Combinations of options 1 and 2 – please outline.				
<b>SA objective</b>	<b>Impact of the options</b>			<b>Commentary and comparison of options (including if appropriate nature and spatial extent of potential impacts, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility)</b>
	1	2	3	
SO1a: Travel	+	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>The survey of travelling showpeople that was carried out for the TANS report surveyed a small sample of travelling showpeople at the Woodford Halse yard and families living adjacent to the equipment depot. Generally the families are satisfied with the location of the plots. However, they would like better access to services and closer amenities for children. However, they also acknowledged that both yards benefit from quiet locations in the village and close to the local schools. This suggests that extending existing sites could be positive (Option 1)</p> <p>With regard to additional sites, access to services by foot, cycle or public transport are part of the Housing SPD site criteria so this will be positive for new sites (Option 2). With regard to Option 3 any strategy that introduces flexibility will be positive.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO1b: Air and noise pollution	?	?	?	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>It is not possible to assess against this criteria at this stage as it is locationally specific. Once potential new sites are known it should be possible to undertake a comparative assessment of new sites compared with expansion of existing sites.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: It is not possible to assess against many of the SA criteria as they are locationally specific and can only be assessed once potential site locations are known. These criteria have been scored as uncertain and it will be important that once potential sites are identified as part of the Local Plan process they are subject to comparative assessment including comparing new sites against extension of existing sites.</p>
SO2a: Archaeology and cultural heritage	?	?	?	See assessment against SO1b
SO3a:	?	?	?	See assessment against SO1b

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 8 – Site location – Travelling Showpeople</b>				
Habitats SO3b: Greenspace SO3c: BAP habitats SO3d:Non- designated sites				
SO4a: Crime and community safety	0	0	0	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>Research undertaken for the TANS report found that there is concern regarding security at the Woodford Halse yard as the yard is frequently broken into when families are away travelling (March to October). However, this would be a risk wherever sites are located.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO5a: Access to education SO5b: Sustainable modes of travel to education	+	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>The survey of residents that was carried out for the TANS report found that residents of the current yards stated that both yard benefitted from being located close to local schools. This suggests that extending existing sites could be positive. With regard to new sites, access to schools is part of the Housing SPD site criteria so this will be positive for new sites. With regard to Option 3 any strategy that introduces flexibility will be positive.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO6a: Energy efficiency, low carbon technologies and adaptation SO6b: Renewable	0	0	0	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>The options will have a neutral effect on the SA objective</p>

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 8 – Site location – Travelling Showpeople</b>				
energy				
SO7a: Health and health inequalities	+	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>The survey of residents that was carried out for the TANS report suggests that families are generally registered with the local GP and are happy with local health services. This suggests that extending existing sites (Option 1) could be positive. With regard to new sites (Option 2), access to health services is part of the Housing SPD site criteria so this will be positive for new sites. With regard to Option 3 any strategy that introduces flexibility will be positive.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO8a: Access to employment	?	?	?	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>Travelling showpeople plots are multi use plots – they are used to store equipment (fairly large equipment which has been increasing in size over recent years) and also accommodation. However, a key issue is that there is lack of space in the current yards because of an increase in the size of fairground equipment. Therefore, the key issue is whether there is space to extend the current sites in such a way that will meet needs (both need for storage and need for accommodation). This is something that should be addressed in the responses to this Issues and Options Consultation. Therefore, it is currently uncertain whether the options will help to address this need.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: The issue of whether the options will help to meet the needs to travelling showpeople should be addressed in the responses to this Issues and Options Consultation. Once this issue is clearer (and the locations of potential sites are known, a comparative assessment of the site options can be undertaken.</p>
SO9a: Landscape SO9b: Built environment	?	?	?	See assessment against SO1b
SO10a: Housing	?	?	?	See assessment against SO8a.
SO11a: Access to services SO11b: Social opportunities	+	+	+	See assessment against SO1a

