



**Newark & Sherwood Local Development Framework**

**'Planning to meet the needs of Gypsy and Traveller communities'**

**Gypsy & Traveller Development Plan Document**

**Evidence Base Document 6**

**Summary of Stakeholder Consultation Event**

**February 2015**

## GTA Stakeholder Workshop - 05/11/2013

### Minutes

#### **Attendees**

#### **Introduction**

Attendee introductions

(RM) Brief introduction of the format for the workshop, particular reference made to;

- The meeting will be informal, with an aim to identify the views and experiences of the attendees and gather information on connectivity and travel flow of the G&T communities.
- The Strategic Housing and Planning Policy Business Units at Newark and Sherwood District Council (NSDC) are currently working on an update of the 2007 the G&T communities' needs assessment, to identify needs from 2013 onwards. The consultation is underway and it is anticipated that the results of the consultation will be available January 2013.
- Due to finances this assessment is strictly to identify future numbers of pitch requirement.
- A separate study to identify health issues and needs within the G&T community is being undertaken by the Health Authority. When the study is available a copy will be distributed to all attendees at this workshop.
- Needs for NSDC G&T communities pitch requirement up to 2012 was to provide 84 additional pitches, this requirement has been met.
- It is anticipated that other Nottinghamshire Authorities will follow NSDC lead on the G&T needs assessment.

#### **Question 1:**

Attendees were asked to look at the maps and plans at the rear of the room to identify if any sites were missing, or if anyone was aware of any unauthorised sites.

#### **Response**

- No further sites were identified from the maps.

#### **Question 2:**

Any Issues that could affect G&T communities that go over the areas shown on the maps.

#### **Response**

- A need to be aware of potential double counting, if sites are close to or cross District boundaries.

#### **Question 3:**

Travel flow

#### **Response**

- G&T communities frequently travel between Gainsborough and Newark.
- Some G&T's had already moved or wanted to move from Worksop as the disabled facilities were poor on sites in this area.
- Awareness was raised of G&T communities moving from Chesterfield to the Newark area.
- G&T families were also known to be living in Doncaster, however it was thought if there was land available they may wish to move to Newark. (A point was raised asking for a contact name for the Doncaster area)

- It was considered that movement to and from Mansfield and Ashfield was seasonal and primarily it would be those that would just be travelling through.
- A number of G&T's have moved in to housing due to a lack of pitches
- During the summer months some G&T's travel countryside which is the same information as identified in the 2007 study.

**Question 4:**

Ideal sized sites?

**Response**

- It was considered 10-12 pitches would accommodate 1 family. It was thought that this was generally acceptable however provision should be made for the site to be extended as families grew.
- There did not appear to be a need for larger sites
- Some flexibility should be made for site size especially in smaller locations with less capacity for growth.
- Sites should be close to services and there did not appear to be any issues as far as the G&T community were concerned with sites being adjacent to settled communities.
- G&T communities considered there was a need to know who their neighbours were. This would create greater harmony and minimise issues for the authorities.

**Question 5:**

Preferred location for proposed sites?

**Response**

- It was thought that some G&T's may wish to return to the Newark area.
- It was considered G&T's would be prepared to move to another location however the priority would be for families to stay together.
- Interest was shown in a need for a Local Authority managed site.
- It was thought an allocations system should be set up to vet potential residents to G&T sites.
- There was some desire for different sites to accommodate different groups of G&T's. Although there was a need for this to be managed in a way that wasn't prejudice.

**Question 6:**

Main barriers to delivering G&T accommodation sites, and how barriers can be overcome

**Response**

- Land availability is an issue.
- Misconception of Local Councillors- greater understanding required.
- 'Political Will' - Influencing local residents - need to address public perception
- Enquiries were made about member training.

