

CABINET
11 September 2014 at 7.00 pm

1.

This page is intentionally left blank

PRESENTATION TO CABINET on behalf of Shoreham Parish Council

1. Shoreham supports the need to have a robust Gypsy and Traveller site development plan in order to prevent unauthorised sites. We are particularly vulnerable in Well Hill (where we still await the result of an appeal) and East Hill. Although it is not the case that SDC lose all the appeals the failure to have a plan is referred to by applicants and inspectors.
2. SPC believes that the removal of the Filston Lane site will in fact make the SDC plan more robust and more likely to be accepted by an Inspector.
3. We welcome the recommendation from the officers, now endorsed unanimously by the Local Planning and Environment Advisory Committee to remove the Filston Lane site and ask the Cabinet to accept that recommendation.
4. That stated there is concern in the village about how the site was originally recommended by officers. It is clear from the amended advice and from our experts report, which I hope you have all read, (by the way Mr Dodd was appointed as an Expert not an Agent) that this site never complied with the necessary criteria. The initial investigation was clearly inadequate. This has led to much 'heartache' as well as financial cost to Shoreham. It has also involved a considerable amount of your officers time to the cost of all SDC council tax payers. We shall like an assurance that these are issues are being addressed to prevent anything similar happening in the future. *
5. Whilst accepting the need for all the information to be summarised we are also disappointed that the recommendation does not address 3 issues in our submission and Experts Report.

6. The first of these relates to the Salford Report and the number of pitches actually needed. This part of our case was reviewed and endorsed by our Expert and should not in our opinion be so readily dismissed by the Council. This particularly case when it is known that the government is reviewing the definition of a traveller.*
7. The second is education. The presence of a primary school was one of the reasons for the initial inclusion of the site. At both public meetings the officers of SDC stated that this was a critical issue. The submissions by the school and KCC make it clear that Shoreham Primary School is too small to provide the necessary education and support to traveller children.
8. The third is the very extensive engineering works which would have been necessary (as endorsed by KCC Highways) which would have been required to access the site, which in itself would have a significant detrimental environmental impact.
9. Our other point that although all the AONB is important, the Shoreham Site was particularly sensitive has been supported.
10. We do appreciate that the council has been prepared to listen to all our concerns. * We look forward to the Cabinet endorsing the recommendation before it.