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Disclaimer We do not accept liability for any decisions made based on the information in the Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Guildford borough consultation record, as there may be errors and omissions beyond our control.
Introduction

The purpose of this consultation record
This record has been prepared to show the consultation undertaken during the drafting of the Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Guildford borough. Although formal consultation is not required when preparing a piece of evidence base, this document is useful as it sets out:

- the different stages of consultation and the methods used
- who the Council consulted and how they were consulted
- the main issues raised through consultations and how they were addressed
- how the Council raised awareness of the interviews.

Consultation on the questionnaire and methodology

The Traveller Accommodation Assessment questionnaire is a vital part in gaining an understanding traveller accommodation needs. The questionnaire was drawn up in consultation with traveller’s representatives and travellers themselves. Officers representing the 11 Surrey local authorities attended the Surrey Gypsy and Traveller Community Relations Forum in June 2011 to explain the questionnaire and raise awareness of the work and consultation on the Surrey traveller accommodation assessments and why it was important for travellers to participate. A summary of the consultation undertaken is also available in section 4 of Preparing Travellers’ Accommodation Assessment (TAAs) – The Surrey Approach (April 2012).

Who was consulted on the questionnaire?
The draft questionnaire was sent to:

- Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
- Friends Families and Travellers
- Gypsy Council
- Showmans Guild of Great Britain
- Surrey Gypsy and Traveller Community Relations Forum
- Surrey County Council – Estates Planning and Management
- The Irish Travellers Movement in Britain
- Traveller Law Reform Project
- Voluntary Action – South West Surrey
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
- Guildford Borough Council
- Mole Valley Borough Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Tandridge Borough Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Woking Borough Council

Including officers from housing, planning and site liaison officers
How were they consulted?
All those consulted at this early stage were sent an email on 24 August 2011 seeking comments by 23 September 2011. A copy is attached in appendix one.

Key issues raised
The key issues raised to the draft questionnaire and the response and actions are summarised in the table in appendix eleven.

Who was consulted on the methodology?
The draft methodology for undertaking a traveller accommodation assessment was sent to:

- The Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
- Friends Family and Travellers/ Gypsy and Traveller Law Reform
- The Irish Travellers Movement in Britain
- Gypsy Council
- Surrey Gypsy and Traveller Community Relations Forum (John Hockley, Ann Wilson and Monica Vidal)
- Friends Family and Travellers/Surrey Gypsy and Traveller Community Relations Forum (Charmaine Valler)
- Showman's Guild of Great Britain (Ray Smith)
- Surrey County Council Estates Planning and Management (Amanda Boyton)
- Voluntary Action – South West Surrey
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
- Guildford Borough Council
- Mole Valley Borough Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Tandridge Borough Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Woking Borough Council

Including officers from housing, planning and site liaison officers.

How were they consulted?
All those consulted at this early stage were sent an email on 20 February 2012 seeking comments by 9 March 2012.

A copy of the email sent is below:

On behalf of the eleven Surrey Districts and Boroughs, I am attaching for your information and comment a draft methodology for identifying future pitch/plot requirements for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in Surrey.

The methodology has been devised by the Surrey Districts and Boroughs working together.

This piece of work follows on from some joint work we did to prepare a questionnaire that could be used to find out the accommodation requirements of travellers. The draft
questionnaire was the subject of a previous round of consultation to which you replied. It has been revised in the light of the consultation and incorporated into the draft methodology at Appendix 3. It is not part of the current consultation.

It is intended that the methodology will be followed by local planning authorities in Surrey to assist them in identifying the number of pitches/plots that are required to meet the accommodation requirements of traveller families in the future. This will be translated into the identification of specific sites through the preparation of appropriate Development Plan Documents.

We are keen to make progress with this work and would be grateful if you could let me have your comments on the draft methodology by Friday 9th March.

I am also writing to Emma Nuttell for her comments as well.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me or my colleague Suzanne Parkes.

Regards

Jack Straw
Mole Valley District Council

Two letters were received in response to the email and the comments were taken into account whilst drafting the final version of the methodology.

A small number of typographical errors and formatting issues were also identified. These were amended accordingly.

Raising awareness of the interviews

To prepare for the interviews with Guildfords travelling community our consultants, Mill Field Services were provided with questionnaires, ward and parish maps, site location maps, aerial photographs and site suggestions forms should a person being interviewed know of any suitable sites for future pitches or plots. A list of known Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople site were provided. These consisted of public sites, private sites, unauthorised sites, and sites with temporary planning permission. The Corporate Gypsy and Traveller Officer contacted local travellers on the waiting list and living in bricks and mortar housing in the borough to see if they wished to take part in the interviews, and with their agreement their contact details were passed on to the consultants.

Emails were sent to Guildford Borough Councillors and all Guildford Parish Councils to let them know about the interviews and to raise awareness within the travelling community, particularly if they knew of travellers living in bricks and mortar housing who may want to get involved.

Emails (see appendix two) were also sent to:
Posters (see appendix three and four) and information postcards (see appendix five) were displayed at the Council offices main reception, planning reception and the Housing Advice Centre. Guildford library were provided with a poster and postcards. As Ash is known to have a traveller community living in bricks and mortar housing it was a focus for raising awareness and for providing display material. Posters and information postcards were given to the Ash Centre, and Walsh Cof E Junior and Infants school, who offered to include information on the forthcoming interviews in their parent’s newsletter. Posters and postcards were also sent to Ash library, Ash Manor School and Ash Grange Primary School in order to raise awareness of the study, particularly to those travellers living in bricks and mortar housing that may want to be interviewed.

Community Safety Wardens distributed information postcards to travellers living on sites and within bricks and mortar housing and some also mentioned the forthcoming interviews in their community newsletters (see appendix six). Corporate Gypsy and Traveller officer also distributed information postcards on traveller sites, and talked specifically to travellers living in bricks and mortar in the community to raise awareness and ask if people wanted to be interviewed.

Whilst undertaking the interviews Mill Field asked specifically, as part of the interview, whether those being interviewed knew of any traveller living in bricks and mortar that may want to be interviewed. They also handed out information postcards on sites. The postcard explained when the interviewers would be out and about and how to get in touch if they wanted to be involved and interviewed.

Ray Smith from the Showmans Guild of Great Britain said he would raise awareness within the local Travelling Showpeople community. An article specifically mentioning the Guildford Travelling Showpersons site and encouraging Travelling Showpeople in Guildford to get in touch with Guildford Council appeared in the Showpeoples newspaper, World Fair In July 2012.

The Council also made all information available on its website (see appendix seven) and on its consultation calendar (see appendix eight) with a twitter update (see appendix nine) and information posted on the Guildford Borough Council planning facebook page (appendix ten).

Mill Field Services attended the Travellers Ash Fair on Sunday 1 July 12 to 4pm at the Ash Centre, Ash Hill road, Ash, alongside local Community Safety Wardens and the Guildford
Borough Council Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer. We raised awareness of the Traveller Accommodation Assessment and the interviews and information postcards were handed out. Six interviews were carried out at the fair and a further three contacts were made which were followed up the following week.

Our consultants, Mill Field Services interviewed 98 households in total, 26 households on public sites, 33 households on private sites, 14 Travelling Showpeople households and 25 households living in bricks and mortar housing. Occupants of two authorised sites did not want to be interviewed, three sites were vacant, and there were 13 no-contact sites (which were visited a minimum of three times at various times of the day and evening).

