

GNLP2038: GYPSY AND TRAVELLERS PLANS AND PROPOSALS

INSPECTORS' HEARING ON 25 JULY 2023

MATTER 17 GYPSY AND TRAVELLER ALLOCATIONS AND SUPPLY

ISSUE 1 SITE ALLOCATIONS RELATING TO:

WYMONDHAM STRAYGROUND GNLP5005 AND 5023

Q1: Is the allocation justified and supported by the evidence?

A1: The evidence seems to point in the opposite direction. See A2 below.

Q2: Have any constraints been properly assessed and where necessary is it likely that appropriate mitigation can be achieved?

A2: The constraints to the development of the site are fully set out in 8 points for 5023 and 6 points for 5005. I would add that if Network Rail has not already been consulted this is necessary as further mitigation would be needed to the railway crossing. Otherwise, it is an accident waiting to happen. They will no doubt have views on the crossing being used as a constant access point for the 5023 site. Similar safety measures may apply to the nearby pond.

Issues surrounding mitigation and associated costs: These have been set out in the original responses by the Environment Agency, Anglia Water, Greening Wymondham, Janes Hadfield and me.

Who would pay for:

- **the Contaminated Land Risk Assessment by a competent person and subsequent clean up? Both costs surely would be substantial.**
- **the work associated with freshwater supply and foul water disposal and to ensure the River Bays is not compromised?**
- **the adjustments needed to ensure safety at the junction of Wharton's Lane and the B1172 (also mindful of nearby application 2021/1935 for commercial and residential use). This point sandwiched between the railway line and fire station, is already tight.**
- **the remedial work to ensure safe passage along Wharton's Lane?**
- **the widening of Strayground Lane from Wharton's Lane corner to the site given that G&T homes, like others locally, are surely wider than more conventional caravans? This would then involve costs associated with replacement plantings along this lane.**

Taken together not inconsiderable sums would be needed and it is not clear who would meet them. Or have I missed something here?

Q3. Are the sites available and the number of pitches robust?

A3. On the evidence, yes.

Q4. Are the sites likely to come forward in the timescales envisaged?

A4 On the basis of the willingness of the landowner for 5023 and the vacation of the refuse site for 5005 10 sites should be available within the 5-year period and the remaining 2 thereafter. However, given the considerable amount of mitigation required in Q2 above, to make the sites safe and habitable the timescale is surely tight.

Q5 Are the detailed policy requirements that would apply to the allocation justified and effective?

A5. Yes. Is this site really an appropriate and safe place to live and bring up a young family whether they be from the mainstream or Gypsy and Traveller Community?

If not, the whole area could then be returned to nature and be used as a much-needed leisure resource for the Wymondham community, as eloquently inferenced in the responses of Wymondham Town Council, Wymondham Heritage Society, Janet Stevens, Greening Wymondham and James Hadfield in their original submissions.

Cecilia Riccardi

[REDACTED]

7 July 2023 G&T consultation 4 7723

Original Response

Gypsy and Traveller Consultation for GNLP

GNLP5023 – 10 pitches

This site appears unsuitable for living and raising children given the surrounding level of recent and historic contamination, close proximity to the railway crossing and large pond. Potentially accidents are waiting to happen.

Have the G&T regarding viability, the two local householders and the paving company been consulted? Are Network Rail aware in case further mitigation to ensure the further safety of the crossing is needed?

Surely the site should revert to nature once the LA recycling centre has relocated, and the public byway maintained for leisure purposes. Wymondham is rapidly expanding and such opportunities diminishing.

These comments apply equally to GNLP5005 – 2 pitches

.G&T consultation₃