



Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD

MATTER 14 – Core Policies 4 and 5

**Statement on behalf of Newark and
Sherwood District Council**

January 2018

Question 14: Are Core Policies 4 and 5 a reasonable approach to the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and travelling Showpeople?**Overview on Provision**

- 14.01 The Nottinghamshire Local Planning Authorities have worked together to develop a joint methodology for the production of the Gypsy & Traveller Needs Assessment (GTAA) (GT/01). This process is documented in detail in the Duty to Cooperate Statement (CS/15). The methodology went through a number of stages of production, including a stakeholder workshop and formal consultation exercises involving community representatives, prior to its application. Notably no objections were raised to the methodology, although some technical improvements to the calculations were suggested. These amendments were accepted and the methodology applied to generate the GTAA in its various iterations.
- 14.02 The GTAA has been routinely used in the determination of planning applications and at appeal, most recently the appeal for the refusal of a single pitch at Land east of Beck Lane, Blidworth (APP/B3030/W/17/3168135, decision appended in Appendix A). Significantly the view reached by the Inspector here was that there was nothing unreasonable in the methodology, nor assumptions used within the GTAA.

Core Policy 4

- 14.03 The submitted GTAA (GT/01) and resulting pitch requirements within Core Policy 4, are considered to represent a sound and objective assessment of need, meeting the requirements of Policies A and B in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPfTS). This evidence has been used to plan positively, with Core Policy 4 (and 5) providing a sound and sustainable framework for the management of future development and basis for the calculation of a five land supply. As already outlined the approach has been founded on early and effective engagement with the settled and traveller communities. Following this ongoing cooperation with travellers, their representative bodies and other stakeholders has occurred both as part of the preparation of the GTAA and plan-making process.
- 14.04 Significant effort has been expended in the pursuit of primary data to support the generation of future pitch requirements, with substantial returns being gained from the west of the District and data from the bi-annual caravan counts being utilised. However where it has not been possible to obtain primary data then the assumptions made have been well-reasoned and drawn on robust sources of secondary data such as the previous GTAA, the census and Council housing records. It is considered that the combination of primary data and reasoned assumptions represents the proportionate evidence base envisaged within the tests of soundness.

- 14.05 Whilst still the subject of an unresolved legal challenge, the definitional change to travellers within the PPfTS has been positively addressed, with the latest GTAA having been revised to take account of this. Since the change in definition, GTAA's nation-wide have shown significant reductions in pitch needs for PPfTS defined Travellers. However the reduction in pitch needs in the Newark and Sherwood area has been only moderate and reflects a more reasonable approach.
- 14.06 The Council has re-visited the data and established that housing records and the 2011 census gave a good indication of the numbers and locations of Gypsies and Travellers who lived in 'bricks and mortar'. This showed the main population to reside in Devon Ward, Newark where there is a large concentration of Council housing (focussed in Hawtonville). Council housing records are a valuable source of information over the housing preferences of gypsies and travellers in bricks and mortar. Importantly no formal expressions have been made from settled gypsy and travellers stating a preference to be relocated to a gypsy and traveller site, either through previous consultations or to the Council's housing services. Accordingly it would be reasonable to assume that those gypsy and travellers within bricks and mortar accommodation have, for planning purposes, ceased to travel. Notwithstanding this, an allowance (33% of households) is still made for those in bricks and mortar who wish to be on sites to address any unidentified need.
- 14.07 For the purposes of the calculation, all occupants on pitches within Newark and Sherwood have been included as travellers for the purposes of the definition. Whilst this is likely to result in an over-estimate it is nonetheless considered the most reasonable approach. Such pitches are clearly suitable and capable of future accommodation by residents who would meet the PPfTS definition, and there is assumed to be some fluidity in the status of those occupying pitches. Aside from issues of practicality, to remove such pitches from the calculation of need would have a deflationary effect on requirements, and not lead to their increase due to them no longer contributing towards future household formation.
- 14.08 It is recognised that on a rolling five year basis the Authority is presently unable to demonstrate a five year land supply (1.81 pitches as at 11th July 2017), and that under this measure there is an unmet requirement for 14 pitches between 2017 – 2022. However the Council possesses a good track record in meeting its requirements, with those from the previous GTAA having been exceeded (93 pitches provided against a need of 84). Given the overall level of development required it is considered that the approach provided by Core Policy 4, including the proactive action being taken by the Council, and the facilitative nature of Core Policy 5 will address the current deficit of supply effectively delivering the pitches required and ensuring that a sufficient land supply is maintained over the plan period.