This is a great result when compared with the 2006 GTAA, which had 36 interviews on sites, 23 interviews with traveller households in bricks and mortar housing and 5 interviews with travelling showpeople within Guildford borough.

**Involvement with the draft Traveller Accommodation Assessment**

As the Traveller Accommodation Assessment is a piece of evidence base full public consultation is not appropriate or necessary.

**Who was involved?**

A group of targeted individuals were contacted for their feedback on the draft Traveller Accommodation Assessment. The group consisted of:

- Guildford Borough Councillors on the Local Plan Panel (Councillors Monika Juneja, Angela Gunning, Bob McShee, Caroline Reeves, Gordon Jackson, Julia McShane, Marsha Moseley, Nikki Nelson-Smith)
- Carol Humphrey, Guildford Borough Head of Planning Services
- Samantha Hutchison, Guildford Borough Corporate Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer
- Colleagues in the Guildford Borough Neighbourhood and Housing Team
- The Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
- Friends Family and Travellers (Emma Nuttall)
- Gypsy and Traveller Law Reform (Steve Staines)
- The Irish Travellers Movement in Britain (Michael Hargreves)
- Surrey Gypsy and Traveller Community Relations Forum (John Hockley and Ann Wilson)
- Showman's Guild of Great Britain (Ray Smith and Keith Miller)
- Travelling Showpeoples representative from Whittles Drive (Alfie Gregory)
- Surrey County Council Estates Planning and Management (Amanda Boyton)
- Traveller Education Surrey County Council (Sue Hurtley)
- Surrey Community Action (Kathryn Robinson)
- Surrey County Council (Hilda Brazil)
- Voluntary Action – South West Surrey (Monica Vidal)
• Elmbridge Borough Council
• Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
• Mole Valley Borough Council
• Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
• Runnymede Borough Council
• Rushmoor Borough Council
• Spelthorne Borough Council
• Surrey Heath Borough Council
• Tandridge Borough Council
• Waverley Borough Council
• Woking Borough Council
• Local community representative

How were they involved?
The group outlined above were asked for their views on the draft Traveller Accommodation Assessment. A copy of the email sent is set out below.

Dear ****

A Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Guildford borough has recently been drafted and I wondered whether you’d be happy to read the document and let me know what you think? The document is highly confidential at this stage so your discretion would be greatly appreciated.

A brief overview is set out below.

What is the Travellers Accommodation Assessment (TAA)?
The Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) is part of the evidence that informs the preparation of the new Local Plan. This TAA is dated June 2012, and reflects the position at that point in time. The TAA identifies the number of pitches and plots required to meet the accommodation needs of travellers residing or resorting to our borough. It does not determine where these pitches and plots will go.

Why prepare a TAA?
We want to make informed decisions in our new Local Plan. To do this, we need to have detailed evidence to feed into the new Local Plan, which includes a TAA. Travellers accommodation must be assessed as part of the overall housing need. A Local Plan cannot pass examination and be found sound if it is not supported by the information in a TAA demonstrating what travellers accommodation needs are. The Housing Act 2004 requires us to carry out a TAA and the National Planning Policy Framework says we should have a clear understanding of how many homes we need in our area. National policy on planning for travellers is set out in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

How is a traveller accommodation assessment prepared?
Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (March 2012) puts the provision of new pitches and plots into the hands of councils. It requires us to make our own robust assessment of need and set targets for pitch or plot provision to address the likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of travellers in this borough. To assess our travellers accommodation
needs we have followed the guidance set out in the Surrey-wide methodology for preparing traveller accommodation assessments. The main component of a TAA is interviews with the travelling community, and these were carried out by our consultants Mill Field in June and July 2012. The findings from the interviews and other data is then combined to calculate the need for new pitches and plots.

The TAA is a technical study, and its findings are not available for consultation. It is based on evidence available when interviews with the travelling community took place in June 2012. Factors such as granted or refused planning permissions may well have changed since this time, however they will be accounted for subsequently.

What are the key findings?
The TAA shows there is a need within our borough for 43 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and 6 plots for Travelling Showpeople over the next 5 years from 2012 to 2017. This addresses the backlog of need from overcrowding, doubling-up on sites, concealed households, unauthorised encampments or developments, temporary planning permissions and those living in bricks and mortar housing but with a need to be on a site. It also addresses the future demand for accommodation in the next five years to 2017 from adult children wanting to leave home and create a separate household. Carrying these figures forward the future projected need between 2017 to 2022 is 14 pitches and 1 plot and between 2022 to 2027 is 16 pitches and 1 plot.

I look forward to hearing from you, by Monday 16th September, and if you have any queries in the meantime please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Kate Lines, Senior Planner, Planning Services

Key issues raised
Eight responses were received and the comments were taken into account whilst drafting the final version of the Traveller Accommodation Assessment.

The feedback received in response to the draft Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Guildford borough is summarised in appendix twelve.
Appendix one – Consultation letter on questionnaire

Dear Sir/Madam

SURREY AUTHORITIES GYPSY, TRAVELLER AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE ACCOMMODATION NEEDS QUESTIONNAIRE – CONSULTATION

Over the last eighteen months there have been a number of changes to the national planning framework which have impacted on how local planning authorities assess the need for new pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople within their area and how this identified need is to be delivered. Within the Surrey context this includes the abandonment of the South East Plan Panel Report into the Review for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Provision and, at a national level, the publication of the proposed Planning Policy Statement (PPS) ‘Planning for Traveller Sites’ (April 2011).

On behalf of the 11 Boroughs and Districts in Surrey, I am writing to inform you of how we intend to address the implications of these changes and also seek your advice as to how to best assess the need for new pitches across the County.

Gypsy, Traveller and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAA)

In 2006/07 three Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAA) were carried out across Surrey covering north, east and west Surrey as required by Circulars 01/2006: Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and 04/2007: Planning for Travelling Showpeople. The GTAA provided information on the need for new pitches across Surrey between 2006 and 2011.

Information from the GTAA along with other evidence and consultation responses were used to inform the Partial Review of the South East Plan which sought to identify the accommodation needs of the travelling community in the region and provide a pitch requirement for each local authority.

The Review of the South East Plan reached examination in February 2010 when the draft distribution of pitches was considered by a panel of Government Inspectors. However, prior to the publication of their Report, the Coalition Government came to power and announced their
intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs) (i.e. the South East Plan) including the Partial Review of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation. The Government has announced that it will not be asking the Panel to complete its report, be considering its recommendations or complete the process of approving the partial review of the South East Plan.

Proposed Planning Policy Statement - Planning for Traveller Sites

On 12th April the Communities for Local Government (CLG) published ‘Planning for Traveller Sites’ for consultation. This draft Planning Policy Statement (PPS) is intended to replace the existing Circular advice on planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites (01/2006) and Planning for Travelling Showpeople (04/2007). The consultation paper proposes to shift responsibility for determining the level of future pitch provision from the regional planning process down to individual local authorities, based on robust evidence of local need in the light of historical demand.

Under the Government’s proposed policy, local planning authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004). However, unlike the advice in the current circulars the Government’s proposed policy does not specifically refer to the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment guidance that sets out how needs should be assessed for the purposes of the Housing Act.

