

Government Action on Unauthorised Encampments

The government has put out the following statement:

The Government is aware of long-standing concerns raised by the public and colleagues around unauthorised encampments. These can cause settled communities significant distress and perpetuate a negative issue of the travelling community, the vast majority of whom are law-abiding citizens and amongst whom we see some of the worst life chances in our society.

Action is needed to address the sense of unease and intimidation residents feel when an unauthorised encampment occurs; the frustration at not being able to access amenities, public land and business premises; and the waste and cost that is left once the encampment has moved on. This week, the Government has published a response to a detailed consultation, which will take forward a comprehensive range of measures across government, and ensure fair play:

www.gov.uk/government/consultations/powers-for-dealing-with-unauthorised-development-and-encampments

Extended police powers to tackle trespassers

The Government will consult on proposals to amend the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 to:

- Permit the police to direct trespassers to suitable authorised sites located in neighbouring local authority areas;
- Increase the period of time in which trespassers directed from land would be unable to return;
- Lower the number of vehicles needing to be involved in an unauthorised encampment before police powers can be exercised – changing this from six or more, to two or more; and
- Enable the police to remove trespassers from land that forms part of the highway.

Considering a new criminal trespass offence

The Home Office will conduct a review that will consider whether it should criminalise the act of trespassing when setting up an encampment. This will consider the financial and operational impacts that new legislation would have, investigate the effectiveness of similar legislation in Ireland and consider how such a power could work in practice. This could act as a real deterrent to such activity in the future, and it is therefore right that this option is explored fully.

Additional support for local authority enforcement activities

- New statutory good practice guidance to support local authorities use of powers to deal with unauthorised encampments; and a commitment to keep these

powers under review, particularly in instances of deliberate and repeated breaches of planning.

- Further work to ensure that measures are in place to address issues around the clean-up costs which can occur following an unauthorised encampment.
- Up to £1.5 million of funding for local authorities to support planning enforcement through the next round of the Planning Delivery Fund, helping them deal with unauthorised development (i.e. where unauthorised sites are on land owned by travellers).
- Extending the period of time that a Temporary Stop Notice can be in place for.

Further reforms to the planning system to tackle unauthorised development and encampments

- New guidance making clear that the Communities Secretary will be prepared to review planning cases where concerns are raised that there is too high a concentration of authorised traveller sites in one location.
- Strengthening policy on intentional unauthorised development, helping to maintain confidence and fairness in the planning system.
- Make information on permanent and transit sites freely available in open data format so that local authorities have a single clear source of data on the availability of such sites.

Supporting law-abiding Gypsy, Roma and Travellers

The Conservative Government's ground-breaking Racial Disparity Audit identified significantly worse health and education outcomes for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities than the rest of society. The Government is funding projects across England to improve outcomes in the areas of educational attainment, health and social integration, and to reduce the community's vulnerability. We will continue work across Government on a strategic approach to improve outcomes for Gypsies, Roma and Travellers, as well as the settled community.

We are also supporting the provision of more authorised sites, through the New Homes Bonus (paid to councils at the affordable housing premium rate) and through our Affordable Homes Programme. This locally-led approach is working, as the number of caravans on authorised sites has increased from 14,498 in July 2010 to 19,569 in July 2018.

Taken together, we believe that these measures will go a long way to addressing the issues which have been highlighted and informed by representations from colleagues and the responses to our consultation. We want fair and equal treatment for both travellers and the settled community.

Who is running Brexit policy and what is it?

If you listen to Sir Martin Donnelly, former Permanent Secretary at the Department of International Trade and friend and supporter of Ollie Robbins, senior civil servant negotiator for the UK, the UK has to accept that the Withdrawal Agreement is as good as it gets and sign it.

So we can guess there is a senior strand of advice and opinion within the current civil service which says the UK must seek to change Parliament's mind and get on with signing up to the Withdrawal Agreement they have negotiated. Doubtless they will help the PM get some clarification or side document to the Agreement over the backstop to try to secure its passage on a second attempt. That would sign us up to the 21 months or more of very expensive talks, submit us to the Irish backstop which looks like a device to get us to stay in the customs union, and place us at a huge disadvantage in trying to negotiate a so called future partnership.

Much of the civil service work as I understand it from press reports and Ministerial statements has been to map all the contours of our current relationship with the EU and try to replicate them whilst claiming we have in some technical sense left the EU. This of course has all been under the guidance of Ministers, and Ministers have to take responsibility for what the civil service does as soon as they sign the work off. There does not seem to have been any effort to design and table a Free Trade Agreement, and our best trade negotiator Crawford Falconer has been kept well away from all the EU talks.

This strand of opinion gains considerable support from the Chancellor and the Secretary of State for Business. They have expressed their continued regrets at our departing the EU and have made clear their opposition to leaving without a Withdrawal Agreement. They have exuded hostility to WTO Brexit and do not look as if they are trying to smooth our passage in that eventuality. They keep in touch with a limited number of leaders of large international businesses and seem enthusiastic every time one of those speaks out about alleged dangers of leaving. Indeed we can read reports that they encourage businesses to accentuate the negative. Many of the scare stories say we will have trouble importing, yet the government has not set out just why and how it will mess up our ports.