- 14.09 The Council would acknowledge that it has experienced some difficulty in its efforts to identify a suitable site and/or sites to deliver pitch requirements through the Development Plan. Most recently through the proposed Quibell's Lane allocation becoming 'undeliverable', a late change in circumstance which led to the uncoupling of the Plan Review (detailed in the Uncoupling Briefing Note (CS/16)). Reflecting the importance with which the Council views its responsibilities in positively planning for this section of the population, Full Council resolved on 11th July 2017 (minute appended at Appendix B) that the "Council take all necessary steps to secure appropriate provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites to meet anticipated need". This has been reflected in Core Policy 4, as amended, which outlines a proactive approach whereby the commitment to meet the pitch requirements of the most up-to-date GTAA through all necessary means is made. This includes, amongst other methods, the allocation and purchase of land by the Council for the delivery of new sites.
- 14.10 In this respect the Council can confirm that it is actively engaged in securing a site and/or sites in or around the Newark Urban Area, with a land agent having been appointed to undertake a site search towards the end of 2017. This has produced some initial results with sites currently being assessed for their suitability. A further call for sites will also be carried out to ensure all potential options are considered. Notably, the Council has recently been made aware of a site being promoted for gypsy and traveller use within the Newark Urban Area. The intention is that the necessary allocation(s) will be made through the amended Allocations & Development Management DPD. Significantly if the option pursued is one which the Council controls then it anticipates being in the position to secure land and grant planning permission in advance of the formal allocation process. It is considered that this approach provides a sound and appropriate planning framework to deliver the required pitches and to ensure sufficient land supply over the plan period.
- 14.11 The 15 year period (2013-2028) covered by the GTAA represents a reasonable timescale (as per paragraph 4 of the PPfTS). Nevertheless given that this period will expire before the end of the wider plan period (2033) there will be the need for a new assessment to be prepared prior to 2028. Core Policy 4 has been positively worded to ensure that no potential vacuum in planning policy will occur. This requires the Council to address future pitch requirements consistent with the most up-to-date GTAA, and so provides for a seamless transition between two GTAA periods within the same wider plan period.
- 14.12 Two 'clarifying minor amendments' have been proposed to Core Policy 4. In order to take account of recent permissions and to ensure the supply position is correct at the time of examination the Council has proposed a minor amendment (**CMA/0008**) to paragraph 5.15. This would result in the paragraph reading:

‘Through the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (June 2016) (GTAA) a need for 40 pitches has been identified between 2013 – 2028. As a result of permissions having been granted since 2013, 28 additional pitches need to be provided over the rest of the GTAA period.’

- 14.13 The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (NFGLG) [Representor 051] submitted representations stating that the pitch requirements within Core Policy 4 should be referred to as ‘minimum requirements’. This is accepted by the Council and proposed to be addressed through the making of a further minor amendment (CMA/0019) with the third paragraph of Core Policy 4 being amended to read:

‘The Council will secure 40 pitches to meet the identified minimum need over the period of the current GTAA as follows;’

- 14.14 Representations have been received from the Campaign to Protect Rural England [representor 008], Southwell Town Council [representor 036] and Peter Harris [representor 042] arguing that the geographic approach to future pitch provision should be restricted to locations within, or around the Newark Urban Area, and that in the case of representors [036] and [042] there should be a strong presumption against small unrelated sites distributed across the District. The policy approach places an emphasis on the Newark Urban Area as the location for meeting gypsy and traveller accommodation needs over the plan period, and the balance of recent permissions is recognised within the policy and supporting text. It is considered appropriate, and consistent with how other forms of new development have been planned for, to broaden this out in line with the spatial strategy in those circumstances where needs cannot be met within or around the Newark Urban Area. Doing so would continue to support a sustainable pattern of development, and along with the safeguards contained in Core Policy 5 ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially, and environmentally in accordance with the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