Whilst the consultation paper indicates the Government is keen that planning policy highlights the importance of ensuring that targets are based on robust evidence, it does not consider it necessary for the Government to prescribe to local planning authorities the type and volume of evidence required, especially as their conclusion will be tested through the process of consultation and Examination in Public of local plans.

This approach to evidence gathering reflects the Government’s proposal that local authorities set their own evidence based targets for the provision of pitches/plots. The proposed policy does not dictate what targets local planning authorities should adopt. This is to be a matter for local planning authorities to decide for themselves depending on the circumstances in their particular area.

The Surrey Approach

The GTAAs are now around five years old and the Surrey authorities recognises the need to replace them with a new and up-to-date assessment of the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople taking into account household change, movement in and out of Surrey and natural demographic changes generally. This will ensure the evidence on the need for additional pitches is up-to-date for use in preparing local plan documents.

In light of the Government looking to ‘streamline’ the planning process and not prescribe planning guidance on undertaking assessments, the Surrey authorities have agreed that the methodology and accommodation assessment themselves should deal solely with identifying the number of pitches required rather than having a wider remit to include assessments of the condition of sites and the education/health needs of households. It is considered that information around these issues is already collected by Traveller Education and Adult Social Care Teams and that management of most public sites in the county is under the control of Surrey County Council who carry out weekly inspections of the sites.

The Surrey authorities have concluded that by focussing the next round of assessments on the future need for pitches, there is a greater prospect of achieving the robust evidence needed to inform the preparation of local plans.
Consultation on a draft Questionnaire

Moving forward with the assessment for new pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, the Surrey authorities have drafted a questionnaire which alongside other sources of information (caravan counts, authorised encampment data etc) will be used to gather the data required to assess accommodation need.

As a representative of the Travelling Community we sincerely welcome your comments on the draft questionnaire (please find enclosed). Comments should be received by FRIDAY 23rd SEPTEMBER 2011 and sent to:

Email – suzanne.parkes@molevalley.gov.uk

Or,

Post – Planning Policy Team, Mole Valley District Council, Pippbrook, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1SJ

Consideration should be given to whether the questionnaire is sufficient to identify the required number of new pitches across each local authority area or whether additional questions are needed.

Next Steps

Once responses to the draft questionnaire consultation have been received it will be amended where necessary. Consideration is currently being given as to how the surveys will be undertaken. This includes:

- whether to use consultants to prepare the study and/or undertake the interviews.
- whether there should be one study for the county of Surrey; group studies of 1 or more local authorities or 11 individual studies.
- when is the most appropriate time to undertake the surveys given the travelling heritage of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

The approach taken will largely depend on the resources of each local authority and the stage they are at in preparing their local plan i.e. in some local authority areas the need to undertake a new survey is more urgent than in others in terms of how it feeds into their plan making preparations. However, if you wish to make any comments on the above points please feel free to do so. The Surrey authorities are very much looking to work in partnership with your organisation so that a robust assessment of accommodation need can be undertaken.

If you have any queries regarding this work please do not hesitate to contact me via email – jack.straw@molevalley.gov.uk or phone 01306 879246. You can also discuss this work with my colleague Suzanne Parkes (suzanne.parkes@molevalley.gov.uk / 01306 879144).

We look forward to receiving your comments.

Yours Faithfully

Jack Straw

Jack Straw
Planning Policy Manager
On behalf of the Surrey Boroughs & Districts
Appendix two – Email sent to contacts regarding the forthcoming Traveller Accommodation Assessment interviews

Dear xxx

As part of the evidence base that will inform our new Local Plan work has started on gathering information to inform the new Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Guildford borough.

From Monday 18 June Mill Field Services, on behalf of Guildford Borough Council, will be going to known Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites across Guildford borough – public private and unauthorised sites – to interview travellers about their likely housing needs over the next 5 years. We also want Mill Field Services to interview travellers that are living in bricks and mortar housing in Guildford borough and to hear about their housing needs. If you know of anyone who lives in Guildford borough that may want to be interviewed please refer them to Sam Hutchison on 01483 444385 or alternatively they can email planningpolicy@guildford.gov.uk with their contact details and addresses.

A new Guildford council webpage www.guildford.gov.uk/taa provides further information.

The consultants are also undertaking interviews on behalf of Woking Borough Council, the contact there is Louise Kidd in the Planning Policy Team on 01483 743428 or visit woking.gov.uk.

If you have any questions please ask,

Kind regards,

Kate Lines
Senior Planner
Planning Services

www.guildford.gov.uk

Guildford Borough Council
Millmead House
Guildford
Surrey GU2 4BB
Follow us on Twitter @GuildfordBC

Guildford Borough Council is currently preparing its new Local Plan, a set of documents guiding development over the next 15 years and beyond. If you would like to be consulted on the Local Plan Strategy and other documents, or be kept up to date on progress, please join the Local Plan mailing list by sending your details to planningpolicy@guildford.gov.uk
Appendix three - Poster and postcard display in Guildford Borough Council planning reception
Appendix four – Interviews advertised and postcards made available in the main reception of the Guildford Borough Council offices, Millmead, Guildford and in the Housing Advice Centre.
**Appendix five – Postcard advertising interviews**

**Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople**

**What is your housing need?**

Guildford Borough Council is looking at the housing needs of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling showpeople in the borough. Interviewers will be visiting sites and would like to know what you think.

Look out for interviewers between 18 June and 6 July 2012.

If you live in a house and would like to get involved please get in touch.

Please contact Sam Hutchinson on 01483 444385 or visit [www.guildford.gov.uk/taa](http://www.guildford.gov.uk/taa)
Appendix six- Extract from Community Safety Wardens newsletter

7. Traveller Accommodation Assessment

Our Planning colleagues have asked me to put in the following article.

Did you know that Guildford Borough Council will be looking at Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople’s accommodation needs this summer? Interviewers will be visiting public and private sites from 18 June to 6 July to interview one person per household about the housing needs of their family over the next 5 years. If you are a traveller currently living in bricks and mortar housing but have a need to be on a site you can also be interviewed, just call the Sam Hutchinson on 01483 444385 or email planningpolicy@guildford.gov.uk before 22 June 2012.

Thank You for taking the time to read this newsletter and if you would like me to include anything you think may be of interest to others then please get in touch.

Best Wishes.

Mick Raynor.
Appendix seven – The Traveller Accommodation Assessment webpage

You are in: Guildford Home Page / Environment and planning / Planning / Planning policy / Evidence Base and Statistical Information / Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Guildford borough

Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Guildford borough

Background

It is important for the Council to have robust evidence to understand the housing needs of the travelling community, as required by the Housing Act 2004 and national Planning policy for traveller sites. This will inform new planning policies and the likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of our area over the lifespan of the new Local Plan. Local Development Framework

The existing Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment was prepared in 2006 and covered the period until the end of 2011. It is therefore important to look afresh at travellers accommodation needs.

The methodology

The Traveller Accommodation Assessment will include Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, who for the purposes of planning are collectively referred to as travellers.

A Surrey-wide methodology called Preparing Travellers Accommodation Assessments (TAAs) - The Surrey Approach has been agreed, following joint working with other Surrey councils and in consultation with traveller representatives. By following this methodology it will help us to compare the findings of our assessment with others across the county.

