

**TO EACH MEMBER OF THE
COUNCIL**

28 January 2020

Dear Councillor

COUNCIL MEETING – 28 JANUARY 2020

Further to the Agenda and papers for the above meeting, please find attached Member questions submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.

The questions and answers will be taken as read without discussion but the questioners will be allowed to ask a supplementary question arising directly from the questions or from the replies.

Should you have any queries with regard to the above, please contact Democratic Services on 01684 272021.

Yours faithfully

**Lin O'Brien
Head of Democratic Services**

1.

Member questions submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13

The following questions have been received from Councillor Mary Jordan to the Lead Member for Built Environment. The answers are given by the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Mel Gore, but are taken as read without discussion.

Question 1:

Following a protracted dispute between a traveller family and Gloucestershire County Council/Tewkesbury Borough Council, have Gloucestershire County Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council agreed on a strategy to solve this problem?

Answer 1:

The individual circumstances of this case are complex and have involved both Tewkesbury Borough Council and Gloucestershire County Council and a number of Parish Councils in the Borough who have been required to use their powers. Discussions have involved both planning and housing advice service to seek suitable alternative solutions. The County Council is also doing what it can to ensure that a place can be found for the family.

Question 2:

This issue, although complex, highlights the fact that the site allocation for travellers does not seem to be fit for purpose. What does Tewkesbury Borough Council propose doing to address this need?

Answer 2:

The adopted Joint Core Strategy sets out the established needs for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the Borough between 2016 and 2031. With planning permissions already granted since 2016 and the site allocations proposed in the emerging Tewkesbury Borough Plan the full Joint Core Strategy needs for those who meet the government's definition of a traveller will have been satisfied, as required by the national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Nevertheless, demand for additional pitches from individuals/families may occur in the plan period, outside of the identified need in the Joint Core Strategy. However, the Joint Core Strategy provides a criteria-based policy under which additional sites may be considered, through the planning application process, providing they are in accordance with the plan's policies.

It is recognised that, county-wide, there is likely to be an additional need for separate public/affordable pitch provision, and how any public provision would be delivered and maintained. This issue is being explored jointly with the six Gloucestershire local authorities and the County Council and the need for any sites will be considered through the ongoing review of the Joint Core Strategy.

The following questions have been received from Councillor Paul Ockelton to the Lead Member for Built Environment. The answers are given by the Lead Member for Built Environment, Councillor Mel Gore, but are taken as read without discussion.

Question 1:

Would the Lead Member for Built Environment please confirm the current January 2020 housing land supply for the authority and confirm the housing trajectory for the next two years?

Answer 1:

The five year housing land supply for the Borough is 4.33 years (for the period) 2019/20 to 2023/24). This is as set out in the latest Housing Land Supply Position Statement (August 2019).

This position statement also provides the housing trajectory for the next five years. This only includes those sites granted planning permission as of 1 April 2019 and does not include the emerging Borough Plan sites.

The five year supply position will be recalculated following completion of the housing monitoring for 2019/20 which will start from 1 April 2020.

Question 2:

What is our Plan B if the Borough Local Plan Examination Inspector asks us to find more sites for housing?

Answer 2:

If an Inspector considered that there was a need to allocate further housing sites then it is likely that the examination would be suspended and the Council would be requested to consider what sites might be suitable and available for allocation.

To do this we may draw on sites that have been submitted through the last consultation period as being available for allocation. We may also refer to the sites that have been submitted to our Assessment of Land Availability.

Question 3:

Why was the A38/A40 Link Road, not pursued at the Innsworth appeal?

Answer 3:

No link road was proposed by the Appellant for the Innsworth scheme. Highways England and Gloucestershire County Council as the respective highway authorities assessed the proposals at application and appeal stage and at no point indicated that such a link road would be necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development.

Question 4:

As the Joint Core Strategy is an equal partnership, how has Gloucester City managed to come up with brownfield sites for almost 1,000 houses as part of the recently published Gloucester City Plan. Can the Leader of the Council, Lead Member for Built Environment or Chief Executive provide assurances that further strategic scale development WILL NOT be sought at Twigworth, Innsworth, Longford, Churchdown, Brockworth or Down Hatherley in terms of the duty to co-operate with Gloucester City Council who clearly have more than adequate brownfield sites?

Answer 4:

The Adopted Joint Core Strategy already makes allowance for Gloucester allocating housing sites within its City Plan. Therefore, the sites within the recent City Plan consultation are already accounted for in within the Joint Core Strategy supply and are not additional homes. It was not the role of the Joint Core Strategy to allocate smaller, non-strategic sites within the city and was always intended for the City Plan.

In the Joint Core Strategy, Gloucester's supply consisted of sites already built since 2011, those that already had planning permission, an allowance for small-scale windfall sites and capacity for sites to be brought forward in the City Plan. Even with these sources of supply, Gloucester could still not meet its needs and therefore strategic allocations on the edge of city, within Tewkesbury Borough, were required.

The Joint Core Strategy Review will need to consider again the needs of Gloucester beyond the current plan period (to 2031). In developing the plan, all reasonable alternatives have to be considered to determine the most sustainable approach to meet these needs. At this early stage of plan making we are not in a position to state where this future development will be located or indeed rule out any particular areas.