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 8 – Site location – Travelling Showpeople</b>				
SO12a: Land and soil SO13a: Waste SO14a: Drainage and clean water	+	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>The plan will lead to an increase in travelling showpeople sites which could increase contamination, waste generation and pollution etc. However, in the absence of the plan sites will continue to be developed but in a less planned and well managed way. Therefore, the plan can potentially score positively if sites are likely to be well managed. No evidence has been presented that suggests that the existing sites are poorly managed. Therefore, all of the options could score positively.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO15a: Flooding SO15b: Strategic flood risk management	?	?	?	See assessment against SO1b

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 11 – Major Development Sites</b>			
What additional policy (ies) should this plan contain to bring forward the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites on major development sites including housing? Option 1 Developers should provide a proportion of Gypsy and Traveller sites on major developments including housing within the District. Issue 1a What scale of development should trigger this requirement? 250 houses? <sup>8</sup> Issue 1b In what circumstances should Gypsy and Traveller pitches count towards the affordable housing provision on such sites? Option 2: Developers should provide commuted sums where provision for Gypsy and Traveller pitches cannot be made on a major development site.			
<b>SA objective</b>	<b>Impact of the options</b>		<b>Commentary and comparison of options (including if appropriate nature and spatial extent of potential impacts, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility)</b>
	1	2	
SO1a: Travel	++	+	Summary and comparison of options Option 1 would lead to traveller communities that are more integrated into newer settled communities. Therefore, access to all services and modal shift should be positive. It is not clear at this stage if commuted sums are used where sites will be developed. However, access to services by foot, cycle or public transport are part of the Housing SPD site criteria so this will be positive for any new sites.  Mitigation / Enhancement: None
SO1b: Air and noise pollution	?	?	It is not possible to assess against this criteria as this criteria is locationally specific and can only be assessed once potential site locations are known.  Mitigation / Enhancement: It is not possible to assess against many of the SA criteria as they are locationally specific and can only be assessed once potential site locations are known. These criteria have been scored as uncertain and it will be important that once potential sites are identified as part of the Local Plan process they are subject to comparative assessment
SO2a: Archaeology and cultural heritage	?	?	See assessment against SO1b
SO3a: Habitats SO3b: Greenspace SO3c: BAP habitats SO3d: Non-designated sites	?	?	See assessment against SO1b

<sup>8</sup> Please note that it has not been possible to assess 1a and 1b as these are questions that have been posed to consultees. Option 1 and 2 have been subject to a comparative assessment

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 11 – Major Development Sites</b>			
SO4a: Crime and community safety	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>Research undertaken as part of the TANS report<sup>9</sup> showed that increasing site provision is the most effective way of dealing with unauthorized development and encampments and the social issues that this causes. Both of the options would do this by ensuring that there is adequate funding available for site development. Option 1 has the potential to perform slightly better with regard to integration with settled communities as traveller communities would be developed as part of major developments. However, this is very much dependent on the location of the traveller sites and how they are integrated with settled communities.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO5a: Access to education SO5b: Sustainable modes of travel to education	+	+	See assessment against SO1a
SO6a: Energy efficiency, low carbon technologies and adaptation SO6b: Renewable energy	0	0	<p>Summary and comparison of options:</p> <p>The options will have a neutral effect on the SA objective</p>
SO7a: Health and health inequalities SO8a: Access to employment	+	+	See assessment against SO1a
SO9a: Landscape SO9b: Built environment	?	?	See assessment against SO1b
SO10a: Housing	+	+	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>Both options would be positive as they would ensure that there is adequate funding available for site development. It is not possible to assess the adequacy of sites until site locations are known.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO11a: Access to services SO11b: Social opportunities	+	+	See assessment against SO1a

<sup>9</sup> RRR Consultancy (April 2013): West Northamptonshire Travellers Accommodation Needs Survey (TANS) 2013.

<b>Issue / Option being assessed: Issue 11 – Major Development Sites</b>			
SO12a: Land and soil SO13a: Waste SO14a: Drainage and clean water	?	?	<p>Summary and comparison of options</p> <p>The way that sites are developed in relation to Major Development Sites will have an uncertain effect on this criteria. This is because this is mainly related to the size of the site (smaller sites tend to be better managed) and this is unclear at the moment.</p> <p>Mitigation / Enhancement: None</p>
SO15a: Flooding SO15b: Strategic flood risk management	?	?	See assessment against SO1b