

Summary of GTLP Draft Options Consultation Comments and Council Responses (7th August – 2nd October 2014)

Note: Where comments have been directly quoted, the text has been put in italics with quotation marks.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Tim Randles (Office for Nuclear Regulation)	0001
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<p>Gives details of the AWE Burghfield site (which lies to the west of the Borough) and the associated emergency planning and consultation zones which include parts of Shinfield and Swallowfield parishes. Future reviews may extend these zones and could have implications for the provision of additional mobile homes. ONR expect to be consulted on future applications in the relevant areas.</p> <p>It is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Gypsy and Traveller sites are located outside the AWE Burghfield emergency zone; b) The distance from the nuclear site should be taken into account when selecting Gypsy and Traveller sites, with a preference for sites that are further away. 	<p>These comments are noted. This has implications for Issue C (overall site distribution) and is already one of the criteria considered when assessing individual applications in policy TB10 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Amanda Turner (Headteacher - Shinfield Infant and Nursery School)	0002

Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option B (increase number of pitches on authorised sites) is preferred, due to impact on local schools and shortage of spaces in local schools - Issue C: Option B (more even spread of sites across the Borough) is preferred, as it is fairer to split evenly especially due to the above reason - Issue D: Option A is preferred, 5 year phased plan - Issue E: Option A is preferred, allocate reserve spaces - Issue F: (Travelling Showpeople sites) No – no need - Issue G: (Transit sites) No – no need - Issue H: (Site layout) Policy definitely needed and suggests liaising with other councils on this - Issue I: (Site boundaries/landscaping) As on Issue H - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) As on Issue H - Issue K1 and 2: (Site retention and restoration) Definitely use legal agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – impact on local schools and services is one of the criteria considered when assessing potential sites and applications (policy TB10 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan). However, this issue is also addressed through financial contributions which the Council currently seeks from developers and it is considered that option F (using a mixture of strategies including enlarging sites and possibly creating new sites) would allow more flexibility to ensure access to services/reduce impact on infrastructure by enabling different solutions to be tailored for the situation. • Issue C – noted. However, developer contributions are required to be put towards local infrastructure such as highways, schools, parks, libraries and leisure facilities; if more sites are located in an area, this would result in more funding for schools and other services. • Issue F – noted, however the need for Travelling Showpeople sites may change following the update to the GTAA. • Issues H-J – noted. Wokingham Borough Council will undertake ongoing work with other local authorities under the Duty to Cooperate. <p>The responses on issues B, D, E, G and K are noted.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Phil Lawman	0003
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option B (increase number of pitches on authorised sites) is preferred – do not want additional sites or unauthorised sites. If this does not meet the need then option A (enlarging authorised sites) can be considered as long as there are not more than 15 pitches on any one site. - Issue B: Option C (15 pitches or less) is preferred – meets Government guidelines and will allow maximum number of pitches on all sites. - Issue C: Option A (use existing distribution) is preferred to avoid more sites across the Borough. - Issue D: Option A (phase by 5 year periods) is preferred if expansion of existing sites is required. - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred as we need to plan for the expected number of pitches to meet demand - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred – should use existing site, but could make this larger if needed. - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred, otherwise this will encourage unauthorised stopping in the Borough. - Issue H: Option I (use existing Government guidance on site layout) is preferred as this already exists. - Issue I: Option D (use existing Government guidance on landscaping/boundaries) is preferred as this already exists. - Issue J: Option E (use existing Government guidance on amenity buildings) is preferred as this already exists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – it is agreed that unauthorised sites should be discouraged. However, option F (using a mix of options) would allow more flexibility to achieve this by enabling different solutions to be tailored for the situation as the need for sites changes over time. This should include options A and B, but also option C (creating new sites) and others if necessary. • Issue E – demand is not static and may change over time; allocation of reserve sites would enable the Council to plan for this. • Issue F –noted, however the existing Travelling Showpeople site in the Borough may be insufficient to meet possible future need • Issues H-J - it is considered that the GTLP offers the Council an opportunity to build upon the existing Government guidance (which does not always cover particular matters in detail or consider local context). On this basis creating more specific criteria-based policies would be beneficial in this regard. <p>The responses on issues B, C, D, G and K are noted.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Issue K (site retention): Option B(iv) (use a variety of methods to retain Gypsy and Traveller sites) is preferred as this is what the sites are being designated for.- Issue K (site restoration): Option B(iv) (use a variety of methods to ensure site restoration) is preferred.	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:		
Mrs L Ayres	0004		
Call for Sites			
Site name / number: N/A (site mentioned is outside the Borough and has not been formally submitted)			
Summary of Representation:		WBC response:	
The respondent (a Travelling Showperson) previously owned a property in Chalfont St Giles but was unable to obtain planning permission for it, although other sites in the near vicinity [of the site] have been granted permission. It is requested that this site be discussed as it would be ideal and the respondent and her family wish to settle and have a home on land they own without incurring costs to the Council.		The respondent's comments are noted. The Council is unable to consider a site that lies outside of the local authority's area for allocation (in this case, the site falls within the administrative area of Chiltern District Council). However, the Council is considering the provision for Travelling Showpeople in Wokingham Borough as part of the GTLP (Issue F).	

Respondent:	Representation no:
Peter Ratcliffe	0005

Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: The priority should be the needs of the Travelling community. If they think that the current pitch sizes on the current plots are too small then B (increasing pitch numbers) is not suitable and if the community thinks the sites are too small then A (enlarging sites) ought to be a priority. It is considered that the travelling community generally would prefer smaller sites with a greater choice of location and C (allocate new sites) is therefore preferred. - Issue B: Options A or B (5-10 pitches) would be preferred - see above comments - Issue C: Option B i) and iii) (split evenly between parishes and according to parish area) are preferred. It is noted that there are very few sites north of Wokingham, giving almost no facilities for travelling families that need to be based in this area. There are no sites in Remenham, Wargrave, Sonning and Twyford with only one in Charvil. These parishes make up over 20% of the area of Wokingham but have less than 4% of the sites for travellers. This cannot be giving travellers the choices they need. - Issue D: Phasing should be used so that the plans can be adjusted as time goes by to reflect the reality of what is happening in the future. - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred so that the Council can phase these in when they are needed. It is assumed that planning permission is going to be needed and there are bound to be local concerns which should be dealt with early to allow sites to be introduced when needed. - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred. You cannot have fairs and circuses in the borough and not provide somewhere for the workforce on these fairs to live but if there is no demand for sites from travelling showpeople then there seems no reason to provide them. This could 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – The respondent’s comments are noted. However option F (using a mix of options) would allow more flexibility to meet the needs of the Travelling community by enabling different solutions to be tailored for the particular situation. This would include new sites if required. • Issue C - The respondent’s comments are noted. However, some of the northern parts of the Borough are subject to constraints (e.g. Green Belt) that do not affect the south. In addition, the existing distribution has partly resulted from past applications made by the travelling community who may show preferences for certain areas (e.g. near family or services). Therefore it may not be possible to achieve a completely ‘even’ distribution. • Issue E – The allocation of reserve sites can serve as a more flexible alternative to the five year phasing of sites suggested in Issue D. It is agreed that in both instances the potential issues with a site should be overcome before any allocation takes place. • Issue F – Noted, however the need for Travelling Showpeople sites may change following the update to the GTAA. • Issues H-J – Noted. It is considered that the GTLP offers Wokingham Borough Council an opportunity to build upon the existing Government guidance (which does not always cover particular matters in detail or consider local context). Creating more specific criteria-based policies would be beneficial in this regard. <p>The responses on issues B, D, G and K are noted.</p>

<p>be reviewed in 5 years' time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred as there is no demand now, but this could be reviewed in 5 years' time. - Issue H: Option I (use existing Government guidance on site layout) is preferred, although the council should review this guidance to ensure that it is not inappropriate for Wokingham and adapt it to reflect unique local circumstances. Once adopted it must be followed. - Issue I: Option D (use existing Government guidance on landscaping/boundaries) is preferred. See comments on Issue H. - Issue J: Option E (use existing Government guidance on amenity buildings) is preferred. See comments on Issue H. - Issue K (site retention): Option B(iv) (use a variety of methods to retain Gypsy and Traveller sites) is preferred as these sites are created for travellers and gypsies and that is what they should be used for and the borough ought to use all the powers it has to ensure this. - Issue K (site restoration): Option B(iv) (use a variety of methods to ensure site restoration) is preferred – see comments above. 	
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Angela Gemmill (Marine Management Organisation)	0006
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:

UNCLASSIFIED

No comments.	This response is noted.
--------------	-------------------------

Respondent:	Representation no:
Emma Green (Buckinghamshire County Council)	0007
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
The consultation document suggests that a relatively low number of new pitches are required to accommodate Gypsy and Traveller communities throughout the Borough over the Local Plan period. Buckinghamshire County Council would therefore expect Wokingham Borough Council to plan to meet the need for these new pitches wholly within the Borough boundary.	These comments are noted. Wokingham Borough Council aims to meet its need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches within the Borough through site allocation and policies in the GTLP. The Council will continue to have on-going dialogue with Buckinghamshire County Council.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Steve Deveson	0008
Call for Sites	

UNCLASSIFIED

Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
It is an issue that most people do not have the ability to study much of the information relating to the GTLP consultation. It may be better to supply a list of major issues - such as the upkeep of the sites and the controls put on the users. Site occupants should respect the local community and not cause a drain on the Council's resources (such as those required to deal with unauthorised encampments). In addition it is hard to plan for numbers when the Travelling community are of a transient nature.	These comments are noted. Issues H-K (options for dealing with site layout and management, boundaries, amenity buildings, retention and restoration) are intended to address these issues and the consultation on the GTLP – as well as the plan itself once adopted - is intended to aid the integration of new and existing Gypsy and Traveller sites into the local community.