The interviews

In order to assess what travellers' housing needs are we need to ask questions to find out the facts about any over crowding, whether travellers are doubled-up on pitches or plots, and what the housing needs of young adults are likely to be over the next five years.

Mill Field Services will undertake interviews with the travelling community from 18 June to 6 July 2012. Mill Field Services will visit all known public, private and unauthorised Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites to try to interview one representative from each household. the interviews have been timed to avoid the Epsom Derby (2 June) and the Appleby Fair (7-13 June) and to avoid the school summer holidays.

Mill Field Services also need to interview travellers who may be living in bricks and mortar housing who wants to be interviewed please contact Sam Hutchinson on 01483 444385 or email Planningpolicy@guildford.gov.uk before 22 June 2012. Mill Field Services will also be attending the Gypsy and Traveller event in Ash on 1 July 2012, 12 to 4pm.
The findings

Once the interviews have been completed the Council will look at the findings which will help to inform the Traveller Accommodation Assessment. The Council will use the guidance within the Surrey wide Traveller Accommodation Assessment methodology to assess the level of need for pitches and plots within Guildford borough.

Frequently Asked Questions
Who are Gypsies and Travellers?

Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers are defined as a minority ethnic group under the Race Relations Act (2000). There are a number of Gypsy and Traveller communities which each have their own history and tradition:

• Gypsy and Romany ethnic groups who have lived in Britain for around 600 years. Their ancestors originate from northern India.

• Irish Travellers are a nomadic group with a distinctive way of life who have been part of the Irish and British society since ancient times.

• New Travellers are people of settled background who adopted a travelling lifestyle in more recent past, although some are now in their third or fourth generation of travelling (Earle et al, 1994)

The planning definition in Planning policy for traveller sites (2012) identifies Gypsies as:

"Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on the grounds of their own or their family's or dependents' education or health need or old age have ceased to travel temporality or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group or Travelling Showpeople or circus people travelling together as such”.

Who are Travelling Showpeople?

The planning definition of Travelling Showpeople is identified in Planning policy for traveller sites (2012) as:

"Members of a group organised for the purposes of holding fairs, circuses or shows (whether or not travelling together as such). This includes such persons who on the grounds of their own or their family's or dependents’ more localised pattern of trading, educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excludes Gypsies and Travellers as defined above”

Travelling Showpeople occupy plots rather than pitches which reflects the term traditionally used by Travelling Showpeople and differentiates plots which may need to incorporate space for the storage and maintenance of equipment as well as residential use.

Glossary

There is a useful glossary of terms used at the front of the Surrey wide Traveller Accommodation Assessments methodology (see below)
Appendix eight - Copy of consultation calendar from Guildford Borough Council website

You can use this calendar to discover more about past, present and future involvement across the Guildford Borough. Just click on the links in the box.

Consultation Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun 24/6</th>
<th>Mon 25/6</th>
<th>Tue 26/6</th>
<th>Wed 27/6</th>
<th>Thu 28/6</th>
<th>Fri 29/6</th>
<th>Sat 30/6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment on a planning application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street parking review consultations - Millmead and Woodbridge Road areas and Warwicks Bench</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller Accommodation Assessment interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix nine - Guildford Borough Councils planning twitter webpage
Appendix ten - Guildford Borough Councils facebook page
Appendix eleven – Summary of comments received on the draft Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation needs questionnaire and the response and action.

