

Penny Kirkham, Magor with Undy Town Councillor

On Monday 17/07/23 MUTC held a public meeting and the outcome was a unanimous rejection of the Langley Close and Dancing Hill sites as being suitable for the G&T community for some of the reasons I would like to outline today:

**The G&T community themselves have stated neither site is suitable – so why are they are being considered?**

The recommendation for today’s Committee to take this to consultation is at odds with Council’s own stated intentions eg. Page 103 of the document before you today, states that “G&T households themselves are key stakeholders” It goes on “It’s important that households want to live on potential pitches provided by the Council”

However the G&T community say that these sites are not suitable, so why are they still being considered?

In addition, at the Meeting of the People Scrutiny Committee in July 2022 it was stated “we don’t want a situation where we arbitrarily choose a site and tell the family ... The important thing for us is to listen and respond accordingly”.

The G&T community have said these sites are not suitable, so together with us must be thinking “are you listening and responding accordingly?”

-----

**There are perceived inconsistencies in the evaluation document (RAG)**

Is there a scientific basis for scoring or weighting RAG? There needs to be transparency and fairness in the assessment of each site to determine suitability.

Without sharing access to the scoring or weighting means, it appears there are inconsistencies in the comparative categorisation of Red, Amber and Green. For example:

Green Infrastructure (GI) comments ...

Why is Langley Close categorised as GREEN when Highways state access is achievable off St. Brides Rd but will result in considerable loss of the existing boundary hedge? (Yet similarly due to loss of hedge at Garthi Close and Rocklea Open Spaces both are RED)

Another example is the

Travelling Ahead feedback in the RAG ...

Why is only Dancing Hill categorised as RED when the **same** issues are stated for Langley Close? I.e. negatives: both close to existing homes, both close to M4 (with consequent noise and pollution); and positives: both are larger sites and so some flexibility.

Why are they categorised differently .... What is the criteria?

There are more examples like this that I could share should you require them.

*NOT INCLUDED DUE TO TIME CONSTRAINTS BUT SAID WOULD SHARE WITH MCC*

*Ecology comments ... Langley Close mentions identified as priority grassland during Monmouthshire LDP (2010), although surveys would need to be carried out it's classed as AMBER when Garthi, Rocklea and Dancing Hill are all RED.*

*Community feedback in the RAG ... all 5 sites have almost identical comments but only one (Rocklea Open Space, Mitchel Troy) is categorised as RED. One in Magor (Langley Close) is AMBER and the other (DANCING HILL) GREEN; however they are the same examples/feedback from the community so why a different treatment in the RAG?*

*Ecology... why are SINCS (sites of importance for nature conservation) within 500m given same AMBER categorisation as those within 200m (Langley Close) and 100m (Dancing Hill)*

---

### **Why isn't privately owned land being considered?**

The findings of the GTAA ([Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessments](#)) process suggest an aspiration within much of the Gypsy Traveller community for private site provision in Monmouthshire. (*From the [MCC GTAA 2020-2025 \(13.0.2\)](#)*)

Why aren't a wider range of sites being considered ie. privately owned land?

What kind of dialogue is Council having with landowners in Monmouthshire?

Is Council working with and supporting G&T households to identify private sites to address the identified unmet need?

---

### **Finally .... Noise Pollution**

MUTC believes that due to the proximity to the M4, the Langley Close & Dancing Hill sites would fall into TAN 11 Category C (or worse) where planning permission would not normally be granted.

If these sites would not normally be suitable for residential development .... Why are they being considered as suitable for the G&T community?

---

In summary, and for the reasons stated today, MUTC do not believe either Langley Close or Dancing Hill are suitable to be recommended to be put forward.

Due to overrunning the 3 minutes we were asked to keep to the following item was dropped but again can send to MCC to go with papers for Cabinet if able? .....

**Residents stated a perceived/apparent disproportionate number of G&T sites in the local area.**

- Blackwall Lane is within 2 miles from where I'm sat at the moment,
- Minnetts Lane, Rogiet is 2 miles in the other direction.
- And Crick is a further 3 miles east.

3 sites within 5 miles of Magor with Undy.