Respondent:	Representation no:
John Palmer (Representative of Haines Hill Estate, Twyford)	0009
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
There is not considered to be a reason to provide a further Gypsy and Traveller site in the area of Haines Hill, since the Council already has a large site at Ruscombe [Twyford Orchards] and the Haines Hill Estate provides a smaller site near Waltham St Lawrence.	These comments are noted. Please note that Waltham St Lawrence falls under the control of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead and therefore this site does not contribute towards meeting the accommodation needs of the Travelling community in Wokingham Borough.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Residents of Twyford Orchards, Twyford (Group of three people)	0010
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Don't want overcrowded pitches - Want to have enough space for families to stay together - Sites should be governed by rules and regulations 	These comments are noted. The various options presented under Issue A (methods to address Gypsy and Traveller needs), Issue B (site size) and Issue H (site layout and management) are intended to address matters such as preventing overcrowding (e.g. through providing new or larger sites) and how to support communities on sites (e.g. through having a resident warden).

Respondent:	Representation no:
Ms C (Resident of Twyford Orchards, Twyford)	0011
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	

Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Green space is important - The wishes of families must be taken into account (particularly the desire to stay together) - Drainage facilities must be provided - Expansion of sites can cause disruption for existing residents - Need to consider parking for commercial vehicles - Sites should be in walking distance of facilities - There should be smaller sites and more of them - Need space for children to play away from roads; provide crossings - Sites require proper maintenance 	<p>These comments are noted. Policy TB10 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan already has criteria that relate to proximity of sites to local services and this will help to inform approaches to site creation/distribution in the GTLP. The GTLP also intends to build upon existing policy with specific criteria-based policies that will include approaches to site size (see Issue B) and factors such as parking, infrastructure, maintenance and play space (Issue H – site layout and management).</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Ms R (Resident of Twyford Orchards, Twyford)	0012
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Don't expand existing sites – start from scratch and create new sites - No more than 14 pitches on any site - Sites should all have a warden (who lives on the site) - Transit sites are a good idea but they don't always stay as transit sites – 	<p>These comments are noted. Issue A (methods to address Gypsy and Traveller needs) includes the option to create new sites, although this could be considered as part of a mix of options – including site expansion where appropriate - depending on the situation. Issue B gives options on site size (option c: 15 pitches</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>however a warden could control this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sites should be local to all amenities – within walking distance - Want amenity blocks that are big enough to be flexible (e.g. space for larger washing machines) and want more room for storage in them - Six foot fencing between each family plot for privacy - Parking areas are a big issue – need more than one parking bay on each plot. Communal parking would have to be allocated and sectioned off - Would like to see play areas for children - Should introduce traffic management on sites 	<p>or less). Policy TB10 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan already has criteria that relate to proximity of sites to local services and this will help to inform approaches to site creation/distribution in the GTLP. The GTLP will also include specific criteria-based policies that will address matters such as the provision of transit sites (Issue G), amenity buildings (Issue J), boundaries (Issue I) and factors such as parking, maintenance and play space (Issue H – site layout and management).</p>
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr D (Resident of Twyford Orchards, Twyford)	0013
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Build more sites - but not big ones. Smaller sites are good - should have sites of about 10-12 pitches and these should be spread out to reduce overcrowding - Sites should be out of town but not too far out so that they are still within walking distance from facilities - The growth of Gypsy and Traveller community over time must be considered - Should have decent sized pitches and utility blocks – but nothing too large; too many facilities would be unnecessary - Should have play areas for children on rubber surface with equipment. 	<p>These comments are noted. Issue A of the Draft Options Paper (methods to address Gypsy and Traveller needs) includes the option to create new sites or enlarge existing ones, and Issue B gives options on site size (option b: 10 pitches or less). Policy TB10 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan already has criteria that relate to proximity of sites to local services and this will help to inform approaches to site creation/distribution in the GTLP, as will the publication of an updated GTAA that will identify the growth and resulting needs of the Travelling community. The GTLP will also include specific criteria-based policies that will address matters such as amenity buildings (Issue J) and factors</p>

	such as play space (Issue H – site layout and management).
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Ms B (Resident of Twyford Orchards, Twyford)	0014
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to the sites needs to be improved because of the problems caused by parked vehicles obstructing roads. Need to incorporate more car parking on pitches as many have lorries - New sites should not be isolated – should have ability to walk to shops - Sites should not be too close to main roads because of safety 	These comments are noted. Policy TB10 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan already has criteria that relate to proximity of sites to local services and this will help to inform approaches to site creation/distribution in the GTLP. The GTLP also intends to build upon this existing policy with specific criteria-based policies that will address factors such as parking, access and safety (Issue H – site layout and management).

Respondent:	Representation no:
Resident of New Acres, Wokingham Without	0015
Call for Sites	

Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sites need to be near services – otherwise have to rely on cars too much 	These comments are noted. Policy TB10 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan already has criteria that relate to proximity of sites to local services and this will help to inform approaches to site creation/distribution in the GTLP.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Residents of New Acres, Wokingham Without (Group of two people)	0016
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Occupants need their own individual utility blocks for washing facilities – much better than having to share in one communal block - Transit sites are a good idea [reference made to well-managed Brighton site which some occupants visit in the summer]. Site [in Brighton] has an access code on the gate which makes it safer and enforces 3 month time limit on occupancy - Size of site access is an issue – cannot get services like the bus [Mobile Children’s Centre bus] onto some sites 	These comments are noted. The GTLP will include specific criteria-based policies that will address matters such as the provision of transit sites (Issue G), size and number of amenity buildings (Issue J) and factors such as access and safety (Issue H – site layout and management).

Respondent:	Representation no:
Resident of New Acres, Wokingham Without	0017
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
- Transit sites are a good idea – with appropriate utilities [utility blocks with water supply, WCs etc.]	These comments are noted. Issue G of the Draft Options Paper asks about provision of transit sites and Issue J is about matters surrounding amenity buildings which will form part of criteria-based policies in the GTLP.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Resident of New Acres, Wokingham Without	0018
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	

Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Permanent base is needed in the winter; transit in the summer - Individual utilities - Avoid overcrowding 	These comments are noted. Issue A of the Draft Options Paper (methods to address Gypsy and Traveller needs) seeks to explore the different ways to address need for pitches that can result in overcrowding (including creating new sites or enlarging existing ones). Matters such as site layout and amenity buildings will also be addressed through the GTLP (see Issues H and J).

Respondent:	Representation no:
Residents of New Acres, Wokingham Without (Group of three people)	0019
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new council site with proper amenities would be good; permanent pitches - Sites should be bigger – more space - Play areas should be included otherwise children have nowhere to go; risk of playing near roads - Being within walking distance of services is preferable 	These comments are noted. Issue A of the Draft Options Paper (methods to address Gypsy and Traveller needs) includes the creation of new sites as an option, as well as the potential enlargement of existing sites. Option f would allow the Council to use a mix of methods to address Gypsy and Traveller needs. Issue H (site layout and management) also raises the issue of providing on-site play space. Policy TB10 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan already has criteria that relate to proximity of sites to local services and this will help to inform approaches to site creation/distribution in the GTLP.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Residents of Carters Hill, Hurst (Group of three people)	0020
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On-site park/play facilities for children - New sites should be in walking distance of facilities - No transit sites as occupancy cannot be controlled and they become permanent when people don't move on - Any transit sites should be separate from permanent sites to avoid safety issues - Need bigger utility blocks on each plot; baths not just showers; good build quality - Site maintenance is essential - Adequate drainage to prevent flooding - Car parking should be on pitches – - Management of sites is very important 	<p>These comments are noted - in particular the management of any potential sites (permanent or transit) and the need to ensure that facilities such as communal parking and utility blocks are fit for purpose. Issues H (site layout and management) and J (amenity buildings) identify factors that could be included in criteria-based policies in the GTLP to address these matters. Issue G relates to whether Wokingham Borough should seek to provide transit sites. Policy TB10 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan already has criteria that relate to proximity of sites to local services and this will help to inform approaches to site creation/distribution in the GTLP.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Resident of Highfield Park	0021

Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a need for sewerage/washrooms/outside toilets on each pitch as not all residents have these in their caravans - Street lighting would be good to have on sites for safety - Better security (to prevent strange cars etc. coming onto site) - Smaller sites are preferable - Sites should be in walking distance from facilities - There should be transit sites - There should be more Council-operated sites as these have rules and regulations that can be enforced - Play areas on sites are a good idea 	<p>These comments are noted. In order to govern issues such as site safety, provision of play areas, maintenance and amenity buildings, Issues H and J of the Draft Options Paper identify options that can be included in criteria-based policies in the GTLP. Issue G relates to whether Wokingham Borough should seek to provide transit sites. Policy TB10 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan already has criteria that relate to proximity of sites to local services and this will help to inform approaches to site creation/distribution.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Resident of Highfield Park	0022
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New sites are needed - More Council-operated sites – close to schools and facilities - Need sufficient parking space for visitors - Pitches need to be large enough for family to visit - Play areas for children are a good idea 	<p>These comments are noted. Issue A of the Draft Options Paper (methods to address Gypsy and Traveller needs) does identify the creation of new sites as an option which could be considered alongside other options depending on the situation. Other matters such as parking, play space and site layout (including pitch size) are raised in Issue H (site layout and management) and can be incorporated into future criteria-based policies in the GTLP.</p>
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Resident of Highfield Park	0023
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need new Council-operated sites - Safety and security are important – street lighting and fire hydrants - Play areas are a good idea, with seating for residents [communal space] - The size of sites is less important than their layout – allow people to maintain their own plots - Individual pitches should have 6/7ft fences to provide privacy and security - Utility blocks are needed 	<p>These comments are noted. Issue A of the Draft Options Paper (methods to address Gypsy and Traveller needs) does identify the creation of new sites as an option, although the ownership of such sites would be determined at application stage. Issue I includes consideration of boundary treatments; it should be noted that any future policy will have to balance the need for privacy with the enclosing nature of high boundaries which can affect community cohesion. Issues H and J also raise matters around site safety and amenity buildings for potential inclusion in the GTLP.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