Please note that where issues where raised with regards to specific questions these were based on the draft questionnaire that was circulated for consultation. Having considered the responses to the consultation, the questionnaire and some questions have been amended, deleted or added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Organisation</th>
<th>Issue Raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>Page 1- beneath “name of respondent” insert Licensee/occupying without licence.</td>
<td>Concern has been raised over the confidentiality of the draft questionnaire. This relates to the section where the respondents name is asked for and those of people residing in the same household. This information was suggested for inclusion as when the previous GTAAs were undertaken it was unclear who had and had not been interviewed. Including this question would aid local authorities to see exactly who had been interviewed and whether the response rate was proportionate. Nevertheless the Showmen’s Guild has raised the point that from previous GTAA’s no one could be identified from their responses and that if the travelling community thought they could be they may not respond. Adding the licensee number could add to the concern over confidentiality.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed to include the licensee number within the questionnaire. A section on Data Protection has been included on the front page. This identifies that within the report no personal information relating to specific individual will be made public, and no individual will be identifiable through the description of where or how they live or their other circumstances. The interviewer will also be required to sign a declaration stating that the interview has been conducted in accordance with a local authority’s requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>Between Q2 and Q3- If the person is doubled up a question should be asked for how long</td>
<td>This could be useful for example, it may just be a temporary arrangement/or would perhaps help identify a level of urgency i.e. doubling up for a longer period of time.</td>
<td>Amend the questionnaire to include this question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>I do not understand Q3. How would a family be allowed to have more than one pitch? Alternative Q3- Which of the family members listed at Q2 are doubled up?</td>
<td>This has been discussed amongst the group and it is understood that in some boroughs/districts a family is able to occupy more than 1 pitch. This is primarily with larger households where if they residing on one pitch it would be deemed as overcrowded.</td>
<td>The purpose of this question is deemed relevant however; it will be amended to read ‘does this household occupy more than one pitch’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Organisation</td>
<td>Issue Raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>Extra questions-</td>
<td>When first discussed amongst the Surrey authorities it was considered that this questionnaire should just look at the need for new pitches as this information is collected by Gypsy Liaison Officers/Surrey County Council. There is concern that collecting this information may lead to false expectations that improvements are to be made to the site. Particularly on private sites whereby this question is irrelevant. Furthermore, there is the concern over the extra cost of gathering and analysing the data if such questions were added and consultants were used and how this data would be utilised.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed. As this issue has been raised by a few respondents the information from the previous GTAAs on site conditions will be included in a section within the final report. This information will be updated with any information provided from site managers and if any information is provided as part of the interview. This information is then available from one single source so that those with the responsibility for site management can use the information if they wish to secure funding for improving site conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy Liaison Officer, Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>Do you have access to basic services like electricity, water, toilet, washing facilities, shared or sole use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If doubled up, has your local authority threatened to or is in the process of evicting you?</td>
<td>Rather than adding this question and perhaps entering into long discussions regarding planning applications, appeals and action etc. it may be easier to discuss this with Development Control, Enforcement &amp; Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officers. If this issue is raised by the respondent additional information can be recorded at the end of the questionnaire.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>Q8- Not sure about this question. Everyone knows when a pitch is coming up.</td>
<td>It is understood this will be the case on public pitches where the Council/County Council is responsible for the waiting list. However, this is not the case on private sites - the local authority has no idea if a pitch changes hands, unless they apply to remove a personal permission/condition. Nevertheless, this question has been discussed amongst the group and it is not considered necessary as later on in the questionnaire the respondent is asked whether they intend to move</td>
<td>This question will be deleted from the Questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy Liaison Officer, Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Organisation</td>
<td>Issue Raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>Q9- How can this be answered with any kind of certainty</td>
<td>As the travelling population in Surrey tends to be settled it is unlikely that they will be much moving around. However, there could be instances where they have secured a pitch on an alternative site - to be nearer other members of the family and an element of supply could be introduced. It may also be the case that there are newly forming households and pitches may become vacant this way e.g. two households forming into one. There are limited elements of supply - this could be one of them and would be missed if the question were not asked.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>Q11- After “Type of Accommodation”- “what is your preference”</td>
<td>This should be added for clarity purposes. It should probably also be added under ‘where is the accommodation required’.</td>
<td>Amend the questionnaire as suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>It should be noted that Gypsies would be far more likely to prefer a pitch on private land but may not say this in case it prejudices their chance of obtaining a council pitch.</td>
<td>Noted. When asked it should be made clear that this does not prejudice their chances of obtaining/remaining a council pitch but is more of an indication as to how future sites should be delivered i.e. the mix between public and private provision.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>Extra question- Would you be willing to contribute towards</td>
<td>Adding this question could be getting into a conversation regarding finances/money which Gypsies and Travellers tend to see as a ‘taboo’</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Organisation</td>
<td>Issue Raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>the cost of building a new pitch if suitable land was found</td>
<td>subject.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>Q12 Do you have or know of any land………</td>
<td>This could result in a lot of unrealistic sites being suggested, many of which may not be owned by the respondent.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>Q18 Is this relevant bearing in mind the powers LPA's have to move people on</td>
<td>Powers local authorities have to move on the travelling community from land when they have pitched up without the benefit of planning permission are recognised. However, this question helps to understand whether they are just passing through (for which transit/temporary stopping places may be required) or whether they represent a concealed need for a permanent site in the area.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ryan</td>
<td>Additional Question - Is it your intention to make provision in a will for a family member to succeed to your pitch? The Mobile Homes Act 1983 allows succession rights. What this means is that where a resident dies then their spouse, or another member of their family living with them when they die, will inherit the agreement to live in the caravan/trailer on the pitch. If there is no family member living with the resident when they die, the person that inherits the home (either through a will or under the laws of intestacy) can sell the caravan and assign the agreement to live in the caravan on the pitch to the person that buys it, with the approval of the site owner. The person that inherits the caravan does not have the right to live in it on the pitch, or give it to a family member, unless the site owner</td>
<td>This information is considered by the Surrey authorities as too personal to ask. It could cause the respondent some concern and they may have further questions regarding this issue which the interviewer will not necessarily be able to answer. If this is a pertinent issue for the Gypsy and Traveller then it should be raised by those managing sites or discussed at the Surrey Gypsy and Traveller Community Relations Forum.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Organisation</td>
<td>Issue Raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **John Hockley**  
Joint Chair of the  
Surrey Gypsy and  
Traveller Community  
Relations Forum | I have looked through the questionnaire and wondered if there was any way to reduce the number of questions without affecting the potential outcome. | The questionnaire has been significantly shortened since the previous GTAAs were undertaken. The draft questionnaire has 21 questions whilst the West Surrey GTAA had over 100 questions and the North and East Surrey surveys approximately 60 questions. It should also be noted that for some respondents not all questions will be relevant e.g. questions relating to Travelling Showpeople and transient sites. These will therefore not be asked and will reduce the length of the survey. Caution will be taken when considering additional questions however; it is considered that reducing the number from those proposed would affect the potential outcome and could result in information being missed which is required to assess the need/supply of new pitches. | No amendments proposed. |
| **John Hockley**  
Joint Chair of the  
Surrey Gypsy and  
Traveller Community  
Relations Forum | As I mentioned before, trying to convince the travelling community that completing yet another questionnaire is vital to obtaining accommodation/services for the future is a tough task on the back of the GTAA failure, so making it more palatable may help. | Agreed. The purpose of this questionnaire and the work will need to be clearly explained to the community and local authorities will need to consider how to raise awareness and make this work more palatable. | Local authority representatives attended the Forum’s AGM in October to explain the questionnaire, consultation, and why it is important to be involved. |
| **John Hockley**  
Joint Chair of the  
Surrey Gypsy and  
Traveller Community  
Relations Forum | Who carries out the survey is also a tricky problem and I guess these issues and more is best discussed at the Forum AGM (hopefully this is good timing). This will be an agenda item and we will set aside a goodly amount of time to discuss the options and scope peoples’ views. | Agreed. | Local authority representatives attended the Forum’s AGM in October to seek views on who is best placed to undertake the questionnaire/interviews. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Organisation</th>
<th>Issue Raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monica Vidal</td>
<td>Question 8 can possibly be answered by the liaison officer servicing that site.</td>
<td>See the response to Comment 6.</td>
<td>This question will be deleted from the Questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Vidal</td>
<td>Questions 9 and 9a may seem a little intrusive, although people may not mind it, I would not know.</td>
<td>This is a similar question asked in the general housing needs surveys and was included in previous GTAAs. It is not believed that this question raised any issues when asked.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Vidal</td>
<td>After question 10 some of the questions appear very similar and as John Hockley suggested you may need to make the questionnaire shorter, or respondents will certainly wonder why you need to know so much to establish the need for more pitches.</td>
<td>See the response to Comment 14.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Smith</td>
<td>We are pleased that Surrey is looking to renew the Accommodation Assessment process and welcome the opportunity to comment at an early stage. This is very positive.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Smith</td>
