

| Rep No | Consultee Name | Consultee Organisation | Agent Name | Agent Organisation | Document(s) commented on | Proposed Modifications | Comment Summary | TWBC Response | Hearing Session Participation (and reason for participation) |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|
| NEBD15-9, 15-10 | Louise Goldsmith | Capel Parish Council | | | PS_093, PS_094 | | <p>Legally compliant and soundness not stated</p> <p>Capel Parish Council supports the comments made by Save Capel in its representation to this consultation.</p> <p><i>[TWBC: see NEBD20-1 for the Save Capel's representation]</i></p> | This is noted. | Not stated. |
| NEBD20-1 | | Save Capel | | | PS_094 | | <p>Unsound, legal compliance not stated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Save Capel (SC) understands that Table 8 of PS_094 his relates to the only allocation (comprising 3x pitches) in the Plan, which is located in East Capel. SC refers to our Stage 3 Matter 9 hearing statement with regard to the suitability and availability of this site.It is also evident that the 10-year supply (post-adoption) using the PPTS definition has only a 1-2 surplus of pitches, therefore relying on the delivery of the site in the South-West parcel (B) of strategic sites policy STR/SS 1.In a similar situation to housing supply, the strategy for the provision of a 10-year supply is therefore questionable. Using the Ethnic Need definition the Plan fails to demonstrate a 10-year supply which is at the heart of the revised Plan. <p><i>[TWBC: see further comment on the immediate partial review at NEBD20-11 in Table 10 – representation summary table on the Revised Policy Wording for Policy STR 1]</i></p> | <p>Regarding the ethnic need definition, while the GTAA recommends adopting the ethnic definition, the GTAA accepts that the Local Planning Authority may adopt the PPTS 2023 definition (with the balance of ethnic need being an additional need that the Council may choose to meet), i.e., the remaining ethnic need could be subject to a criteria-based windfall policy (which, of course, would be subject to all other relevant material considerations). Thus, it is noted that adopting the ethnic need is not mandatory, and the GTAA accepts that it is for Local Planning Authorities to decide individually which approach to take for planning purposes (but to be kept under review in light of evolving appeal decisions and case law). Given that the emerging Local Plan (2020-2038) proposes to include a criteria based windfall policy (that will also apply to proposed allocations), it considers that adopting the PPTS definition for Plan-making purposes (i.e., seeking to meet the PPTS definition through existing supply and proposed allocations) is most appropriate, but that any further (windfall) applications will be assessed in light of the balance of ethnic need.</p> <p>Thus, any proposed windfall sites, for which there have been a high number in recent years, will be considered on their own merits and in accordance with the proposed Policy. The Council therefore remains confident that, through existing supply, proposed</p> | Yes, I wish to participate at the examination hearing session - SC intends to continue to participate fully in any remaining stages of the Local Plan's review and will seek to make formal representations in any future hearings during which the issues raised in this representation are discussed. |

| Rep No | Consultee Name | Consultee Organisation | Agent Name | Agent Organisation | Document(s) commented on | Proposed Modifications | Comment Summary | TWBC Response | Hearing Session Participation (and reason for participation) |
|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | allocations, and windfall development, a 10-year supply post-adoption will be ensured. The Council will in any case review the proposed strategy as part of the early review of the Plan post-adoption. | |
| NEBD21-3 | Mrs Nichola Watters | Wealden District Council | | | PS_093, PS_094 | None <i>[TWBC: see the next column – Comment Summary]</i> | <p>Legally compliant and sound <i>[TWBC: applied for the overall STR 1 – Development Strategy (PS_109) as specified in the representation form.</i></p> <p><i>Comments related to PS_093 and PS_094 are then listed here for clarity.]</i></p> <p><u>Comments with regard to Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment (PS_093 and PS_094) as part of the Policy STR 1</u></p> <p>The Council notes the addition of Part (1) to Policy STR 1, which mandates an early review aimed at securing sustainable development to meet the Council’s unmet housing needs, including those for Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Show People, up to 2038. This is particularly relevant given the Council’s previous stance that both authorities plan to meet their own economic, retail, and gypsy and traveller accommodation needs through their respective Local Plans.</p> <p>There has been no specific request from TWBC to WDC to address unmet needs for Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople. Although TWBC requested WDC to meet their unmet housing needs in late 2020, WDC is currently unable to consider any such request due to the need for further work on their own evidence base and assessment of their ability to meet their own needs.</p> <p>The GTAA from June 2024 identifies a need for up to 29 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers in the Borough, based on the definition of need used in the Plan. This need extends beyond the plan period (2024-2039). The 5 Year Gypsy and Traveller Supply Statement 2024 shows</p> | This is noted. TWBC will continue to liaise with WDC through the Duty to Cooperate over cross-boundary strategic matters, including the provision of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. | No, I do not wish to participate at the examination hearing session. |

