

### **Summary of responses to Gypsy and Traveller engagement process: 20.8.2007 – 20.9.2007**

196 questionnaires were sent out to a mixture of stakeholder groups and individuals

26 replies were received representing a 13% return

4 of those were from organisations which said they didn't feel able to complete the questionnaire

Of the remaining 22 replies only 5 were from individual gypsies, travellers and showmen or their representative groups

#### **Replies were received from the following groups:**

Surrey CC Planners; The London Green Belt Council; Thames Water; Highways Agency; Mayford Village Society (Woking); The Showman's Guild of GB; Surrey police (Sunbury); Hook Heath Residents' Association; Spelthorne Rentstart; Byfleet, West Byfleet & Pyrford Residents' Association; Spelthorne Mental Health Association; Surrey Primary Care Trust; Surrey Community Action; Runnymede Partnership; Claygate Parish Council; Sutton Green Residents' Association (Woking); Carr-Gomm; Runnymede Rentstart; Runnymede Association of Voluntary Services; The Learning and Skills Council.

#### **Replies were received from the following gypsy and traveller locations and groups:**

Elm Farm Caravan Park (Chertsey); Greenlands, Cox Lane, Ewell; Ponderosa, Spelthorne; Friends, Families & Travellers (FFT Planning); Knaphill, Woking.

#### **Summary of responses:**

12 out of 22 respondents (54.5%) agreed that provision should be met over a wider area than just north Surrey (Qu. 3)

13 out of 22 respondents (59%) disagreed with the idea of simply expanding existing sites (Qu. 4)

14 out of 22 respondents (64%) disagreed with the idea of simply providing new sites (Qu. 5)

15 out of 22 respondents (68%) agreed that any new provision should be a mix of expanded existing sites and new ones (Qu. 6)

14 out of 22 respondents (64%) agreed that any new provision should be by the local authority (Qu. 7)

16 out of 22 respondents (73%) disagreed with more sites/pitches being provided privately (Qu. 8)

12 out of 22 respondents (54.5%) agreed that any new provision should be a mix of local authority and private sites (Qu. 9)

15 out of 22 respondents (68%) disagreed with the idea of more provision being on large sites (Qu. 10)

12 out of 22 respondents (54.5%) agreed that any new provision should be on small sites (Qu. 11)

11 out of 22 respondents (50%) agreed that any new provision should be through a mix of small and large sites (Qu. 12)

**Detail of responses:**

| <b>Question.</b>  | <b>Strongly agree</b> | <b>Agree</b> | <b>Disagree</b> | <b>Strongly disagree</b> |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>1</b> - Gypsy and Traveller sites and pitches should be provided where there is already an identified need (Option A)  | <b>3</b>              | <b>6</b>     | <b>5</b>        | <b>5</b>                 |
| <b>2</b> - Gypsy and Traveller sites and pitches should be provided within North Surrey but only after considering the issues of sustainability, equity and choice, social inclusion, environmental protection, and flexibility of provision (Option B) | <b>3</b>              | <b>6</b>     | <b>8</b>        | <b>2</b>                 |

| <b>Question.</b>   | <b>Strongly agree</b> | <b>Agree</b> | <b>Disagree</b> | <b>Strongly disagree</b> |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>3</b> - Distribution should be made across a wider area than North Surrey and met within other parts of the County or Region (Option C) | <b>6</b>              | <b>6</b>     | <b>3</b>        | <b>3</b>                 |
| <b>4</b> - Gypsy and Traveller pitches should be provided only through the expansion of existing sites rather than providing new ones      | <b>3</b>              | <b>4</b>     | <b>7</b>        | <b>6</b>                 |
| <b>5</b> - Gypsy and Traveller pitches should be provided through the provision of entirely new sites *                                    | <b>2</b>              | <b>4</b>     | <b>8</b>        | <b>6</b>                 |
| <b>6</b> - Gypsy and Traveller pitches should be provided through a mix of expanded existing sites and entirely new sites                  | <b>9</b>              | <b>6</b>     | <b>3</b>        | <b>3</b>                 |
| <b>7</b> - If more sites/pitches are required, these should be provided by the local authorities   | <b>4</b>              | <b>10</b>    | <b>6</b>        |                          |
| <b>8</b> - If more sites/pitches are required, the need should be met through private provision  | <b>2</b>              | <b>2</b>     | <b>13</b>       | <b>3</b>                 |
| <b>9</b> - If more sites/pitches are required, these should be provided through a mix of local authority and private sites                 | <b>4</b>              | <b>8</b>     | <b>6</b>        | <b>2</b>                 |

| Question.   | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| <b>10</b> - If more sites/pitches are required, these should be provided through large sites (10 pitches or more)   |                | 5     | 11       | 4                 |
| <b>11</b> - If more sites/pitches are required, these should be provided through small sites (less than 10 pitches) | 4              | 8     | 8        | 1                 |
| <b>12</b> - If more sites/pitches are required, these should be provided through a mix of small and large sites     | 4              | 7     | 5        | 4                 |

### **Summary of main comments made by respondents to the questionnaire**

- More direct consultation needed with gypsies and travellers
- The GTAA pitch requirements are likely to be an under-estimate and therefore provisional
- All local authorities should be equally required to share in the provision of sites and pitches
- Need to be met where it arises
- Gypsies and travellers should not be forced to live where they don't want to
- Gypsies and travellers want to live on or near existing sites for family, economic and cultural reasons
- Evidence is needed to assess the impact of placing gypsies and travellers away from existing communities
- A Race Equality Impact Assessment is needed
- Any new provision should be a mix of expanded, existing sites and new ones
- Any new provision to be a mix of local authority and private sites
- Ensure sufficient employment opportunities accompany any 'new' provision
- Privately owned sites tend to be better-maintained than public sites
- Many gypsies and travellers are able to pay for pitches/sites
- Any new provision to be small, family-type sites rather than large sites (gypsy and traveller, police and utilities' preference)
- Service providers, e.g. health, education, utilities, roads need to be fully consulted and kept informed
- Planning policies need to be less restrictive though the green belt must be protected at all costs