Respondent:	Representation no:
Resident of Walkers Yard	0024
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Pitches need a place for laundry/washroom- Children's play areas	These comments are noted. Issues H (site layout and management) and J (amenity buildings) raise matters relating to play space and washing facilities for potential inclusion in future GTLP policies.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr H Payen (Plot 7, Walkers Yard, Eversley Road, Arborfield)	0025
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option A - make current sites larger (but this would have to be judged by merit) - Issue B: Depends on the situation and how the sites are designed - Issue C: Not offering new sites - existing - Issue D: Phasing is a good idea – make sure there is supply in future - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred [for the reason given above] - Issue F: Unsure – not clear on how to define Travelling Showpeople - Issue H: Option I (use existing Government guidance on site layout) is preferred as it already covers issues like parking and spacing on plots [fire safety guidance] - Issue I: Option A (type of boundary treatments) is important – need to follow fire safety regulations - Issue J: Options A and B (number and size of amenity buildings) needs to be considered. Especially when it comes to space for appliances like washing machines – there are site occupants who have to keep machines outside. - Issue K (site retention): Option B(iv) (use a variety of methods to retain Gypsy and Traveller sites) is preferred. - Issue K (site restoration): Option B(iv) (use a variety of methods to ensure site restoration) is preferred. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A - It is agreed that sites need to be judged on an individual basis in terms of factors such as size (Issue B); the solutions are appropriate for dealing with need will also vary across areas of the Borough (Issue C – site distribution) and over time (Issues D – phasing - and E – reserve sites). • Issue J - It is acknowledged that modern sites need to consider the use of individual utility blocks for more than just washing facilities. <p>The responses on issues B, C, D, E, F, H, I and K are noted.</p>
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Resident of Highview	0026
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	

Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a need for new sites - Special play areas are not required - Need to be in walking distance of schools for those without cars - Sites should not all be in one area – they should be spread out 	These comments are noted. The distribution of sites is the result of a number of factors, some of which may be out of the Council’s control (such as a private individual making an application on land that is suitable). The potential provision of play areas is raised in Issue H (site layout and management).

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Inge Taylor	0027
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Options B and C (increase number of pitches on authorised sites and allocate new sites) is preferred, to make use of what is already there without causing additional building and changed use of land. - Issue B: Option C (15 pitches or less) is preferred as this is a good size for travellers to live together without sites dominating existing settlements - Issue C: Option A (use existing site distribution as a guide) is preferred as the existing sites are already established - Issue D: Option A (phasing) is preferred to see how things progress - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred but in consultation with local residents - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred as it would be better to have sites local people have had a say on than unauthorised sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – new site allocations are likely to result in a change in the use of land, but this would only take place if the land in question is judged to be suitable for such a change. • Option C – noted. However, it may not be possible to rely solely on expanding existing sites or finding new sites in established areas • Issue E – all site allocations will take place after consultation with local residents and other consultees • Issue K2 – it should be noted that this policy would be intended for use when the Gypsy and Traveller community no longer require a site – at which point its use would cease and it could be restored back to its original condition.

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) – not sure what these are - Issue H: (Site layout) All of the matters listed should be considered in a policy so that the Council have control rather than relying on central government guidance - Issue I: (Site boundaries/landscaping) As on Issue H - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) As on Issue H - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B (seek to retain sites in Gypsy and Traveller use) as the Gypsy and Traveller community like to live together and other people do not tend to live on the sites - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (require that a site is restored to its original condition through a mix of methods) to encourage respect for the facilities provided 	<p>The responses on issues B, D, F, G, H, I, J and K1 are noted.</p>
---	--

<p>Respondent:</p>	<p>Representation no:</p>
<p>Mrs Sherrie Kempster (Resident of The Paddocks, Kybes Lane, Shinfield)</p>	<p>0028</p>
<p style="background-color: #f2f2f2;"></p>	
<p>Call for Sites</p>	
<p>Site name / number: N/A</p>	
<p style="background-color: #f2f2f2;"></p>	
<p>Summary of Representation:</p>	<p>WBC response:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should look to extend existing sites (making them permanent where applicable), recognising the importance of keeping families together. Many Travelling families want this - Amenity blocks are essential – these should have space for a kitchen, washing facilities and living space (but not to be used for sleeping in) - Private sites can supply play areas for their own children (as long as they have 	<p>These comments are noted. Issue A of the Draft Options Paper (methods to address Gypsy and Traveller needs) does identify the expansion of existing sites as an option; sites with temporary permission can currently apply for permanent permission and this will be assessed, although having specific criteria in the GTLP will aid this assessment process. Issues B, H and J all raise the issues of site size,</p>

<p>the space)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The maximum size for Council sites should be about 18-20 pitches 	<p>layout (including play space) and amenity buildings and how these might be addressed in policies in the GTLP.</p>
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr and Mrs Ray (Residents of The Paddocks, Kybes Lane, Shinfield)	0029
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Families want to stay together; they will try to do this if they can obtain planning to increase the number of pitches on the site - Transit sites are best located on established sites where family/friends can monitor their use. Having transit sites in isolated locations can cause problems with people showing up and causing trouble; that can then prevent others from using the site and result in pitches being left vacant - Proper control of sites is needed – but equally having too much control (e.g. wardens, gates and camera surveillance) can make a site feel like a prison which is not pleasant - Sites should be run and managed by members of the Gypsy and Traveller community – their knowledge would be better to maintain security and ensure residents respect the site - It is best to work with existing sites where residents already know each other – where there is already an established community – and look to develop these e.g. through expansion to accommodate growing families - It is not essential to have sites in walking distance of services if family/friends 	<p>These comments are noted. Issue A of the Draft Options Paper (methods to address Gypsy and Traveller needs) includes the creation of new sites as an option, as well as the potential enlargement of existing sites. Issue G relates to whether the Council should provide transit sites, and the factors included Issue H (site layout and management) such as safety and maintenance would affect both permanent and transit sites in any future policy in the GTLP.</p>

with cars can help one another with lifts etc.	
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs E Halson (Swallowfield Parish Council)	0030
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option F (a mix of options to deal with Gypsy and Traveller need) is preferred, with the following comments: Options a) and b) - no site should become too big Option c) - some new sites must be allocated to avoid existing sites becoming too big Option d) - planning permissions [for suitable unauthorised sites] will be essential to ensure that the most suitable sites are chosen <p>The Parish Council do not agree with option e (removing personal conditions on sites). It would be preferred to see a specific site or a designated part of a site or sites for those just travelling through an area (and such transit areas will be needed).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue B: Option A is preferred, though the need for a few of option B (5 pitches or fewer, with no more than 10 pitches in one area). Less than 5 pitches is considered more desirable, as it helps avoids overcrowding or sites dominating an area which is better for social integration. <i>'Most importantly, it</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – In terms of option E the removal of a personal occupancy condition from a site would not automatically change the nature of the site from permanent to temporary/transit occupation. The site could still be permanently occupied, just by any Gypsy and Traveller (not solely a named person). • Issue C – The Council acknowledges that sustainability – particularly access to services - is a key issue that must be considered when assessing any sites. This would always be a factor considered with each site in combination with any overall approach to distribution in the Borough, such as the existing requirements of policy TB10 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan. • Issue G – The Council is aware that a dedicated policy and clear, enforceable regulation/management would be required for any potential transit sites. The purpose of such sites would be to address the issues that the Parish Council has raised (unauthorised encampments and tensions between the settled community and Travellers). The Council is committed to continue working with neighbouring local

must BE one caravan per pitch, not multiple caravans on one pitch. Enforcement by WBC is important.'

- Issue C: The Parish Council feels strongly that option B is most appropriate. The current distribution is very uneven. Finchampstead should not have any more; Swallowfield has a number within it or in neighbouring parishes. The most important thing must be to look for suitable sites, so that Travellers are spread fairly evenly across the borough. Area is a better criterion than population size; the important thing is to find sites. The Parish Council fail to see why these (options a – c) are the only criteria mentioned. *'While all are laudable attempts at 'fairness', the Plan states the need for access to key services (especially education, health and transport) so this sort of sustainability needs to be taken into account. This may require significant investment in other services. In Swallowfield, for example, the country lanes are ill suited to caravans and large vehicles (as WBC has been made only too well aware in the past year) and local public transport links are meagre. While there is a medical practice, it is already oversubscribed, as is the Parish's primary school, Farley Hill School, which is increasingly unable to take Swallowfield children, who therefore have to go to Shinfield or Arborfield Parishes (mainly Lambs Lane, sometimes The Coombs). The shortage of primary school places in Shinfield is well documented and being addressed but for an already expanding housed population. While there is a new secondary school, Oakbank, in Shinfield Parish, there are no public transport links to it from any part of Swallowfield Parish.'*
- Issue D: Phasing seems sensible, if there is no need for all the sites at present. Over-provision, before it is needed, could encourage more in-migration.
- Issue E: Yes to reserve sites, as long as they are only used if necessary at some time in the future. It makes sense to come up with a long term plan as this will enable Gypsy and Traveller needs to be taken into account when other development priorities are discussed. Reserve sites could be subject to change if necessary.
- Issue F: (Travelling Showpeople sites) No – the GTAA has identified no need in

authorities as this is a cross-boundary issue.