- 14.15 The Environment Agency [representor 031] whilst objecting to the proposed approach to future pitch provision at Tolney Lane, Newark nevertheless recognise that the Council has sites benefitting from historic permissions and that there may be circumstances where it is minded to approve extensions. Importantly the approach to Tolney Lane has been guided by a significant appeal decision. Whereby the granting of temporary consent to cater for the appellants immediate accommodation needs whilst more suitable provision was secured elsewhere was deemed acceptable. The amended policy reflects this approach by placing an emphasis on consents of a temporary nature. The wider context provided is one where the Council will, through all necessary means, address gypsy and traveller accommodation needs through the identification of a suitable site(s) which following

Core Policy 5 will be at lesser flood risk than Tolney Lane and so lessen the pressure to positively respond to proposals for temporary consent in that location.

Core Policy 5

- 14.16 Core Policy 5 has been updated to ensure that it is consistent with the requirements of the PPfTS, and where appropriate comments received through consultation have been factored into the amended policy. The view of the Council is that in its amended form the policy is sound and conforms to national planning policy.
- 14.17 Representations from the NFGLG [representor 051] and the CPRE [representor 008] concerning various criteria in Core Policy 5 are noted, however, the District Council does not believe it necessary to make additional modifications. The Regulation 22 Statement (CS/08) sets out the Councils reasoning.



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 3 October 2017

Site visit made on 3 October 2017

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/17/3168135

Land east of Beck Lane, Blidworth, Nottinghamshire NG21 0QA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Patrick Ward against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01775/FUL, dated 21 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the change of use of land to 1 traveller pitch comprising 1 mobile home, 1 touring caravan, 1 mobile utility unit and hardstanding.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The appellant had undertaken some works to the site and had occupied it for a period of time. However, this period of residency has now ceased and much of the work undertaken has been removed from the site. However, the Council indicates that a hedgerow was removed and is now replaced with post and wire fencing.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are;
 - The effects of the proposal on the Green Belt
 - The suitability of the access to the site and highway safety
 - Whether the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by any other matters

Reasons

The effects of the proposal on the Green Belt

4. The appellant and the Council agree that the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt, by definition. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) identifies that openness is one of the essential characteristics of the Green Belt. The proposal would involve the siting of a mobile home, 1 touring caravan and a further utility caravan and

additional hard-surfacing within the site. Based on the size of the site and the submitted drawings, I consider that the proposal along with the parking of vehicles on the site, would have a harmful effect on the openness of the area. The harm by reason of inappropriateness and by reason of the erosion of openness carries substantial weight in the determination of this appeal.

5. The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) recognises that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be permitted except where very special circumstances are established. It adds that, "subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances."

The suitability of the access to the site and highway safety

6. The appeal site is a roughly rectangular parcel of land sitting to the east of Beck Lane to the south of the settlement of Blidworth. At this point Beck Lane is a single track which is unsurfaced, is a highway and designated as a 'byway open to all traffic'. The Council states that although it is capable of use by vehicles, it is only maintained to a standard suitable for pedestrians and horse-riders. I observed at my site visit that it is narrow, bounded by vegetation and provides a rough surface. Discussions at the Hearing suggested that parts of the lane are prone to water-logging which results in deep water/mud. It was also stated that it is well used by walkers and horse-riders, some no doubt from the stables that I observed at my visit.
7. The appellant considers that the proposal would give rise to only a very limited number of vehicle movements. He adds that the resultant effects would be minor and not sufficient to warrant dismissing the appeal on this basis.
8. Core Policy 5 of the Council's Core Strategy states, amongst other things, that such sites should have safe and convenient access to the highway network. I accept that the proposal is for a single pitch with the likelihood that there would only be a maximum of 3 vehicles at the site. However, balanced against this I observed that there are few (if any) places along the lane where vehicles could pass each other. In addition, whilst walkers may be able to step onto part of the embankment or verge (if it exists) the prospect of conflict with horses would not be so readily resolved. In my judgement this could pose a safety risk for the horses and riders. I accept that the limited size of the site would mean that such instances may not be a regular occurrence, but I remain concerned that safety along the lane would be prejudiced as a direct result of the proposal.
9. The County Council are also concerned that the more regular use of the lane by vehicles would damage its surface. It is not certain how the passage of more vehicles would affect the existing un-bound surface and discussions at the Hearing in relation to a requirement for the appellant to become responsible for repairing any damage were not conclusive. In my judgement, any additional wear and tear on the lane would be unlikely to significantly damage its surface. However, I remain concerned that safety would be prejudiced and the proposal would be contrary to Core Policy 5 in this respect.