Public Consultation on Tunbridge Wells Borough Council’s Local Plan: New Evidence Base Documents – summary and response table for comments on Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople documents (PS_093 – PS_094)

| Rep No | Consultee Name | Consultee Organisation | Agent Name | Agent Organisation | Document(s) commented on | Proposed Modifications | Comment Summary | TWBC Response | Hearing Session Participation (and reason for participation) |
|----------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | an anticipated unmet need by the end of the Plan period, ranging from a shortfall of 14 pitches to just one pitch, depending on the definition and assessment period used. This also depends on the Inspector’s consideration of Local Plan Policy H9 and the proposed sites/pitches in the Submission Local Plan. The Council welcomes this early review to address development needs, including those for Gypsies, Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople, as stated in the Gypsy and Traveller Supply Statement 2024. | | |
| NEBD23-2 | Mr Bartholomew Wren | Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council | | | PS_093 PS_094 | In taking a pragmatic approach, we don’t consider that any significant modifications are required to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound with regard to meeting Gypsy and Traveller pitch needs. The supporting text at paragraphs 6.387 – 6.396 and tables 10 and 11 in the submission Local Plan should be updated to reflect the updated evidence published. Related criteria-based policy H9 is appropriate as drafted. | Legally compliant and sound We acknowledge that TWBC has to undertake an early review of the Local Plan post adoption and has indicated that it will seek additional sites and/or additional capacity at existing sites in order to ensure that the full needs of Gypsies and Travellers are met. Given this, TMBC is satisfied that TWBC can meet identified its Gypsy and Traveller needs in the 10-year period following adoption of the Local Plan, and expects TWBC to have a subsequent Local Plan in place within that period, which may, if required, include further site allocations. Given landscape and other constraints it can, in our experience, be challenging to identify suitable Gypsy and Traveller sites. We recommend that TWBC undertake a targeted call for sites and work proactively with landowners in seeking to fully meet future needs | This is noted. TWBC does not consider that the Submission Local Plan supporting text at paras 6.387 - 6.396 and tables 10 and 11 require amendment in this instance. This is because the Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs planned for in the Submission Local Plan is based on the earlier GTAA (dated 2018). The new, updated GTAA would directly inform provision as part of the Local Plan Review. Should however, the Inspector feel that this supporting text and tables do require Main Modifications, the Council would be happy to draft suggested Main Modifications, to be consulted upon through the Main Modifications process. | No, I do not wish to participate at the examination hearing session. |
| NEBD39-1 | Stephanie Holt-Castle | Kent County Council (KCC) | | | PS_093 | | Legal compliance and soundness not stated The County Council seeks clarification on whether permanent, allocated Gypsy and Traveller sites will be required to contribute to county infrastructure such as education, social care, libraries, and waste services through S106 planning obligations. | In a similar way to other types of residential development where applicable, Gypsy and Traveller sites will be required to contribute to county infrastructure. | Not stated. |
| NEBD42-1 | Carol Williams | Paddock Wood Town Council | Troy Hayes | Troy Planning + Design | PS_093, PS_094 | | Legally non-compliant and unsound PS_093 Tunbridge Wells Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople | The Previous GTAA was prepared by RRR consultancy in 2018 – it had covered the period from 1 April 2017 – 31 March 2037. The revised GTAA | Yes, I wish to participate at the examination hearing session - The Town |