**Question 7:**

Scope to delivering a site specifically for older members of the G&T communities

**Response**

- It was generally thought that there was not a requirement for separate sites for the older G&T community, however better disabled facilities were required, with the aim of providing 'Life time homes.'
- It may be a possibility that some older residents would want quieter sites - this point was left without any conclusion.
- A representative of Health Care Services advised she would wish to be involved in supporting G&T's with the provision of adaptations and disabled facilities.

**Area Specific Questions (Newark and Sherwood District)****Question 8:**

Prominent issues in meeting the accommodation needs of G&T's in the district

**Response**

- Lack of trust in the G&T community after the 2007 study, as it had been anticipated that a new site would be delivered and this hasn't happened.
- Apathy!
- Desire for a Local Authority managed site, to reduce tensions.
- There is a misconception by the settled community that Tolney Lane is owned the NSDC.
- Many G&T's find the process too complex
- A fair outcome and correct decisions can only be made if the G&T community become involved with the process.
- It was important for the G&T community to receive feedback from the consultation work.

**Question 9:**

Land availability for G&T sites in the Newark area

**Response**

- There was a need to speak to landowners to identify available land.
- Clarification was required for the availability of land at Slaughter House Car Park.

**Question 10:**

Specific reasons for vacant pitches at Tolney Lane

**Response**

- It was confirmed that there were vacant sites at Tolney Lane however it was considered they were unsuitable for current use. (Ropewalk)
- It was thought that some non-travellers were residing on pitches at (Church View)
- Outsiders are not allowed on vacant pitches 'rules and regulations.'

**Question 11:**

Main barriers to members of G&T communities accessing services and how can these barriers be overcome?

**Response**

- A need to be clear with consultation responses and how they are carried forward.

**Question 12:**

What facilities are provided on existing sites and what facilities should new sites have?

**Response****Question 13:**

Bricks and mortar accommodation - G&T's living in houses but wish to live on sites

**Response**

- There are only 4 G&T families recorded as living in houses. There is a lack of available information, possibly because it is optional, however it is thought that there is likely to be more than 50 G&T families in the Newark area living in houses.
- Families want to move back to Tolney Lane however suitable pitches are not available.

**Question 14:**

Bricks and mortar accommodation - G&T's living on sites but wish to live in houses.

**Response**

- Some G&T families now have grown up children and there is a desire for these extended families to return to G&T communities.
- It was considered families go into housing through necessity rather than choice.

**Question 15:**

Any other issues

**Response**

- The current G&T assessment should 'make it more real' if/when a site is delivered.
- Councillors should talk directly to the G&T community.

**Summary/Feedback Session****Bassetlaw**

- According to the previous study the permanent provision had been met however there was a need to identify transit sites.
- There was a lack of available data for G&T's living in houses however there did not appear to be a need within the community.
- Further work needed to be done to determine the requirement for different sites for G&T's from different communities.
- It was considered there was a lack of suitable facilities on the site at Stubbings Lane.

**Ashfield**

- There was availability for 8 pitches on a site with planning permission at Park Lane. Kirkby the site has not as yet been developed.

**Mansfield**

- Mansfield does not have any provision for G&T's.

- There have not been any planning applications for G&T sites within the district it is therefore difficult to determine a need.
- Warsop was identified as the only area where there had been issues with unauthorised sites.
- It was thought information could be provided by the police to identify unauthorised sites.
- There could perhaps be a requirement for a transit site?

### **Newark and Sherwood**

- Strong desire for a Council owned site.
- Consultation fatigue!
- There is a need to identify key sites to come forward.
- The G&T community did not have any issues with being sited next to the settled community.
- There are vacant pitches on Tolney Lane however there are issues with ownership.
- The G&T community would only go into housing through a lack of choice.
- Wider issues with regard to alcohol/drug influences for G&T's living in houses.

### **Any other Comments**

- Councils are at different stages in the process it would therefore be difficult for joint working.
- Minutes, feedback and the Health and Housing documents will be provided to all attendees.
- Next steps - further consultations and meeting will be held however these will be local to each district.
- It is imperative for future pitch provision to be effective by ensuring different G&T communities are accommodated accordingly.