Other matters

Suitability of the site in planning terms

10. The appellant makes specific reference to the criteria within Core Policy 5 and seeks to demonstrate that these criteria are satisfied or not relevant and so concludes that the site is acceptable in planning terms. Although some doubt must be raised over the ability to provide essential services including mains water/electricity/drainage, it must be born in mind that the development plan and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework should be taken as a whole and individual policies should not necessarily be taken in isolation. In this context, I refer to my previous conclusions (largely agreed by the appellant) that the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is harmful and so it is not possible to confine consideration to Core Policy 5 alone. I conclude that it would not be a suitable site in planning terms.

The sustainability of the site

11. The appellant makes reference to paragraph 13 of the PPTS which sets out criteria for relevant policies for local planning authorities and assesses the appeal site against these. Although it is intended as part of a framework for policy making, the appeal proposal does not offend any of these criteria. However, in my mind it is relevant that this is just one paragraph within a wider section of the PPTS which opens with the statement that policies should be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, amongst other things.
12. The Framework sets out the economic social and environmental aspects of sustainable development. I acknowledge that the proposal would offer some benefit in terms of providing a site for the appellant's family in a location which is relatively close to services, it cannot be ignored that it would cause substantial harm by reason of its Green Belt location and when taken together, I conclude that it would not amount to a sustainable form of development.

Untidy Site

13. The site had previously been the subject of fly-tipping and the Council served a Notice under Section 215 of the Act in July 2016. The appellant indicates that their involvement with the site has resulted in a much improved appearance and this would continue if the appeal scheme is implemented. I acknowledge that paragraph 26 of the PPTS states that Council's should attach weight to certain matters in determining applications, including the effective use of previously developed, untidy or derelict land. It appears that the S215 Notice had been complied with and it seems to me that it represents a remedy for the previous state of the site which would not rely on its development for the appeal scheme (which in itself would have a harmful effect on it). Therefore, I attach no weight to this point.

The need for gypsy and traveller sites and lack of 5 year supply

14. The Council accepts that there is an existing unmet need for gypsy and traveller sites within the District. It accepts that it cannot demonstrate a 5 years supply of sites for gypsy and traveller pitches and there is a need for at least 12 pitches in the District up to the year 2021. However, they also point out that during the years 2007-2012 the provision of 93 pitches exceeded the East Midlands Regional Plan requirement of 84 pitches.

15. The Council has published its Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2013-2028 (GTAA), which was amended in 2016 to take account of the revised definition of gypsy and travellers contained in the PPTS. This sets out the need for pitches for the following time periods, as follows: 2013-2018, 13.8 pitches; 2019-2022, 14.3 pitches; 2023-2028, 10.9 pitches. Since 2013 permission has been given for 12 permanent and 21 temporary pitches and whilst this falls marginally short of the figure for 2013-2018, the time period has not yet expired. The appellant is critical of the GTAA and suggests that it cannot be relied on, but from my perspective, it represents the only assessment that is submitted and I find nothing unreasonable in the methodology nor the assumptions used.
16. I acknowledge that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 years supply of such sites. My attention has been drawn to an appeal decision in the district made in November 2016 (Ref; APP/B3030/W/16/3152355) wherein permission for 8 pitches was granted (on a non-Green Belt site). That inspector concluded that the agreed shortfall of at least 20 pitches led her to conclude that there was a "significant and urgent need" for pitches and she attributed significant weight to this. In my view and in relation to the evidence and different figures now presented, I do not find that the need can now be identified as so significant. In addition, paragraph 27 of the PPTS states that a lack of a 5 year supply of sites should be a significant material consideration but, importantly for this appeal, it adds that the exception to this is where sites are in the Green Belt. In this case therefore, this leads me to conclude that the lack of a 5 year supply is not a significant material consideration for this decision and so I attach little weight to it.