- Issue J - It will be important to refer to Village Design Statements (and also potential Neighbourhood Plans as these emerge) in the assessment of sites.
- Issue K1 - It was intended that this question would focus on the retention of sites in Gypsy and Traveller use after permission is granted (to ensure that non-Gypsies and Travellers do not occupy authorised sites and prevent Gypsy and Traveller from accessing pitches in the Borough). Such retention would last until the Gypsy and Traveller use of the site ceased.

The responses on issues B, D, E, F, H, I and K2 are noted.

the area at present.

- Issue G: (Transit sites) Yes. Despite the GTAA identifying no need for transit sites, this is not Swallowfield Parish Council's recent local experience. There have been considerable issues recently with travellers 'passing through', apparently making their way to a communal event and then back along the same route. As there was no transit site for them to go to legally, they camped illegally on private land, creating bad feeling with land owners.
There is concern that transit sites will attract Travellers who will occupy the sites permanently. However, the provision of a policy and rules such as maximum length of stay should make this easier to regulate and enforce.
The Parish Council are glad to see that there is communication among the 5 Berkshire authorities and see a need for *'concerted action to provide a series of transit sites to facilitate movement on from one site to another. However, we would strongly suggest that there is also cross-county communication to ensure appropriate distribution of sites.'*
- Issue H: (Site layout) Wokingham Borough Council should develop its own policies, as it does in so many other areas of regulation and planning, based on the available guidance. This is essential to aid enforcement and appeals as policies carry more weight than guidance.
These policies and procedures should address all the areas identified (options a-h). In particular: a) pitch size. *'The aim must be to avoid contravention of the intention of a finite number of caravan dwellings determined by the number of pitches. The Plan refers to pitch size as an area with no fixed guidance and we suggest WBC devises its own set of rules.'*
- Issue I: (Site boundaries/landscaping) As on Issue H
- Issue J: (Amenity buildings) As on Issue H – though there may be more leeway on such a policy in terms of overall parameters. Note should be taken of existing Village Design Statements.
- Issue K1: (Site retention) The question is a bit unclear. *'Yes (in the sense implied by section 5.17 of the Plan commentary) the sites should be retained, once identified and used, at least for a reasonably long period of time e.g. 20*

<p><i>years. After that, it is likely that 2014 planning will be out of date. If they are not retained, this exercise will have to be repeated next time there is a need. This can be done by a mix of i) to iii).</i></p> <p><i>If the question is asking whether sites should be reserved only for Gypsies and Travellers, as seems to be the case from part b) above, we also say Yes. These are being set up as dedicated Gypsy and Traveller sites and it will muddy the waters if they are also open to, for example, mobile home owners. It will not be clear whose needs are paramount and the process of finding more Gypsy and Traveller pitches may have to begin again. This can be done by a mix of i) to iii).'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue K2: (Site restoration) It is very important that sites be restored to their previous condition by a mix of options i) to iii) (legal agreements, conditions and GTLP policy). 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Katy Dagnall (Finchampstead Parish Council)	0031
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option G (other). <i>'As 46% of Wokingham Borough Gypsy and Traveller population are sited in Finchampstead Parish, no more should be added.'</i> - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches or less) is preferred as this would be easier to manage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues A and C – It is acknowledged that Finchampstead Parish has a higher concentration of existing Gypsy and Traveller population in the Borough. However, factors such as the presence of established existing sites that may have scope for expansion and the views of the Gypsy and

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue C: Option B(i) – split evenly between each Parish - Issue D: Option A (phasing) is preferred as the Council would have a measure of control - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred so that the local population is aware of these sites and can comment on them. This would avoid the Council running out of sites and new sites being allowed at appeal. - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred. <i>'Not in Finchampstead - this is not a traditional area for travelling show people.'</i> - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred. <i>'Not in Finchampstead - this is not traditionally a transit site. Difficult to monitor, and could put new pressure on allocated sites, if the transit travellers decide to stay.'</i> - Issue H: (Site layout) Use existing government guidance - Issue I: (Site boundaries/landscaping) As on Issue H - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) As on Issue H - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B (seek to retain sites in Gypsy and Traveller use) - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(ii) (require that a site is restored to its original condition through the use of legal agreements); <i>'e.g. asking for a retainer on first occupation of the land, which can be forfeited if not left in the proper state and used to restore the land if necessary. This is similar to the deposit system used on rented accommodation.'</i> <p>No comment is made on the SA/SEA but it is noted that sites should meet sustainability objectives.</p>	<p>Traveller community, alongside other factors such as Green Belt (which could limit development in other areas of the borough) (who may wish to locate near to family already living in the Borough) will need to be considered when allocating sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue G –Whether there have been such sites in the past would not necessarily affect future provision should a need be identified. • Issue K2 – it should be noted that this policy would be intended for use when the Gypsy and Traveller community no longer require a site – at which point its use would cease and it could be restored back to its original condition. It is not intended as a punitive measure to take a site away if it is not properly used / maintained. <p>The responses on issues B, D, E, F, H, I, J and K1 are noted.</p>
---	--

<p>Respondent:</p>	<p>Representation no:</p>
<p>Mr Ray Bryant (Hart District Council)</p>	<p>0032</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<i>'Hart anticipates that such needs would be met within the Wokingham council area. A clear rationale would be expected from the Borough Council should any sites on the boundary or close to Hart district be proposed at the next stage, with explanation of how impacts on Hart would be identified and mitigated.'</i>	Wokingham Borough Council aims to meet its need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches within the Borough through site allocation and policies in the GTLP. Any allocated site will be fully assessed with regard to its impact on neighbouring local authorities should it be in proximity to the Borough boundary. The Council will continue to have on-going dialogue with Hart District Council.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Maddy Bristow (Earley Town Council)	0033
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<i>'The above document was discussed by Councillors at a recent meeting of the Town Council's Planning Committee. After considering the document, Councillors resolved not to comment on it.'</i>	This response is noted.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Heather Lewis (Senior Conservation Officer (Berks) – Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT))	0034
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<p>- <i>Issue A: Overarching comments for development site allocation:</i> <i>'As a wildlife conservation charity, the Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust are concerned with ensuring the protection and enhancement of the natural environment on and adjacent to any sites proposed for development.</i> <i>'A full evaluation of biodiversity impacts of each proposed development site is only possible on provision of appropriately detailed up to date habitat and species survey reports. Such reporting would be expected to form a core part of any planning decision making process.</i> <i>'It is the Local Authority's responsibility to ensure the provision and evaluation of this appropriate, up-to-date environmental information about each preferred development site. This data is required to enable objective decision-making for sustainable development, of which retention and enhancement of biodiversity is a key test.'</i></p> <p>The NPPF requires sustainable development that contributes to and enhances the natural environment, including biodiversity; <i>"allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value"</i> (NPPF, paragraph 17). <i>'Section 40(1) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 also creates a duty for every public authority to "have regard" to biodiversity whilst exercising its functions.'</i> BBOWT looks forward to being consulted further on all preferred development sites</p>	<p>The assessment of impacts on biodiversity, protected species and habitats (including the Special Protection Area (SPA)) will form an integral part of the site allocation process, in accordance with Core Strategy policy CP7 (Biodiversity) and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy TB23 (Biodiversity and Development), with sensitive sites being considered less suitable unless appropriate avoidance and/or mitigation measures can be implemented. Such measures will be identified prior to any allocation of a site in the GTLP to ensure that the site is suitable and deliverable in future.</p> <p>Wokingham Borough Council will have regard to all relevant legal obligations and national and local policy requirements during the production of the GTLP.</p> <p>All of the comments on issues A-K and the preferred options are noted.</p>

that are identified.

Allocation of sites must also meet all relevant legal and national policy obligations, including policy CP7 of the Core Strategy, with regard to protected habitats and species and have regard to the objectives of Berkshire Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, and policy CP8 with regard to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.

'During the planning process for proposed development sites, we would expect to see consideration of impact avoidance and where avoidance cannot be achieved, implementation of mitigation measures, to ensure that the development will proactively contribute to protecting and enhancing protected species or sites as well as the wider natural environment.'

In the absence of effective impact avoidance or mitigation measures, site allocation in the GTLP may be considered unsound.

- Issue B: (Site size) No comment
- Issue C: (Site distribution) No comment
- Issue D: (Phasing) No comment
- Issue E: (Reserve Sites) No comment
- Issue F: (Travelling Showpeople) No comment
- Issue G: (Transit Sites) No comment
- Issue H: (Site Layout) No comment

- Issue I: (Site boundaries/landscaping) All proposals for site landscaping should be in line with the national policy obligations of the NPPF and CP7 of the Core Strategy to enhance the natural environment and incorporate biodiversity.