<td>The previous process was handled at a time when Showpeople had great confidence in the intentions of the Government of the time and therefore the local authorities to deliver real improvements in their living conditions, but comments prior to and during the General Election campaign; the action of the Secretary of State in announcing the revocation of 04/2007 exactly one year ago with nothing in its place; and the document circulated for consideration on Planning for Travellers have eroded that confidence. Therefore a new series of assessments will have to overcome that feeling to gain the</td>
<td>This is a concern of the Surrey authorities and it is understood why some communities may hesitate to get involved/respond to the questionnaire. It is agreed that the questionnaire needs to be handled with care and a clear explanation regarding the process needs to be given to the travelling community to try and gain a meaningful response. It is hoped that as the Surrey authorities are looking to undertake this work, this will give some confidence to the travelling community. Also the fact that some pitches have been provided across Surrey in recent years may restore some faith. Admittedly the role of the Showmen’s Guild and that of other Gypsy and</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure continued liaison with travelling community representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Organisation</td>
<td>Issue Raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ray Smith           | confidence of people being interviewed that the information is not to be misused. There will have to be careful explanations of the process and the need for them.                                                                                                                                            | Traveller  
Representation Groups will be vital to ensure ongoing communication between the local authorities and Travelling Community.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Showmen’s Guild     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Support noted for the questionnaire to remain as a numbers/need exercise.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | In response to other comments received, information from the previous GTAA on site conditions will be included in a section of the final report. This information will be updated with any information provided from site managers and if any information is provided as part of the interview.  
This information is then available from one single source so that those with the responsibility for site management can use the information if they wish to secure funding for improving site conditions. |
| Ray Smith           | We agree that there is no need to include the background information on lifestyle in new assessments as this is held on file already, but should be a number exercise primarily to count needs. The background information and interviews should be required reading for Council officers dealing with the Travelling Communities as they give an insight into the life problems faced, but there is no need to repeat this. It has not changed. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | No amendments proposed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Showmen’s Guild     | The existing GTAAs should be used at present as the Councils’ base information and they should not await this new study before making plans for LDFs. After all, these were debated within Councils with Travelling groups, subject to consultation, and then examined at the EiP and even though the full outcome of that EiP process was not completed the mix of the local GTAAs and the EiP give current valid information and should not be lost. We therefore wish each council to publish the figure that they have as their existing “Need” and on which they are planning at present and allow us to comment if this is different from the previous GTAA. Such figures should only change when new | The existing GTAA’s provide some idea of need within each local authority area and went through a rather lengthy process of consultation/examination. The three previous GTAA sub-groups have read through the relevant sections of the GTAA and noted the Panel's criticism of the work. Moving forward with the next accommodation assessments the Surrey authorities are seeking to address the issues which the Panel particularly identified: overcrowding; turnover; housed travellers etc.  
At the moment the figures from the GTAA/Panel report are being used in the determination of planning applications/appeals but are not otherwise being used to plan for future provision within local authority areas. This is primarily as most Surrey authorities are getting their Core Strategy in place | No amendments proposed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Organisation</th>
<th>Issue Raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ray Smith</td>
<td>robust information is found. They are, as the Secretary of State said last August, a good starting point.</td>
<td>and changes to the national/regional planning policy framework have led to delays in preparing land allocations/site specific plans.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showmen’s Guild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure continued engagement with the Travelling Community and their representatives including on the draft methodology and results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We believe that in the interests of consistency the new exercise should be with the combinations of boroughs as before and this would fit with Duty to Co-operate. We also believe that the same exercise of round table meetings to review information as it comes in should be repeated as it was most helpful.</td>
<td>The 11 Surrey Boroughs and Districts will make every effort possible to ensure joint-working and will examine whether one County study or a number of smaller ‘sub-group’ studies can be produced rather than 11 individual surveys. So far the 11 local authorities have jointly-produced the questionnaire and the next step is to produce a joint methodology showing exactly how the information will be used and any assumptions being made. How the questionnaires is conducted i.e. in one group, smaller groups or on an individual basis, will very much depend on the resources available to each local authority and their proposed timetable for this work. The local authorities also found the use of round table meetings to review the information useful. Whether these can be re-established will be explored. Information could otherwise be disseminated and discussed virtually or through other appropriate means e.g. at the Travellers Forum. It is the intention to circulate a draft methodology to Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople representatives before this is finalised and the survey work undertaken.</td>
<td>Discuss amongst the Surrey authorities as to how the survey will be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Smith</td>
<td>I have concerns about having people named on the forms. The previous exercise was confidential and whilst clearly in some areas groups of showpeople would be identified as there are so few, it did not specify individual families.</td>
<td>See response to Comment 1.</td>
<td>A section on Data Protection has been included on the front page. This identifies that within the report no personal information relating to specific individual will be made public, and no individual will be identifiable through the description of where or how they live or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showmen’s Guild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Organisation</th>
<th>Issue Raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ray Smith</td>
<td>I also think that the specific questions about needs of families and how many places they will want on page 4 would seem like a housing application to some people who would think that being on this list will mean they will get somewhere to live, which it does not.</td>
<td>Agreed. The questionnaire needs to be handled with care and a clear explanation regarding the process needs to be given to the travelling community to try and gain a meaningful response and ensure there is no confusion. The interviewer will be clearly briefed prior to conducting the interviews.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showmen’s Guild</td>
<td>No amendments proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ray Smith           | They should be carried out by consultants as there is a natural suspicion between many travellers and local authorities as the main contact is often enforcement action and not a good basis for trust. People will be reluctant to declare the occupation levels of yards where there is overcrowding as they will fear eviction and enforcement. The last exercise, for the reasons described above of the different attitude to the Government and from the Government, and the fact that it was anonymous and done by independent persons, overcame this to some degree but not completely. | Noted.  
Discussions continue as to who is most appropriate to undertake the interviews. Possibilities include someone from the Travelling Community, a former Gypsy and Traveller liaison officer with an established rapport with the community or consultants. | No amendments proposed.  
Discuss amongst the group.  
It is proposed that the Travelling Community is asked directly who they consider is most appropriate to undertake the surveys.                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Organisation</th>
<th>Issue Raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Staines</td>
<td>We welcome this opportunity to comment not only on the questionnaire but also on future GTAAs in Surrey.</td>
<td>Support noted. As the response to comment 24 shows it is the intention of the Surrey authorities to circulate a draft methodology to Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople representatives before it is finalised and the survey work undertaken. Whether the joint-working forums of the local authorities and traveller representatives can be re-established will also be explored.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed. Ensure continued engagement with the Travelling Community and their representatives including on the draft methodology and results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Staines</td>
<td>As to the questionnaire it seems a sensible approach to restrict data collection principally to pitch needs. However, we are concerned that the questionnaire does not address issues of site conditions. In our view it should do this and not rely on a ‘gatekeeper’ to report on site conditions. This should be included as it is a vital part of assessing the needs for pitches.</td>
<td>See response to Comment 4. The questionnaire does allow additional comments to be made and points will be reported back to the relevant authority. In addition information regarding site conditions was provided as part of the previous GTAAs and can be used for site management purposes along with more up-to-date information which is collected by site managers.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed. As this issue has been raised by a few respondents the information from the previous GTAAs on site conditions will be included in a section within the final report. This information will be updated with any information provided from site managers and if any information is provided as part of the interview. This information is then available from one single source so that those with the responsibility for site management can use the information if they wish to secure funding for improving site conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Staines</td>
<td>We are concerned that the questionnaire asks no questions about future family formation and the likely need for pitches for newly forming families. It should be amended to do this. It should also contain questions as to whether the site and pitch is overcrowded and seek the views of the pitch occupants about overcrowding and the numbers of pitches needed to address overcrowding.</td>
<td>Question 17 addresses future family formation and clearly asks the question ‘are any members of your household likely to require their own pitch/plot in the District/Borough in the period to 2017 i.e. the next 5 years’. This is supplemented by additional questions including preferred location and type of pitch required (public or private). This question remains part of the finalised questionnaire (question 11).</td>
<td>No amendments proposed. Ensure continued engagement with the Travelling Community and their representatives including on the draft methodology and results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What constitutes an ‘overcrowded’ household is difficult to measure as this is a subjective issue. It is therefore proposed that a number of questions are asked regarding the composition of the household and the type and size of their existing accommodation and whether it is shared with another household(s).