| Rep No | Consultee Name | Consultee Organisation | Agent Name | Agent Organisation | Document(s) commented on | Proposed Modifications | Comment Summary | TWBC Response | Hearing Session Participation (and reason for participation) |
|------------------|----------------|------------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>Accommodation Needs Assessment 2024-2039 Final Report (June 2024)(V2) Unclear what is meant in para ES18, that figures in table ES.1 include need from previous GTAA's yet remain unfilled. Which GTAA's are being referred to as nothing in study to explain this.</p> <p>Para 4.12 states new sites should avoid areas prone to flooding and also that they are located close to the families whose needs are being addressed. Why are TWBC proposing pitches at Paddock Wood as indicative area identified in the masterplan can flood from surface water run-off. What evidence is there the proposed sites in Paddock Wood are located close to the families whose need they are meant to address. Town Council have examples that suggest need for pitches is not fully evidenced in Paddock Wood.</p> <p>PS_094 Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Statement (September 2024) Unclear between 2024 GTAA and Council's Statement what previous under supply actually is. Pitch Need (2024-2039) is 20 in the GTAA and 45 in the Statement. The Statement figure is not mentioned in the GTAA so unclear how previous undersupply has been calculated. This needs further explanation.</p> <p>TWBC not explained whether any changes to Local Plan policies are required including location of potential allocations e.g. GTAA states accommodation should be avoided in areas prone to flooding and new sites located close to existing families.</p> | <p>(2024) therefore takes into account any unfulfilled need from the previous GTAA.</p> <p>The GTAA identifies that the majority of Gypsy and Traveller need derives from existing families on existing lawful sites. The primary strategy within the emerging Plan is to therefore expand/intensify existing sites where there is capacity and subject to planning constraints alongside the addition of two new site allocations. The site identified within Policy STR/SS1 is to meet a specific, identified family need. The Policy (H9 Gypsies and Travellers) also allows for suitable windfall sites to come forward.</p> <p>It is noted that the breakdown of the calculation of need is presented is slightly different ways between the GTAA and the Council's Pitch Supply Statement (as the GTAA identifies the balance of need (having deducted existing supply) to the end of the Plan period, whereas the Statement separates the two to ensure clarity regarding the overall identified need from 2024-2039 and the total identified supply). The position is as at 1 April 2024 and therefore supersedes the previous GTAA; in any case, any outstanding need/shortfall in need as at 1 April 2024 forms part of the need calculation.</p> <p>No changes are currently proposed to Local Plan policies; Policy H9 - the Gypsy and Traveller Policy identifies allocations primarily on existing sites as well as two new site allocations (one of which has FULL planning permission), as well as allows for suitable windfall sites.</p> | <p>Council wishes to participate in any future Hearings on the Local Plan given the scale of growth still proposed at Paddock Wood and given the well-known constraints and complexities of the area as well as the Local Plan, masterplanning, infrastructure delivery and funding uncertainties that still remain.</p> |
| NEBD43-1 to 43-2 | Mrs T Homewood | | | | PS_093, PS_094 | | Legal compliance and soundness not stated | The accommodation needs for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling | Not stated. |

| Rep No | Consultee Name | Consultee Organisation | Agent Name | Agent Organisation | Document(s) commented on | Proposed Modifications | Comment Summary | TWBC Response | Hearing Session Participation (and reason for participation) |
|--------|----------------|------------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Tunbridge Wells Borough currently has 26 Gypsy and Traveller sites, with 9 in Paddock Wood and 2 additional sites in Brenchley and Matfield (TN12 6 postcode). This postcode already hosts 47.6% of the borough’s sites.Tunbridge Wells Borough Council (TWBC) proposes adding 19 new pitches on top of the 26 sites, with 18 in Paddock Wood and potentially 0 to 1 in Cranbrook. This would concentrate nearly all new pitches in Paddock Wood, as such a disproportionately high figure in an unsustainable location that experiences:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Overstretched facilities: full capacity GP/surgeries, and primary schools have increased intake (3 to 4 classes per annum) without new buildings, posing health and safety risks and negative impact on education.Overcrowded train services and exacerbated flooding issues due to recent housing developments.Lack of infrastructure: No additional infrastructure has been allocated to support these developments.Access issues: The proposed sites are accessible only by narrow, single-track lanes without pavements, which already struggle with existing site traffic.Also concerns about Gypsy and Traveller sites within Maidstone Borough that are also in Paddock Wood (TN12 6 postcode). Maidstone Borough Council has confirmed in writing 4 Gypsy and Traveller sites in Paddock Wood (TN12 6 postcode), 3 of which have been rejected in 2016. This amounts to 29 pitches listed on these 4 sites as of January 2024. This number may have changed since the 2016 assessment. | <p>Show people have been considered previously at both Stage 2 and Stage 3 hearing sessions. Specially this has been at Stage 2 (Matter 8, Issue 11 TWBC Hearing Statement TWLP/040) with the hearing session held on 22 June 2022 and also at Stage 3 Matter 9, Issue 3 (TWBC Hearing Statement TWLP/146) for which a hearing session was held on 17 July 2024.</p> <p>Throughout the preparation of the Local Plan the Council has engaged and consulted with statutory consultees and infrastructure providers to identify and plan for infrastructure needs arising from the proposed development strategy. Any infrastructure needs identified have been incorporated into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (PS_105). This has been evidenced in the many Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) completed by the Council with infrastructure providers, which has included with the Kent and Medway Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS Trust, KCC (range of serviced including education) and both Network and South Eastern Rail.</p> <p>Infrastructure provision has been considered at various points during both the Stage 2 and 3 hearing sessions.</p> <p>The response comment relating to provision within Maidstone Borough is noted. TWBC has and will continue to engage with Maidstone Borough Council through the Duty to Cooperate over cross-boundary issues, including Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs.</p> | |

| Rep No | Consultee Name | Consultee Organisation | Agent Name | Agent Organisation | Document(s) commented on | Proposed Modifications | Comment Summary | TWBC Response | Hearing Session Participation (and reason for participation) |
|--------|----------------|------------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------|--|
| | | | | | | | These concerns highlight the need for careful consideration by TWBC before proceeding with the proposed pitch additions. | | |