- Issue J: (Amenity buildings) No comment
- Issue K1: (Site retention) No comment

- Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option iv (mix of methods) is preferred. The Council should seek site restoration to promote local biodiversity through the most effective mechanism, such as legal agreements or pre-commencement conditions. As per previous comments, all site landscaping should meet legal and policy obligations (NPPF and CS policy CP7) to protect and enhance biodiversity.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Judith Neuhofer (Barkham Parish Council)	0035
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<p><i>A completed comments form and covering letter have been submitted by Barkham Parish Council. It is noted that the letter is a modified copy of a letter that was previously submitted by Barkham Parish Council for the consultation on the GTLP Draft Scoping Report in July-August 2013. The date of the letter (19th August 2013) has been removed and parts of the text altered, but the contents of the letter remain fundamentally the same as that previously submitted and do not relate to the current GTLP Draft Options consultation.</i></p> <p>Comments Form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option E (where appropriate, allow any Gypsy and Traveller to live on authorised sites) is preferred, as the Parish consider it is more appropriate for Travellers to live on regulated sites - Issue B: Option B (10 pitches or less) is preferred as pitches should be kept to a small, manageable size to encourage community integration - Issue C: Option B(i) (more evenly between each Parish) is preferred, as it will prevent large sites clustering in one area and encourage community integration - Issue D: Option A is preferred, 5 year phased plan. Sites have been granted permission; the issue of non-Gypsies and Travellers on sites needs to be addressed - Issue E: Option B is preferred (do not allocate reserve spaces) – this should not 	<p>Wokingham Borough Council's previous response on Barkham Parish Council's letter was as follows: <i>'The purpose of the Sustainability Appraisals (SA) Scoping report is not to set pitch numbers. The GTAA is a technical document which has been undertaken to inform the GTLP, and whilst it has assumed that the site occupancy remains as is for the purposes of the assessment, this is not the Council's agreed position in relation to the issue of enforcement. The Council takes the issue of non-Gypsy and Traveller occupation seriously and is seeking advice on how best to address this issue.</i></p> <p><i>'Comments noted re consultation - this is an early stage of consultation and there will be further opportunities to comment. The Council does wish to ensure that the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan is in place as soon as reasonable practicable to ensure that we have a deliverable supply of sites. Therefore, this will mean that consultation may take place over school holidays.'</i></p> <p>Regarding the responses on the Draft Options comments form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – Option E does not relate to all Gypsy and Traveller sites, just those where there is an existing personal occupancy condition that could be varied to allow Gypsies and Travellers other than a named occupant and their family to live on the site. • Option C – noted. However, some Parishes do have more constraints

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>be necessary due to non-Gypsy and Traveller occupation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue F: (Travelling Showpeople sites) No – Showpeople would not require a permanent site - Issue G: (Transit sites) No – this will encourage Travellers to stay on the site rather than moving on to permanent sites - Issue H: (Site layout) All of the identified issues are important to any Gypsy site policy - Issue I: (Site boundaries/landscaping) All of the identified issues are important to enable sites to blend in to the local landscape. Correct positioning of boundaries is important (ref. Bearwood Road site). - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) All of the identified issues are basic requirements - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B is preferred (legal agreements, conditions and policy) to ensure authorised sites are occupied by Gypsies. Non-Gypsy and Traveller occupation should be enforced against. - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B is preferred (legal agreements, conditions and policy) to ensure sites are restored after use, otherwise these would become derelict. <p>Additional comment: Applications for housing on Gypsy and Traveller sites should be refused as this would reduce the supply of pitches.</p>	<p>than others that may affect more even distribution (e.g. urban areas or Green Belt).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue F – Travelling Showpeople are a defined group who also require particular facilities to enable their way of life. This includes permanent sites for the storage of fairground rides/equipment, particularly during the winter months. • Issue G – Concerns about the issue of transit sites are noted. • Issue H – This point is noted, • Issue K1 – The Council will continue to seek to use the most appropriate mechanisms to ensure current and future planning compliance relating to Gypsy and Traveller sites. <p>The responses on issues B, D, E, I, J and K2 are noted.</p>
--	---

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mary Tomlinson (Thames Valley Team - Natural England)	0036
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	

Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<p><i>European Sites:</i> Along with reference to avoidance and mitigation in CP8 policy regarding the TBHSPA, mention should also be given in the Document to the ‘no net residential gain permitted zone of 400m’ from the TBHSPA, as dictated also in CP8 and of course in retained South East Plan policy NRM6. It would therefore be worth specifically stating in the document at the benefit of this early stage that no pitches will be situated within 400m of the TBHSPA, as Natural England would view pitches to constitute permanent residential gain in the vast majority of instances. The areas in this 400m catchment would be a small area of the Borough around the Broadmoor to Bagshot Woods and Heaths SSSI, and also an area around the Bramshill SSSI, both Sites in the south of the Borough.</p> <p><i>SSSIs:</i> In addition, in terms of the 4 SSSIs (Heath Lake, Longmoor Bog, Sandford Mill, Lodgewood and Stanford End Mill and River Loddon), and any SSSIs in neighbouring Boroughs, it would be worth making it clear / outlining at this stage that any potential pitches will be situated away from any locations which may have any net adverse impacts upon said SSSIs, and backing this up with related policy as required.</p> <p><i>Protected species:</i> Reference should also be made at this stage to the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (amended 2012) in the allocation of sites for pitches.</p> <p><i>Biodiversity, priority species, Local Sites:</i> In terms of general biodiversity, the Authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity in the Borough the consideration of allocation pitches. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the NPPF. Additionally, we would draw your attention to Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that ‘Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity’. Section 40(3) of the same Act also states that ‘conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat’.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. The assessment of ecological impacts will form an integral part of the site allocation process to ensure that sites are suitable and deliverable in future, in accordance with Core Strategy policy CP7 (Biodiversity) and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy TB23 (Biodiversity and Development). Wokingham Borough Council will have regard to all relevant legal obligations and national and local policy requirements during the production of the GTLP.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<p><i>Rights of Way, Access land, and National Trails</i> <i>The Document should also consider potential impacts on access land, public open land, and rights of way in the vicinity of the potential pitch sites.</i></p> <p><i>Ancient Woodland</i> <i>Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable resource of great importance for its wildlife, its history and the contribution it makes to our diverse landscapes. Local authorities have a vital role in ensuring its conservation, in particular through the planning system. The Document should have due regard to the requirements under the NPPF (Para. 118)2, in the consideration process for the allocation of pitches.</i></p> <p><i>Landscape:</i> <i>Both local landscape and nationally designated landscape should be a consideration in the allocation of pitches. In terms of nationally designated landscape, the Chilterns AONB runs adjacent to some parts of the Borough's northern boundary, and also a wider proportion of the Borough's northern area would be considered to be within the setting of this AONB, Consideration of the AONBs Management Plan and its special qualities must form part of the considerations in the allocations of pitches.</i></p> <p><i>For any of the above elements, if predicated effects are adverse and cannot be mitigated against sufficiently then alternative sites must be considered and preferred, in line with the requirements of the SEA process.'</i></p>	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Amanda Sculley (Binfield Parish Council)	0037
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:

UNCLASSIFIED

'Binfield Parish Council would welcome an opportunity to comment on any proposal with 7.5 miles of the parish boundary.'	These comments are noted. Any consultations will be assessed with regard to their impact on neighbouring local authorities/councils.
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Sarah Barnard	0038
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option C (allocate new sites) is preferred because existing sites are inadequate to meet needs. - Issue B: Option B (10 pitches or less) is preferred because smaller sites have less impact on local people and resources. - Issue C: Option B(ii) (split according to population of each Parish) is preferred, as it would ensure that numbers did not disproportionately affect those in larger but less populous areas [see additional comments below]. - Issue D: Uncertain what this question means; would there be more sites every five years? - Issue E: Option B is preferred (do not allocate reserve spaces) - Issue F: (Travelling Showpeople sites) No - Issue G: (Transit sites) What is a transit site? - Issue H: (Site layout) All of the issues should be considered. <i>'Use the government guidance as a base and layer with local policies as applicable to the borough.'</i> - Issue I: (Site boundaries/landscaping) All of the issues should be considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue C (and further comment) – The concern about numbers of sites in rural parishes is noted. The Council has to consider many factors in site assessment including where there is available land that is suitable for sites, as well as how sustainable proposed/existing sites are (in terms of access to services as well as their relationship to adjoining settlements). • Issue D – Phasing is intended to stage the delivery of the sites allocated in the GTLP (so that some of the overall number of allocated sites are released to be developed every five years). • Issue F – Travelling Showpeople also require permanent sites for the storage of fairground rides/equipment, particularly during the winter months when they are not travelling to shows/fairs. • Issue G – Transit sites are defined in the Glossary (which is available online and in the GTLP Draft Options Paper). <p>The responses on issues A, B, E, H, I, J and K are noted.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<p><i>'Use the government guidance as a base and layer with local policies as applicable to the borough i.e. Sites should have to comply with the same policies as other residential homes.'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Issue J: (Amenity buildings) As on Issue I.- Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(iv) is preferred (legal agreements, conditions and policy) to ensure that sites are protected for the purpose for which they were agreed.- Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) is preferred (legal agreements, conditions and policy) – but may be difficult to enforce. <p>Further comment: <i>'Hurst already has about 50% of the traveller provision in Wokingham Borough (The Borough site at Carters Hill, and two private sites in Nelson / Islandstone Lane), plus the very close proximity of traveller sites in Twyford. On this basis no further provision should be made within Hurst Parish.'</i></p>	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Stephen Yandell (Highways Agency)	0039
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
The HA will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network. The Highways Agency has no comment at this time.	This comment is noted.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Alison Ward (Arborfield and Newland Parish Council)	0040
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arborfield and Newland Parish Council considers that seeking additional Gypsy and Traveller sites is ill-advised because of the results of the 2013 GTAA, including non-Gypsy and Traveller occupancy (which has affected growth estimates) and additional pitches that have already been created. Wokingham Borough Council needs to focus on enforcement action against non-Gypsy and Traveller occupants. - Wokingham Borough Council should refuse applications for new sites on land where other forms of residential development would be refused (e.g. countryside). - Issue A: Option G (other) is preferred. Wokingham Borough Council should be releasing the required number of pitches by taking enforcement action against non-Gypsy and Traveller occupants. - Issue B: The Parish Council considers there is no need to allocate sites, but if there was these should be smaller and widely distributed to provide Gypsy and Traveller residents with a greater choice of location and better access to community and social support. - Issue C: There is no need to allocate new sites. Appendix One of the consultation document provides the existing distribution based on sites. The 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Issues F and G: It should be noted that the figures quoted in the Draft Options paper and referred to in the responses to Issues F (Travelling Showpeople sites) and G (Transit Sites) are from the 2013 GTAA; an updated GTAA is currently being undertaken which will provide up-to-date information regarding Gypsy and Traveller need. <p>The responses on issues A, B, C, D, E, H and I are noted.</p> <p>Wokingham Borough Council has to have regard to the Government policy in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites when assessing applications for new sites/pitches.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>Parish Council would like to see any changes in the future distribution related to parish populations (for the reasons noted in Issue B).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue D: Phasing should be used as it will enable the Council to adapt to alterations in the target requirement for pitches. - Issue E: There is no need to allocate reserve sites. - Issue F: There is no demand for and therefore no need to allocate Travelling Showpeople sites. - Issue G: There is no demand for and therefore no need to allocate transit sites. - Issue H: Option A (include a policy with specific standards in the GTLP) is preferred as this will strengthen the Borough Council’s ability to insist on good standards of site layout, safety and management at the planning stage. - Issue I: Option A (include a policy with specific standards in the GTLP) is preferred as this will strengthen Wokingham Borough Council’s ability to insist on appropriate demarcation and landscaping at the planning stage. <p>(Note: The Parish Council’s letter did not include any response on Issues J or K.)</p>	
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Miss Charles-Edwards and Mr Savill	0041
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
- Issue A: Option C (allocate new sites sites) is preferred – but these have to be	• Issues A and C (and further comment) – the concern about numbers of