From this information Surrey authorities will be able to objectively assess whether a household is overcrowded and the number of pitches required to address this issue. It is proposed that this process is undertaken alongside representatives from the Travelling Community who will be there to ‘check’ the assumptions made from the data/information collected.

This issue is addressed through questions 2 – 7 of the questionnaire.

The three Surrey GTAA Groups have reviewed the panel report and agree with the areas listed as to where the previous studies fell short.

In terms of addressing these issues the Surrey authorities intend to:

Conventional housing
- Where appropriate follow the good practice guidance published by Shelter on working with housed Gypsies and Travellers.
- Attend the Surrey Gypsy and Traveller Community Relations Forum to build relationships with the travelling community and help identify those in bricks and mortar housing.
- Work with Gypsy and Traveller representatives, educational and health services to identify those living in bricks and mortar housing.

No amendments proposed.

Include a detailed methodology on how the needs assessment/questionnaire was prepared and undertaken in the main report.

Ensure continued engagement with the Travelling Community and their representatives including on the draft methodology and results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Organisation</th>
<th>Issue Raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concluded that there were a number of areas where the GTAAs fell short generally and these included:</td>
<td>• Ask those Gypsies and Travellers living on-sites whether they know anyone in bricks and mortar housing that could be interviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs of Gypsies and Travellers in conventional housing.</td>
<td><strong>Unauthorised way</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travellers who have moved away from Surrey because of a lack of sites.</td>
<td>• The survey will include those who are camped in an unauthorised way. The additional questions specifically address this issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs from those camped in an unauthorised way.</td>
<td><strong>Vacancies and Turnover Rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The way that the GTAAs dealt with vacancies and turnover rates.</td>
<td>• Surrey authorities will be using vacancy and turnover rates which are relevant to their areas/groups rather than those which have been calculated as a regional average. This applies to public sites and it will be discussed with Travelling Community representatives how this is calculated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearly therefore there will need to be changes in how the future needs assessments are carried out to ensure that needs are fully captured. Failure to do so will simply continue the pattern of failure in the past which have lead to so many problems.</td>
<td>For those Gypsies and Travellers who have moved away from the area it is very difficult to establish need. If this were to be undertaken it would require a question being asked on whether any one being interviewed knew of anyone who had moved away but would like to return to the area. Contact details would then need to be provided – which may not be available, the local authorities would need to contact them where they could (a letter may not produce the results required), and interviews would need to be arranged. The logistics of this process would be difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is therefore disappointing that the consultation letter really makes no mention of these identified shortcomings and how they will be addressed. It merely asks about the items listed under next steps which do nothing to address the identified shortcomings of the past.</td>
<td>Furthermore, as the regional redistribution element has been removed due to the demise of the Partial Review – including those who have moved away from the District could result in ‘double-counting’ as they will be included in other accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In our view a detailed methodology needs to be developed with the full (and funded) involvement of local Gypsies and Travellers and supporting organisations as part of a project design group. We recommend that the approach taken by Chichester District Council is followed. Only with the full and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Organisation</td>
<td>Issue Raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close involvement of the Gypsy and Traveller community from the planning stage onwards will ensure that needs are fully identified and confidence of the Gypsy and Traveller population attained. We refer you to para 2.6 of the Panel Report:</td>
<td>2.6 <em>Even taking into account these caveats, we found the overall standard of the GTAA as a sound and credible evidence base for gypsy and traveller pitch accommodation needs to be very disappointing. By far the best was the in-house GTAA done by Chichester District Council prepared with assistance from several Council departments, FFT, the County Council Traveller Education Service (TES), the Primary Care Trust, a sites manager and a resident local authority site warden and a planning consultant with considerable expertise in gypsy and traveller matters. It was prepared over a period of 11 months in 2006 and clearly understood both the local circumstances and the accommodation needs of local gypsies and travellers from first hand knowledge. We trust that Surrey Councils will take these comments on board and proceed in the fashion outlined. We look forward to a positive response.</em></td>
<td>In preparing the draft questionnaire the Surrey authorities have consulted a number of Gypsy and Traveller representative groups including the Surrey Gypsy and Traveller Community Relations Forum. Members of the Forum include County Council Traveller Education Services, Health Professionals, and members of the Travelling Community. The GTAA prepared in-house by Chichester District Council has also been used as a good practice example. The Surrey authorities are confident that this work is being undertaken in a transparent manner and that the benefits of first hand local knowledge are being maximised. With regards to a detailed methodology it is agreed that this is something which should be drafted and consulted on with the Travelling Community and their representatives. As the response to comment 24 shows it is also the intention of the Surrey authorities to see whether the joint-working forums of the local authorities and traveller representatives formed as part of the previous GTAA work can be re-established.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice de la Rue Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group</td>
<td>Whilst I am pleased to see that the questionnaires are succinct, I am concerned that there is no qualitative data being collected, such as the condition of the site, location in relation to facilities and services or whether there is space for visitors (amongst other things):</td>
<td>See the response to Comment 4 and 30. As part of the preparation of site specific development plan documents consideration will be given to the suitability and availability of sites and the entire DPD will be subject to a sustainability appraisal. As this issue has been raised by a few respondents the information from the previous GTAA on site conditions will be included in a section within the final report. This information will be updated with any information provided from site assessments.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Organisation</td>
<td>Issue Raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other things, for example). I understand that this information may be collected via other routes, but such information can form a vital part of the evidence base. For example, a site may not be suitable but is being used because there is no alternative, or if there is no space for visitors, this could relate to unauthorised encampments. If this more detailed information is not collected in a co-ordinated way it can easily be overlooked, and it will be very difficult for members of the public to access that information when assessing the evidence base, even though it may be relevant. Sustainability appraisal requires that it is not just land use factors that are considered in planning, but the social and environmental aspects too, such as health and well being.</td>
<td>This will look at each proposed allocation in accordance with individual local authority’s sustainability objectives.</td>
<td>managers and if any information is provided as part of the interview. This information is then available from one single source so that those with the responsibility for site management can use the information if they wish to secure funding for improving site conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice de la Rue Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group</td>
<td>In terms of the coverage of any GTAA (or other study), then an approach which covers the whole county would be better than 11 isolated studies, because a broader view is gained. With the Regional element to be lost, there is still a great need for strategic working on the issue of site provision and a cross-county study could contribute to this. However, if 11 studies are to be carried out, then an alternative is that all the local authorities work jointly to ensure provision is made across the county once the findings have been collated. However one issue with this can be discrepancies between the way studies have been carried out, with arguments arising about the number of pitches needed in each district, which can hold up progress on delivery (though if the plan is silent or out of date, emerging</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed. Include a detailed methodology on how the needs assessment/questionnaire was prepared and undertaken in the main report. Ensure continued engagement with the Travelling Community and their representatives including on the draft methodology and results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See the response to comment 24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Organisation</td>
<td>Issue Raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice de la Rue Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group</td>
<td>The government policy would potentially be on the side of the applicant should that situation arise). On the issue of compiling 'robust evidence' that is not a GTAA, please be mindful that the Traveller PPS is only at the consultation stage at the moment, and that Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments are still required under the Housing Act section 225 (as well as within Circular 01/2006 and 04/2007). Many organisations, including local authorities, have objected to the proposal to delete reference to GTAAs for a great number of reasons. It would seem wise at this point to ensure that the approach to the assessment is in conformity with the GTAA guidance, or resources could easily be wasted should, in fact, the reference be retained. In terms of resources, it would also seem sensible to build on the existing GTAAs, reflect on the (unpublished) SE RSS report and identify weaknesses in the studies that way. Although the SE RSS report was never formally published, the GTAAs were scrutinised and robustly tested and again it would be a waste of resources to start from scratch and ignore that examination.</td>