Lack of alternative sites and likelihood of Green Belt development

17. The appellant is of the opinion that the lack of alternative sites for gypsies and travellers means that when new sites are identified, there is a strong likelihood that they will be in the Green Belt. The inference is that the Green Belt will need to accommodate such development and so the harm that this proposal would give rise to would not be unusual.
18. However, the Council offered an estimate at the Hearing that only around 10%-12% of the District is covered by the Green Belt designation. Furthermore, it is clear from national planning policy that such development is not appropriate in the Green Belt. In these circumstances, I find little merit in this argument.

Personal Circumstances

19. The appellant has submitted documents which detail the individual family members who would be resident at the site, including children. The appellant currently lives in his caravans at a location nearby, on the road-side. The submitted documents indicate that the appellant has been the subject of several evictions from unauthorised sites. He has resorted to buying a 'bricks and mortar' home but has found this intolerable. For the sake of his and his family's health, stability and education, he wishes to provide a permanent base. In relation to the impact that dismissing the appeal would have on the appellant, it would deprive him and his family of the immediate prospect of a stable base. In relation to education, I am informed that the lack of a stable base has meant that the children have had no schooling in recent years, and I accept that this would be likely to continue. In relation to health, I am told

that the appellant's family has access to GP services and are still registered with a GP practice, although it is inconvenient to travel from temporary unauthorised pitches to the surgery. In relation to this point, I do not consider that the lack of a permanent base has had a significant impact on access to medical services, although the appellant states that the general stress of constant moves has an effect on health and I have taken account of this. Documents which provide full details in relation to these matters have been supplied to me. I do not seek to set these matters out in full detail within this decision but confirm that I have taken these matters, which also include: the fact that the children have been unable to attend school for some substantial time; the health needs of various members of the family; and the overall doubt and insecurity that constant moves brings about, into account as material considerations in determining this appeal.

20. Notwithstanding my acknowledgement of these matters, I have to take account of the advice in the PPTS, which I have set out above, which states that "... personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt...". Whilst it is clear that this does not rule out the possibility of such circumstances, or a combination of circumstances, outweighing Green Belt harm, it indicates a strict test. Whilst I have taken full account of the circumstances as they have been put to me, I only afford them limited weight in this context.

Human Rights

21. The appellant makes reference to Article 8 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights (respect for private and family life, home and correspondence). Although the appellant does not reside at the appeal site, it is clear to me that dismissing the appeal would rule out his option to do so. Thus, although this would not actually deprive him of his current home, I consider that there would be some interference with matters relevant to Article 8. I have concluded that there would be clear and significant harm arising from the development in relation to the Green Belt, contrary to the development plan and national planning policy, which warrants interference with the appellant's rights in this respect. Taking account of the likely effects on the appellants and the significant planning harm that I have identified, I consider that the interference with the appellants' rights is proportionate in order to protect the local environment.

PSED

22. The appellant and his family are Irish Travellers which constitutes a protected characteristic (race) and the Public Sector Equality Duty applies. This concerns the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. The appellant has set out the disadvantages faced by gypsies and travellers and I have borne these in mind throughout considering this appeal. Taking account of the harm to the public interest, in relation to the Green Belt, I am satisfied that a legitimate aim is being pursued. Dismissing the appeal would deprive the extended family of the opportunity to live at the appeal site, which does not form their current home and this would be a negative impact. Set against this is the significant harm that would arise from allowing the appeal in

relation to the Green Belt. It does not follow from the PSED that the appeal should succeed.