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>spread fairly around the Borough to avoid dense clustering of sites; no more sites should be approved in Hurst.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches or less) is preferred to minimise impact on neighbours. - Issue C: Option B (a more even distribution of sites around the Borough) is preferred – but not option B(iii) (split according to area) as this would lead to an inequitable number of sites in rural parishes. - Issue D: Option A (phase by 5 year periods) is preferred to give residents time to respond. - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred as current need should be dealt with now. - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred – why are these needed as they move on after a few days? - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred, otherwise this will encourage more Gypsies and Travellers stopping in the Borough. - Issue H: Options A-H (create a policy on site layout in the GTLP) is preferred – all criteria should be controlled to ensure suitability, safety impact. - Issue I: Option C (have a policy on how sites blend with their surroundings) is preferred to reduce impact. - Issue J: Options A-D (create a policy on amenity buildings in the GTLP) is preferred. - Issue K1 (site retention): Option B (seek to retain Gypsy and Traveller sites) is preferred as only Gypsies and Travellers should use them. - Issue K2 (site restoration): Option B (seek to ensure site restoration) is preferred otherwise the site looks unsightly. <p>Further comment: Hurst has enough sites (50% of Wokingham’s supply).</p>	<p>sites in rural parishes is noted. The Council has to consider many factors in site assessment including where there is available land that is suitable for sites in addition to how sustainable proposed/existing sites are (this relates to access to services as well as their relationship to adjoining settlements).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue F – Travelling Showpeople require permanent sites for the storage of fairground rides/equipment, particularly during the winter months when they are not travelling to shows/fairs. <p>The responses on issues B, D, E, G, H, I, J and K are noted.</p>
---	---

Respondent:	Representation no:
Linda Matthews (Committee Officer - Woodley Town Council Community Services Committee)	0042

UNCLASSIFIED

Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
The Committee has no comment on the proposals.	This response is noted.

Respondent:	Representation no:
James Brooking	0043
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
It is understood that there is unauthorised occupation of some Gypsy and Traveller sites by non-Gypsy and Traveller occupants, which has created some additional need for sites; otherwise it is considered that there is no urgent need for new sites. On this basis the Council should act to ensure that non-Gypsies and Travellers no longer occupy existing sites.	These comments are noted. The figures quoted in the Draft Options paper are from the 2013 GTAA and an updated GTAA is currently being undertaken which will provide up-to-date information regarding Gypsy and Traveller needs.

UNCLASSIFIED

Respondent:	Representation no:
David Dewar (Planning Policy Officer – Wycombe District Council)	0044
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<i>'We have noted the issues contained in the consultation document, and the various options consulted upon. We have no particular comments to make on these, other than that we welcome the intention of the draft options paper that the Council will meet its full need for traveller accommodation as identified in the Wokingham GTAA.</i>	These comments are noted. Wokingham Borough Council aims to meet its need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches within the Borough through site allocation and policies in the GTLP, which will include identification of potential sites later on in the process. Any allocated site will be fully assessed with regard to its impact on neighbouring local authorities should it be in proximity to the Borough boundary. Wokingham Borough Council will continue to have on-going dialogue with Wycombe District Council.
<i>'We note that the draft options paper does not identify potential site options for meeting this need. We presume this will come in the next iteration of the draft plan and look forward to being consulted on this when it is available.'</i>	

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr Shaill	0045
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	

Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
There are enough Gypsy sites – especially in Wokingham Without and across the boundary with Bracknell. This applies across the Borough.	These comments are noted.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Maria Bradshaw (St Nicholas Hurst Parish Council)	0046
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option C (allocate new sites sites) is preferred (for reason given under Issue C). - Issue B: No preference on site size. - Issue C: Options B(i) and B(ii) are preferred - Hurst Parish Council considers that parishes without any Gypsy and Traveller sites should be investigated in the first instance for suitable sites in order to either split sites evenly between parishes or according to population. - Issue D: Option A (phase by 5 year periods) is preferred as Figure 2 of the Draft Options Paper shows that nothing is required until 2017. - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred (for the reason given under Issue D). - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues A and C – the Parish Council’s concern about the number of sites in Hurst and desire for a more even spread is noted. The Council has to consider many factors in site assessment including where there is available land that is suitable for sites and where the Gypsy and Traveller community wish to live, as well as how sustainable proposed/existing sites are (in terms of access to services as well as their relationship to adjoining settlements). There are constraints in terms of what sites are suggested to the Council and also the nature of other parishes (some of which are urban or Green Belt) which would affect any attempt to achieve an even split. The Council also cannot control where private individuals may make planning applications in future and must assess these on their own individual merits.

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>there does not appear to be any demand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred. - Issue H: This is best dealt with by the Borough or by using Government guidance. - Issue I: See answer to Issue H. - Issue J: See answer to Issue H. - Issue K1 (site retention): Option B (seek to retain Gypsy and Traveller sites) is preferred but it is queried how it is best to be dealt with by Wokingham Borough Council. - Issue K2 (site restoration): See answer to Issue K (site retention). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues D and E – It should be noted that Figure 2 in the Draft Options Paper is based on the figures in the 2013 GTAA, which will be updated shortly. These requirements may therefore change. • Issues H-J - It is considered that the GTLP offers Wokingham Borough Council an opportunity to build upon the existing Government guidance (which does not always cover particular matters in detail or consider local context). On this basis creating more specific criteria-based policies would be beneficial in this regard. <p>The responses on issues B, F, G and K are noted.</p>
---	---

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr Howard Larkin	0047
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: See Issue C. - Issue B: No preference. - Issue C: Options B(i) and B(ii) are preferred. <i>'Looking at your Draft Options Paper and Figs 2, 3 & 4 it is quite clear to me that there are a number of parishes that could take up the slack on this matter and before any more sites or pitches are permitted in Hurst I would expect sites elsewhere to be found. So a split either evenly or on the basis of population is to be encouraged.'</i> - Issue D: Option A (phase by 5 year periods) is preferred as Figure 2 of the Draft 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues A and C – concern about the number of sites in Hurst and the desire for a more even spread is noted. The Council has to consider many factors in site assessment including where there is available land that is suitable for sites and where the Gypsy and Traveller community wish to live, as well as how sustainable proposed/existing sites are (in terms of access to services as well as their relationship to adjoining settlements). There are constraints in terms of what sites are suggested to the Council and also the nature of other parishes (some of which are

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>Options Paper shows that nothing is required until 2017.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue E: See answer under Issue D. - Issue F: No comment. - Issue G: No comment. - Issue H: This is up to the Borough or use Government guidance. - Issue I: See Issue H. - Issue J: See Issue H. - Issue K1 (site retention): <i>'This is up to the Borough to police.'</i> - Issue K2 (site restoration): See Issue K (site retention). 	<p>urban or Green Belt) which would affect any attempt to achieve an even split.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues H-J - It is considered that the GTLP offers the Council an opportunity to build upon the existing Government guidance (which does not always cover particular matters in detail or consider local context). On this basis creating more specific criteria-based policies would be beneficial in this regard. <p>The responses on issues B, D, E, G and K are noted.</p>
--	---

Respondent:	Representation no:
Councillor Gary Cowan	0048
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<p>CLlr Cowan supports the comments submitted by Arborfield and Newlands Parish Council [representation no. 0040] and wishes to add that as the Government is now conducting a review on Gypsies and Travellers, it is inappropriate to hold a consultation until the Government report is concluded.</p>	<p>A Government consultation on proposed changes to planning policy and guidance in relation to Gypsies and Travellers commenced on 14th September 2014. The Council's consultation on the GTLP Draft Options Paper, which commenced on 7th August 2014, still represents an early stage of the plan-making process – therefore any changes that may be introduced by Government in future are still able to be taken into account and incorporated into the GTLP by the Council.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Miranda Parker (Charvil Parish Council)	0049
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option F (a mix of options) is preferred. The solution depends on the sites already available, e.g. some can be enlarged while others cannot, and some unauthorised sites might be suitable to receive permission depending on local views. There may be local opposition to allowing occupation of sites by any Gypsies and Travellers (not just named individuals) and Charvil PC would not support this. - Issue B: Option B (10 pitches or less) is preferred as reasonably small sites have less impact on local services; larger sites can be invasive for the settled community. - Issue C: Option A (guided by existing distribution) is preferred as most sites accommodate Gypsy and Traveller families who wish to live near one another (and it may result in more unauthorised sites if they cannot). Placing new sites in nearby parishes that have fewer sites may be fairer to share pressure on services. - Issue D: Option A (phase by 5 year periods) is preferred as the Council has a fairly good idea when these need to be supplied by and this would be consistent with the rest of the Core Strategy. - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred as this would be consistent with the Core Strategy. - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred as research indicates this is not required. 	The responses on issues A – K are noted.