Within government we also have figures like David Liddington, Deputy Prime Minister and Gavin Barwell, Chief of Staff at Number 10 with strong Remain pedigrees who wish to reach out to Labour to find a compromise across Parliament to delay or water down Brexit.

The Prime Minister herself seeks to balance these Remain forces with the much larger number of pro Brexit MPs on the government and DUP benches. She herself always rules out staying in the Customs Union and single market, as stated in the Conservative Manifesto and by both sides in the referendum. She

says she does not want No Deal but it has to be there in case there is no agreement which is better. She never wavers in saying we will leave on 29 March.

She has also rubbed out the clear red line in the Manifesto that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed, and forgotten the promise to negotiate the future partnership in tandem with the withdrawal agreement to maximise leverage and read across.

The problem is the warring factions around the Cabinet table and in Whitehall, where it appears there are more who wish to delay or thwart the will of the people than there are believers in just leaving in March. Parliament has rightly decided the Withdrawal Agreement is a bad deal – or indeed no deal at all, as it does not relate to the future partnership. Most of the time the PM works with the big majority in her party to get us out of the EU on time. When she does she wins the votes. When she tries to reach out to the small Remain group of Conservative MPs and listens too much to those forces in government that still cannot be reconciled to a proper Brexit on 29 March, she stumbles and loses votes. She should now set out a vision of how we will spend the money, use the new powers and settle a new trade policy if we just leave on 29 March.

Brexit end game?



John Redwood won a free place at Kent College, Canterbury, He graduated from Magdalen College Oxford, has a DPhil and is a fellow of All Souls College. A businessman by background, he has been a director of NM Rothschild merchant bank and chairman of a quoted industrial PLC.

- [Read more about John Redwood](#)

The Irish border

Attitudes to the Irish border sum up the differences between Leave and Remain.

To Leave there is no problem. The current Irish border is a complex

international border, handled with the minimum of fuss. It is a Vat, Excise and currency border. These fiscal and financial requirements are handled away from the border, mostly electronically. If there are to be customs we could do the same with those.

It is a border requiring co-operation against smuggling, which already occurs. It is an anti terrorist border, without the need for border posts. There is action by police on both sides of the border to combat crime. We have a common travel area to ease the movement of people, which will continue after Brexit.

It will become a border for issues of quality and compliance for food and goods. As both sides currently meet the same standards and wish to do so after Brexit to sell to each other, we can continue with compliance checks away from the border with electronic manifests detailing what is on a truck and where it has been or will be tested.

To Remain it is a series of insoluble problems that require Northern Ireland to stay in the single market and customs union. To the Republic of Ireland and the EU it is an opportunity to advance the island of Ireland agenda for government of all matters commercial. They query a series of detailed and sensible proposals using existing technology and practices to avoid a more intrusive police and government presence at the border.

The UK government should repeat that after Brexit it will not impose watch towers and an army of inspectors on the border. It will use existing technology and practises to collect revenue and check goods, and will continue full co-operation with the Republic as now. The Republic can then work with the EU to decide how best to run their side of the border, knowing the UK will be helpful and positive about ensuring a smooth outcome.

The EU talks are not going anywhere – let's table a free trade agreement

It's been good having three days off from Brexit on this blog. Parliament and the UK media need to remember there are many important tasks and debates we need to have about problems in our country that should not be driven out by endless and repetitious arguments about the terms and timing of our departure from the EU. I seek to make sure my work as an MP is not unbalanced by Brexit which takes up too much Parliamentary time.

Over the last few days there has been little progress with the UK Parliament's wish to see the Withdrawal Agreement renegotiated. The EU appears to rule out removing the backstop from the Agreement, which in turns seems to rule out Parliament approving it. For some of us it is far more than the backstop that is wrong with the Agreement anyway. Why would we want

to sign a one sided agreement giving the EU all it wants, without anything firm on the future partnership which might contain things we want? Far from leaving the EU signing the Agreement means delay in taking back control of our money, our laws, and our borders, with genuine issues about whether we would ever be in full control given the backstop and the financial commitments.

The best approach from here is straightforward. The government has to tell the EU there is no chance of passing the current Withdrawal Agreement, whatever might be offered by side letters, reassurance, clarifications or strengthening of the Political Declaration about a possible future agreement. It is also true many MPs do not want to leave with no agreement, so the government should table a comprehensive free trade agreement. Under GATT rules if the EU agrees to talk about this the UK can then leave the EU on 29 March without needing to impose new tariff and non tariff barriers on EU exports to us, and the EU would do the same for our exports to them. There is a period of up to 10 years to agree a final text of a replacement Free Trade Agreement. There is now a private sector draft, but the government itself could scissors and paste EU/Japan and EU/Canada as the starting text.

Any kind of Withdrawal Agreement would leave the UK very exposed. There would be endless more months of rows with the EU, and rows in Parliament over how the talks should be handled by the UK. Meanwhile the EU could legislate any way it wished to damage UK interests as leverage, whilst continuing to charge us large and unspecified sums for the privilege of more talks.