<td>Noted. The three Surrey GTAA Groups have reviewed the panel report and agree with the areas listed as to where the previous studies fell short. These will be areas that are particular focused on to ensure that previous shortfalls are addressed as far as practical. See response to Comment 32. In drafting the questionnaire the Surrey Authorities have considered Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007, the draft PPS and guidance on undertaking a GTAA. In terms of the existing GTAA guidance particular attention has been paid to how current and future need may be identified i.e. how to calculate demand and supply. It is considered that the draft questionnaire asks the right questions for this information to be collected and analysed. The process of preparing the questionnaire and the issues which have been considered will be included in the methodology section of the report. This will be prepared in draft and consulted on with representatives from the Travelling Community.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed. Ensure continued engagement with the Travelling Community and their representatives including on the draft methodology and results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice de la Rue Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group</td>
<td>In terms of the most appropriate time to undertake a GTAA (or other study), then ideally a year should be taken. This would allow seasonal changes to be recorded. In order to maximise the response from the community, then interviewers from the community should be recruited.</td>
<td>Noted. Discussions continue as to who is most appropriate to undertake the interviews. Possibilities include someone from the Travelling Community, a former Gypsy and Traveller liaison officer with an established rapport with the community or consultants.</td>
<td>No amendments proposed. Discuss amongst the group. It is proposed that the Travelling Community is asked directly who they consider is most appropriate to undertaken the surveys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix twelve – Summary of feedback received on the draft Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Guildford borough and the response and action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent &amp; Organisation</th>
<th>Issue Raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Friends Families and Travellers, Emma Nuttall | The document looks good.  
A point our outreach worker who lives on the Ash site would like to raise is that only 3 households on the Ash site were interviewed. | We are grateful for the feedback on the draft TAA.  
Our records show ten representatives from households living on the Ash Bridge site were interviewed. One household was away travelling at the time of the interviews and three households were classed as no-contact sites – they were visited a minimum of three times at various times of the day and evening but without success. These three pitches are accounted for in part M of the study (paragraph 6.41 to 6.46) which looks at those sites where households were not interviewed. | Comments welcomed and noted, no further action.                                                                                                                                                         |
| Ray Smith, Showman’s Guild of Great Britain | Thank you for sending the draft which I have to say is an excellent document and well prepared. We will accept the figures, with the caveat that for the growth in the second period of one plot we believe this could be an underestimate considering likely family growth, but understand this will be reviewed in perhaps 5 years time to give a more accurate estimate. | Comments welcomed. We do hope to review the Traveller Accommodation Assessment at some stage in the future and recognise that the forecast for the period 2017 to 2027 is based on a calculation. | Comments noted. Anticipate reviewing the Traveller Accommodation Assessment at some stage in the future.                                                                                                 |
| Amanda Boyton, Surrey County Council | I am leaving my current post tomorrow and haven't been able to look at the attached. I have copied in Bobby Childs to this email incase there is anything that he would like to comment on.  
I will no longer be doing Gypsy and Traveller work for Surrey County Council, if you need any County Council support please email Robert Childs or Clare Neave. | As Amanda Boyton has forwarded the email on to Robert Childs for comment, no further action is required.                                                                                                                                                  | New contacts noted.                                                                                                                                                                                   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent &amp; Organisation</th>
<th>Issue Raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Robinson</td>
<td>I have just finished reading the draft of the Guildford Borough Traveller Accommodation Assessment. What a thorough piece of work has been carried out here! It holds a realistic view of the community within the Guildford Borough and the growing community as youngsters start requiring their own pitches/homes. Lets hope that areas can be sourced to cover the 43 pitches that are required by 2017. I have nothing negative to say about this report except that I hope this is taken notice of and that the pitches are provided in the future. Many thanks for sending it through to me.</td>
<td>We are very grateful for the time spent on reading the Guildford TAA and for the positive feedback. Work has started on a Travellers Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, which will look for suitable sites to accommodate the housing needs of travellers living in our borough.</td>
<td>Comments welcomed and noted, no further action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Piper,</td>
<td>Thank you for sending us a copy of your draft GTAA, which you will recall was the subject of our telephone conversation on Tuesday 9th September. I confirm that I do not have any detailed comments on the methodology or findings of the Assessment at this stage.</td>
<td>We are very grateful for the time spent reading the Guildford TAA and for getting back to us.</td>
<td>No further action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushmoor District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Hurtley,</td>
<td>Thank you for allowing me to see this. It is indeed a comprehensive assessment and interesting to read. I am pleased that the accommodation needs of the Traveller community are being recognised and considered. For the Traveller community and those of us who work with this community, the value and validity of this assessment will be evidenced by subsequent comments.</td>
<td>Comments are welcome and we appreciate the time taken to consider the Guildford TAA. Future work on identifying potential sites to provide new pitches and plots has started, with a Traveller Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment methodology agreed and a forum established. The two recent incursions by travellers mentioned were for various reasons. The travellers that stopped at the Tescos site did so as it was close to the</td>
<td>Comments noted, no further action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMA Lead Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Schools &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Directorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent &amp; Organisation</th>
<th>Issue Raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>action. I hope that in the near future we can all clearly recognise steps being taken to implement these proposals.</td>
<td>hospital and they wanted to be close to medical provision as they travelled to the Appleby Fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps the recent arrival of a large group of mobile Travellers into Guildford borough (on two occasions) suggests that the provision of a transit site should be further considered?</td>
<td>Whilst our priority in Guildford is to provide permanent pitches, we will keep the issue of transit sites under review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly a lot of work has gone into identifying the need and I feel sure that whatever assessment method is used, figures will vary as is the nature of a ‘transient’ population.</td>
<td>We are grateful for the time taken to consider the Guildford TAA and the feedback given.</td>
<td>Comments noted, no further action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect members of the forum would argue that people were missed and indeed it seems some that were traced would not contribute or were never available, so there will always be a ‘grey’ area in the stats.</td>
<td>We appreciate that there will never be a 100% response rate for a study of this nature, but we are pleased at the number of travellers who have taken part in the interviews.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accommodation need figures arrived at, seem plausible, but with current sites generally at full capacity, provision of new sites seems the only way to fulfil this need and I worry that the current planning process is weighted heavily against GRT applications with public hysteria likely to make it difficult for councillors to approve, whatever the location (as witnessed recently in Woking).</td>
<td>Part M of the study (paragraph 6.41 to 6.46) looks at those sites where households were not interviewed. We identified 12 Gypsy and Traveller households and three Travelling Showpeople households that were not interviewed. Out of these, we considered that three pitches were overcrowded and we included these pitches in the calculation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are starting to look at identifying potential sites to provide new pitches and plots. We have an agreed Traveller Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment methodology and a forum set up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for sending this – I felt very honoured that you asked for my comments! I have respected confidentiality and have not even mentioned to anyone that I have been contacted.</td>
<td>We appreciate the time spent reading the TAA and making suggestions, the feedback is really valued and useful.</td>
<td>Action – Review the suggestions made. Track appropriate changes to the TAA and seek agreement from the Head of Development in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Planning and Governance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have shown my comments as tracked</td>
<td>Recommend changes to the TAA to reflect comments where possible and appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs Morris
Local community representative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent &amp; Organisation</th>
<th>Issue Raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>changes on the attachment. I always hate doing it this way because it looks so tetchy and niggly and cross, whereas I don’t feel like that at all! My main comments are about use of language which I am sure you are alive to anyway, and care over use of ‘units’ (are you meaning household, pitch, family, individual etc). And there are a few juggling of phrasing but these are very minor. I hope some of it might help. Well done for a significant piece of work – I shall continue to watch with great interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>