Hearing Session 16 - 'Gypsy/Travellers' – 22/03/2016

Summary of the points to be referred to in an oral statement by **Councillor R.A.Penrose – Elected Member for Sully and Lavernock Ward** of the Vale of Glamorgan Council, as itemised in Representations No. ID5849/2/1; ID5849/2/2; ASC/01/03 and ASC/01/02.

ID5849(2/1) (2/2) – Hayes Road, Sully (MG5) -Proposed permanent Gypsy/Travellers Site.

- As per attached notes.

ID5849 (ASC01/03) (ASC01/02) Gypsy/Travellers- Alternative Site

- ASD37 deletion of site MG5 Hayes Road, Sully from L.D.P. for reasons previously stated
- Inclusion of site ID909 (ASN92) Land east of Llangan as suitable permanent Gypsy/Travellers' Site.

Objection Points why the Vale of Glamorgan Council should not proceed with their proposal in their L.D.P. of a permanent Gypsy and Travellers' Site at Hayes Road, Sully (MG5).

- The utilisation of what is now "Public Open Space " for the proposed construction of a permanent Gypsy and Travellers' Site, is contrary to the Vale of Glamorgan's policy of "Public Open Space " as mentioned in the deposit LDP 'Open Space Background Paper 2013'.
- The denial of the existing "Public Open Space" to existing users, such as picnickers, campers, residents, tourists, hikers, walkers etc. goes completely against the Vale of Glamorgan Council's policies as stated in the proposed L.D.P. on page 132 (Policy Targets PT12/PT14/PT15) "to safeguard existing community facilities/delivery of infrastructure to meet the needs of the community/promote healthy living".
- The construction of the proposed Gypsy and Travellers' Site immediately adjacent to the "Wales Coastal Footpath" which is contrary to the Vale of Glamorgan Council's deposit L.D.P., where on page 128 (Policy Target PT4) states that the council policy of "protecting and enhancing the built, natural and coastal environment".
- Due to the proposal of a permanent Gypsy and Travellers' Site, the withdrawal of the Vale of Glamorgan Council's previous offer of allotments on this site for use by residents and students of Beechwood College (offered in writing to the Sully and Lavernock Community Council by the Director of Housing and Visible Services). Contrary to Wales Government Allotment Legislation 2008.
- The complications caused by the proposal of the Gypsy and Travellers' Site to the existing users of the slipway, access road and car park (yachts, speedboats, jet ski's, inflatables etc.) including fishermen, tourists, and emergency services. Where the users also need to park tow vehicles and trailers unattended safely at the location. This action goes totally against the council's policy in their deposit L.D.P. where on page 137 (Policy Targets PT26/PT27/PT28) "to enhance, safeguard and promote tourism to the area".

- In previous L.D.P. **analysis** Sully site was not considered as suitable for a permanent travellers' **site,** in their **'Gypsy** and Travellers' Site Assessment (2012).
- No alternative option sites have been given by Vale of Glamorgan Council in this revised version of the deposit L.D.P. whereas the **previous** deposit **L.D.P.(2012)** had alternative consideration, and in fact selected Llangan as the most suitable site for a permanent Gypsy and Travellers' Site.
- The disruptive effect to the students of Beechwood College (Wales' **only** specialised college for Autistism Spectrum Disorder students aged over 16 **years),** which is sited immediately adjacent to the proposed permanent Gypsy and Travellers' Site.
- The effect to the proposed Commercial and Housing Development on Hayes Road (MG9(7)), immediately adjacent to the Travellers' Site, which is totally contrary to the council's policy in their deposit L.D.P.where on page 136 (Policy Targets PT24/PT25) " to assist in the delivery of **major** strategic employment **sites/** the support and delivery of local employment opportunities".
- The effect to the Hayes Point Development by the establishment of a proposed permanent Gypsy and Travellers' site.
- The **safety** concerns of the major chemical **works,** and other business users, who are the **major employers** in this area, who could threaten to relocate their businesses elsewhere as a direct result of this proposal to have a permanent Gypsy and Travellers' Site at Hayes Road, **Sully.**
- The effect to patients and their families at **Ty** Hafan Hospice, where at present **they** my enjoy the tranquillity and seascapes of the coastal footpath, without interruption, to help them come to terms with their individual situations and problems .
- Possible contamination of the old Civic Amenities Recycling Site, making it unsuitable for the proposal of a permanent Gypsy and Travellers' Site.

- **The supporting document report headed "Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Needs" (background paper) dated September 2013 mentions 36 interviewees (namely 7 elected members from the Vale of Glamorgan ,19 officers of the Vale of Glamorgan Council, 7 Officers form Councils in the surrounding areas, and 10 stakeholders). As the elected member for Sully I contacted the Vale of Glamorgan Council requesting the names of all the interviewees, but was informed that this was not available as the interviews were taken anonymously and in complete confidence. I challenge that this document is therefore sound as a supporting document to the LDP, because without these individuals identities it is impossible to quantify if these peoples' statement are accurate or relevant to the subject matter to which they are being asked to give an opinion. The only thing that I do know is that neither I, nor the other elected member for Sully were interviewed, and that no residents or business owners in Sully were interviewed for their opinions. Furthermore in the document the writer, ORS, openly admits that they did not gain access to the illegal travellers' site at Hayes Road, Sully, and therefore are not able to verify the exact numbers of travellers' households that were resident at the site, which again questions the soundness of this document. I consider this document should be withdrawn as a supporting document to the LDP because it is unsound for the reasons stated.**