Best interests of children

23. The best interests of the children are a primary consideration in this appeal. The appellant sets out in his submissions that the lack of a stable base has a number of effects on the children within the family. These problems relate to: lack of access to education; problems gaining access to health services; developing and maintaining friendships; social isolation; safety; and trauma of constant moves. Having considered these matters, I shall return to them in my overall conclusion

Conclusions

24. There is an acknowledged need for and lack of provision for gypsy and traveller sites within the District and the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 years supply of deliverable sites. Set against this, the Council exceeded its previous requirement up to 2012, it has very nearly met the requirement set out in the GTAA for the time period up to 2018 and I am told that work is ongoing to seek the allocation of sites. Paragraph 27 of the PPTS states that the lack of a 5 year supply of deliverable sites will be a significant material consideration, except in the Green Belt. Furthermore, I have concluded that there is no overwhelming likelihood that additional sites would be located within the Green Belt.

25. I have attributed significant weight to the harm that would arise on the Green Belt. I have also identified some harm arising from the inappropriate access to the site. I have acknowledged that the appellant and his family have particular circumstances which have some bearing on this appeal. The PPTS states at paragraph 16 that such development, either permanent or temporary, are inappropriate in the Green Belt and tells us that, subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh Green Belt harm. Turning to the interests of the children, having taken these into account, I do not consider that they would be prejudiced sufficiently to outweigh the Green Belt harm. Even when all matters in favour of the appeal are taken in combination, I find that they are insufficient to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

26. I have given consideration to a temporary permission for the suggested 3 years. However, in my judgement the unacceptable effects of the proposal in relation to the Green Belt and in relation to the access, should not be endured for even this temporary period and would have unacceptable effects that are similarly not outweighed by other matters, including the best interests of the children.

27. As a consequence of my conclusions, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

S Ruston
Mr and Mrs P Ward

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

P Jobson
R Marshall
M Tubb
C Walker
D Albans (Notts County Council)

INTERESTED PERSONS:

G Johnson
K Young

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING:

1. Additional bundle of documents relating to evictions
2. Signed Statement of Common Ground
3. Additional suggested condition relating to tree protection
4. Revised Core Policy 4
5. Photographs of Beck Lane

FULL COUNCIL MINUTE 11 JULY 2017 (Extract)**Page 5 Extraordinary Council Meeting Agenda 26 September 2017****24. NEWARK & SHERWOOD LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – PLAN REVIEW – PUBLICATION DOCUMENT**

The Council considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive which presented the findings of the public consultation exercises undertaken regarding the Plan Review – Preferred Approach consultations.

The Council adopted its Core Strategy Development Plan Document in March 2011 and its Allocations & Development Management DPD in July 2013. The Council commenced a review of these documents to ensure that the policies of the Core Strategy should be regarded as up-to-date and in line with the National Planning Policy Framework and that the allocations contained within the Allocations & Development Management DPD remained appropriate and deliverable.

The report provided information as to the consultations undertaken and the responses received. Detail was also provided as to the preferred approach for strategy consultation; sites and settlements; and town centre and retail consultation. Paragraph 4.0 of the report detailed the preparation of the draft development plan documents and highlighted the issues facing the Council in relation to the provision of additional gypsy and traveller pitches and the proposal to uncouple the Core Strategy and Allocations & Development Management elements of the Plan Review. Appendix E to the report set out the finalised proposals that would make up the Publication Amended Core Strategy DPD.

AGREED (unanimously) that:

- (a) the report be noted;
- (b) the proposals contained within Appendix E and Proposals Map for Edwinstowe form the basis of the Publication Amended Core Strategy DPD;
- (c) the document be published for a period of public representation week commencing 17 July 2017;
- (d) the Council take all necessary steps to secure appropriate provision of Gypsy & Travellers sites to meet anticipated need;
- (e) an amendment of the Local Development Scheme to reflect the proposed timetable in Appendix F be approved; and
- (f) the amended Local Development Scheme come into force on 12 July 2017.