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred as many villages like Charvil do not have suitable sites and it would be unfair for those who do not have space to have to provide these, as well as putting pressure on services at short notice. - Issue H: Option A (provide a policy on site layout in the GTLP) is preferred as this would ensure specific issues are covered and give Wokingham Borough Council greater control over site layout. - Issue I: Option A (provide a policy on site boundaries/landscaping in the GTLP) is preferred as this should help alleviate local residents' concerns. - Issue J: Option A (provide a policy on amenity buildings in the GTLP) is preferred as this would be consistent with the rest of the Core Strategy for housing. - Issue K1 (site retention): Option B (seek to retain Gypsy and Traveller sites) is preferred as given the pressure on Gypsy and Traveller sites, it would be illogical to let others use them. - Issue K2 (site restoration): Option B (seek to restore Gypsy and Traveller sites) is preferred – this should be done by whatever means available. 	
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Margaret Cooper	0050
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
- Issue A: Option G (other) – there should not be any sites that have not had	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues A-C - The Council is required to establish and meet the

- planning permission. Requirements for planning should be equal for everyone.
- Issue B: Option A (5 pitches or less) is preferred – more pitches would increase pressure on infrastructure and requirements for tax.
 - Issue C: Option C (do not attempt to spread sites across the Borough) is preferred. No more sites are wanted as this will increase pressure on infrastructure and the environment.
 - Issue D: Option A (phase by 5-8 year periods) is preferred – this is essential for the Council to sustain and monitor existing sites.
 - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred – this is not necessary or practical and will cost money to maintain.
 - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate sites for Travelling Showpeople) is preferred – they should use existing Gypsy and Traveller sites.
 - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred as there are already enough in Hurst.
 - Issue H: All of the matters listed should be covered by a policy; Gypsy and Traveller residents should consider the same issues as other residents.
 - Issue I: This is very important to protect the surrounding environment and can be controlled by planning legislation.
 - Issue J: All of the matters listed should be covered by a policy; Gypsy and Traveller residents should have the same planning restrictions as other residents under equal rights.
 - Issue K1 (site retention): Option B (seek to retain sites in Gypsy and Traveller use) is preferred – legal agreements would make this transparent to everyone.
 - Issue K2 (site restoration): Option B (seek to restore Gypsy and Traveller sites using planning conditions, legal agreements) is preferred to ensure landscape is retained and the environment is respected.

Further comments: *'My husband and myself strongly object to more Gypsy sites. There are sufficient provisions for Gypsies and Travellers in Hurst including two more recent sites which were approved by planning. We are only a small village and the infrastructure and limited amenities would be compromised.'*

'We all have to live together and therefore we all should consider and respect our neighbours. Sustainability therefore is the key to moving forward which should be everyone's policy including Gypsy's and Travellers regardless where we live.'

accommodation needs of the Travelling community and has to consider various ways of achieving this which may involve the provision of new sites. Any proposed new sites will be assessed - including its impact on infrastructure and the environment – before being considered suitable or not. Appropriate planning permission will be required for any new sites or changes to existing sites.

- Issue E – Reserve sites would not require any maintenance until these are brought forward for development
- Issue F – Travelling Showpeople are defined as a separate group from Gypsies and Travellers and have different requirements for their sites (such as space to store fairground equipment). Therefore it is not practical for them to seek pitches on existing Gypsy and Traveller sites.
- Issue G – For clarity, there are currently no existing transit sites in the Borough although 3 transit pitches have been granted permission at Highfield Park in Arborfield (F/2012/0276).

The responses on issues B, D, H, I, J and K are noted.

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mike Dunstan (Planning and Transportation Officer - Wokingham Town Council)	0051
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option F (a mix of options) is preferred – as only a few pitches are required, a few from each option could allow this target to be met. - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches or less) is preferred. Sites need to be of a certain size (for facilities) but should not be so large that they adversely impact nearby residents. - Issue C: Option B(ii) (distribute sites according to the population of each parish) is preferred as this would help to avoid undue burden on schools and health services and represent a more equal distribution in the parishes. - Issue D: Option A (phase by 5 year periods) is preferred. This gives time and flexibility to find appropriate sites and gain permission. - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred – this will help ensure identified need is met. - Issue F: Option A (allocate sites for Travelling Showpeople) is preferred. It would be prudent to identify a suitable site for the future. This could also be used in the event of unauthorised Travellers needing to be moved on to a temporary site. - Issue G: Option A (allocate transit sites) is preferred – this would help to enforce correct procedures by providing a temporary alternative solution. - Issue H: Option A (include a policy on site layout in the GTLP) is preferred – a specific policy that takes account of Good Practice guidance is necessary to enable enforcement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – The pitch numbers in the Draft Options Paper are based on the figures in the 2013 GTAA, which will be updated shortly. These requirements may therefore change. • Issues F and G – The comments relating to using an allocated site as a resource to allow any Gypsy and Traveller on unauthorised sites to move on to a temporary stopping place is noted. <p>The responses on issues B, C, D, E, H, I, J and K are noted.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue I: Option A (include a policy on site boundaries/landscaping in the GTLP) is preferred – a specific policy that takes account of Good Practice guidance is necessary to enable enforcement. - Issue J: Option A (include a policy on amenity buildings in the GTLP) is preferred – a specific policy that takes account of Good Practice guidance is necessary to enable enforcement. - Issue K1 (site retention): Option B (seek to ensure Gypsy and Traveller site retention) is preferred – a legal agreement is necessary to enable enforcement of the policy. - Issue K2 (site restoration): Option B (seek to ensure Gypsy and Traveller site restoration) is preferred – a legal agreement is necessary to enable enforcement of the policy. 	
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Robin West	0052
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option B (increase the number of pitches on existing sites) is preferred – do not increase pitch numbers unnecessarily, only if need does arise. This should not be above 5 pitches. - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches or less) is preferred – will be less of a burden on facilities and easier to integrate. - Issue C: Option B (distribute sites across the Borough) is preferred as there is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue C and further comment - the concern about the number of sites in Hurst and desire for a more even spread is noted. The Council has to consider many factors in site assessment including where there is available land that is suitable for sites, in addition to how sustainable proposed/existing sites are (in terms of access to services as well as their relationship to adjoining settlements). There are constraints in

<p>currently too high a concentration in a few locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue D: Option B (have no phasing) is preferred – need to find what real demand is rather than projecting over 15 years and possibly having more than necessary. - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred as sensible contingency planning. - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate sites for Travelling Showpeople) is preferred as the GTAA states there is no need. - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred as the GTAA states there is no need. - Issue H: Government guidance should be used <i>except</i> where councillors feel the need for additional requirements to meet local needs. - Issue I: Government guidance should be used <i>except</i> where councillors feel the need for additional requirements to meet local needs. - Issue J: Number (of amenity buildings) should be limited to one per site and sufficient to provide essential services but no larger. Design should be unobtrusive with energy-saving measures if long-term; not to be lived in as a house. - Issue K1 (site retention): Option B(iv) (seek to ensure Gypsy and Traveller site retention by a mix of methods) is preferred, or sites should be restored to their original condition after use. Use any effective measures. - Issue K2 (site restoration): See Issue K (site retention). <p>Further comments: <i>‘The map clearly shows there is already more than adequate provision in the Hurst area compared to the rest of the Borough’.</i></p>	<p>terms of what sites are suggested to the Council and also the nature of other parishes (some of which are urban or Green Belt) which would affect any attempt to achieve an even split.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues F and G – The pitch numbers in the Draft Options Paper are based on the figures in the 2013 GTAA, which will be updated shortly. These requirements may therefore change. • Issue J – The points relating to unobtrusive design, energy-saving measures and essential services in amenity buildings are noted. On sites where a single communal amenity building is provided, this structure would have to be larger in order to cater for all of the site occupants. However, the strong preference of the Travelling community is for private amenity blocks on each pitch, each providing essential facilities for the residents of that pitch. In all cases, the amenity building is meant to serve an ancillary function and is not for occupation as a separate dwelling. <p>The responses on issues A, B, D, E, H, I and K are noted.</p>
---	---

Respondent:	Representation no:
Robin West (Communications Officer - Hurst Village Society)	0053
Call for Sites	

Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<p><i>'As Hurst Village Society we would also like to draw your attention to our view that there is already sufficient provision in our immediate area (including an official Wokingham Borough site at Carters Hill, and 2 other private sites that have recently been approved in Nelson / Islandstone Lane).</i></p> <p><i>'We note from your documentation that there are currently considered to be 8 more sites than necessary within the Borough – however should additional sites be needed at some future date we believe that other parts of the Borough should make a fair provision before considering further sites in Hurst.'</i></p>	<p>These comments are noted. The concern about the number of sites in Hurst and desire for a more even spread has been raised by Hurst Parish Council and a number of private individuals. The Council has to consider many factors in site assessment including where there is available land that is suitable for sites and where the Gypsy and Traveller community wish to live, as well as how sustainable proposed/existing sites are (in terms of access to services as well as their relationship to adjoining settlements). There are constraints in terms of what sites are suggested to the Council and also the nature of other parishes (some of which are urban or Green Belt) which would affect any attempt to achieve an even split. The Council cannot control where private individuals may make planning applications in future and must assess these on their own individual merits.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Draft Options Paper is based on the figures in the 2013 GTAA, which will be updated shortly. Pitch requirements in the Borough may therefore change.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Max Baker (Bracknell Forest Borough Council)	0054
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	

Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>'It is noted that the options paper is based on the 2013 GTAA (although reference is made to the fact that a 2014 update is currently under way). The published assessment covers the period 2012 – 2027. It is stated that there is a surplus of 8 pitches in the first 5 year period and that 25 pitches are required in order to meet future needs between 2017 and 2027. It is implied that there is every intention to meet this need within the Borough – such an approach is welcomed. However, the need for any further pitches and/or plots should be based on the most up to date evidence and therefore the outcome of the refresh is key to the content of the plan. It is not clear what the base date of the refresh is to be, but the figures for need and supply may have to be adjusted to take account of this factor.'</i> • <i>'A question is asked about whether or not the Council should allocate transit sites. The 2013 GTAA states that there is no need for transit sites (para. 5.9) on the basis of the low level of unauthorised encampments on land not owned by gypsies and travellers over the last 3 years. It is considered that a more strategic approach is needed to this issue taking account of the location and capacity of existing transit sites and the number and location of unauthorised encampments in the wider area. Any decision will need to be based on evidence and the availability of appropriate sites'.</i> • <i>'It should be made clear that the 'type of site and distribution' options will be influenced by the location of land promoted and whether or not these sites are deliverable and developable. In addition it will also depend on relationships within the traveller community (expanding a site may not be an option if families do not get along).'</i> • <i>'An option is included about whether or not the Council should seek to retain traveller sites. Various options for achieving this are mentioned including the use of conditions and legal agreements. In view of the specific policies that relate to the provision of sites for travellers, it is agreed that sites should be retained. The means of achieving this must be enforceable and enduring.'</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wokingham Borough Council aims to meet its need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches which will be based upon the latest updated version of the GTAA once this becomes available. This will include information about potential need for transit sites. • Comments regarding the need for sites to be deliverable and developable, as well as taking into occupants' relationships, is acknowledged in relation to planning for site size and distribution. • It is agreed that any controls on site retention for Gypsy and Traveller use must be enforceable in the long term. • Wokingham Borough Council will continue to have on-going dialogue with Bracknell Forest Council concerning strategic matters, including the outcomes of the current Government consultation on Gypsies and Travellers and any implications that this may have for the GTLP. <p>The other comments are noted.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>'Should the Government's current consultation on planning and travellers result in changes in national legislation and policy, it may be necessary to further review the evidence and reconsider certain options put forward. It is noted that the definition of a traveller may need to be changed in light of the results of the question asked through the GTAA about propensity to travel (para 4.26 of the GTAA). Bracknell Forest Borough Council would hope to be consulted on any changes required as a result of evolving legislation and national policy.'</i> 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Kylie Newman (Planning Advisor - Environment Agency)	0055
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: <i>'We feel the most suitable approach to meeting the future needs of the gypsy and traveller community would be to b) increase the number of pitches on the existing authorised sites initially, and if this does not fulfill the required needs then option a) expand existing authorised sites. We have highlighted these preferred 2 options due to the fact that the majority of the existing sites have minimal environmental constraints that fall within our remit, therefore to expand these sites would pose a lesser environmental risk. New potential sites pose a higher risk in terms of locating them in an environmentally sensitive area'.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – In terms of site location, the potential environmental impact of any new site would be considered as part of the assessment process and the Environment Agency would be consulted as appropriate. • Issue H: Comments are noted; site drainage has also been raised by some members of the Gypsy and Traveller community as an important consideration. • Issue I: Comments are noted. As touched upon in Issue A, when assessing site location factors such as flood zones will be taken into account (as per the comments made under 'Flood Risk').

- Issue H (site layout, safety and management): *'We support the use of connection to mains foul sewer supply. Non mains drainage is not a preferred option because of the risk of water pollution. Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights the need to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Where there are concerns arising about the capacity of wastewater infrastructure then in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 34-020-20140306, information will need to be provided about how the proposed site will deal with wastewater. Sites that will rely on anything other than connection to mains drainage should be supported by sufficient information to understand the potential implications for the water environment.'*
- Issue I (site boundaries and landscaping): *'We have no comments on the option in general, but some thought needs to be given to boundaries that may be within a flood zone. Close board fencing and brick walls can impede flood flows causing flooding elsewhere or increasing the flood issues on the proposed site.'*

Factors to consider when assessing potential new or expanded sites:

- **Flood risk:** Gypsy and Traveller sites are classified as highly vulnerable development and are not permitted within flood zone 3a and 3b. Sites that are currently within this flood zone should not be extended or allocated more pitches due to their vulnerability. In accordance with paragraph 101 of the NPPF the Sequential Test will need to be applied to all proposed sites in order to steer new development to areas with the lowest flood risk. The EA would insist on a sequential approach to the layout of the sites to ensure pitches are positioned in the areas with the lowest flood risk.
- **River Corridors:** Any sites near a main river would require a buffer zone of a minimum of 8 metres to the top of bank of the main river. The NPPF paragraph 109 outlines that the planning system should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity; river corridors provide such an ecological network. Wokingham Borough Council is the Lead Local Flood Authority and has the responsibility to ensure

The responses on issues B, C, D, E, F, G, J and K are noted.

<p>appropriate mitigation measures are in place for these waterbodies. Local planning authorities also have a statutory duty to avoid damage to SSSIs and further their conservation and enhancement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater: A site can be extended or located within a source protection zone or a primary aquifer as long as the foul sewage is connected to mains. If non mains foul drainage is proposed then they must not be located within these groundwater vulnerable areas. • Historic landfills: Proposed sites may be acceptable on historic landfills, however if any extra structures are proposed within these locations (such as the amenity buildings) a groundwater investigation report will need to be carried out to ensure there will not be a risk to groundwater by the disturbance of the historic landfills. 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Louise Piper (Rushmoor Borough Council)	0056
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<p><i>'Rushmoor Borough Council welcomes the opportunity to consider the Wokingham Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan Options Consultation document. The Council has no comments to make, but mindful of the relationship between Rushmoor Borough and Wokingham District in the context of the Blackwater Valley, the Council would like to continue to be informed on progress on the Wokingham Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan.'</i></p>	<p>These comments are noted. The Council will continue to have on-going dialogue with Rushmoor Borough Council concerning the development of the GTLP.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

Respondent:	Representation no:
Alison Amoah (Reading Borough Council)	0057
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<p>In line with the Duty to Cooperate, Wokingham Borough Council should consider unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities as part of the emerging GTLP. Reading Borough Council has raised this issue previously in its response to the consultations on Wokingham Borough Council's Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (specifically policy TB10: Traveller Sites – now adopted).</p> <p>Reading Borough Council acknowledges the joint-working between the authorities to date.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. Wokingham Borough Council will continue to have on-going dialogue with Reading Borough Council concerning strategic matters around Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and the development of the GTLP.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Charlotte Benson	0058
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	

Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option B (increase number of pitches on authorised sites) is preferred, as there are already a large number of Traveller sites in the area - Issue B: Option B (10 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Option B(iii) (split according to Parish area) is preferred - Issue D: Option A (phasing) is preferred to reduce problems and protect local residents - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred as time and money should be used elsewhere - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred because of the number of sites that already exist in the area - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate Transit sites) is preferred, as doing so could result in more unauthorised encampments - Issue H: (Site layout) Pitch size, fire safety and access/parking are important – but policy can only be efficient if it is enforced. Infrastructure should be paid for by the site occupants. Amenity space should be provided on sites. Site should be managed to prevent burning of materials - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Concern that unauthorised fencing will be erected and trees cut down - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) <i>No comments made</i> - Issue K1: (Site retention) <i>No comments made</i> - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) is preferred - use a mix of methods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue E – Reserve sites would not require any maintenance until these are brought forward for development • Issue F – For clarity, the majority of sites in the Borough are for Gypsies and Travellers; there is only one current site for Travelling Showpeople. • Issue G – It is acknowledged that any transit sites would have to be carefully managed to ensure that they are used appropriately. • Issue H – The comment about site management is noted. Separate Environmental Health legislation will cover burning of materials on sites. • Issue I – Comments are noted. Applications for new sites would be expected to provide appropriate boundary treatments and landscaping that can be controlled by conditions if an application is approved. <p>The responses on issues A, B, C, D, J and K are noted.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Amanda McGuinness	0059
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	

Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option B (increase number of pitches on authorised sites) is preferred - Issue B: Option C (15 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Options A (use the existing site distribution as a guide) and C (do not control distribution) are preferred - Issue D: Option A (phasing) is preferred - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate Transit sites) is preferred - Issue H: (Site layout) Use existing Government guidance - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Use existing Government guidance - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) Use existing Government guidance - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(iv) (seek to retain sites by a variety of methods) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (seek to restore sites by a variety of methods) is preferred 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues H-J - It is considered that the GTLP offers the Council an opportunity to build upon the existing Government guidance (which does not always cover particular matters in detail or consider local context). On this basis creating more specific criteria-based policies would be beneficial in this regard. <p>The responses on issues A, B, C, D, E, F, G and K are noted.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr and Mrs Measures	0060
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	

Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option B (increase number of pitches on authorised sites) is preferred, as is option G (other) to free up existing pitches by reducing non-Gypsy and Traveller occupation - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches and under) is preferred; small infill spaces should be utilised adjacent to existing sites - Issue C: Option A (use the existing site distribution as a guide) is preferred to develop and strengthen existing Traveller communities - Issue D: Option A (phasing) is preferred – managed growth will better enable the Gypsy and Traveller and settled community to adapt to changes - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred, as the GTAA shows unoccupied pitches or those in non-Gypsy and Traveller occupation that can be used to meet future demand - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred; Showpeople already have provision in the area and stop on a short term basis on sites where shows are being held to earn income - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate Transit sites) is preferred; existing under-utilised or non-Gypsy and Traveller sites should be used first - Issue H: (Site layout) Use existing Government guidance - good practice should be shared between local authorities and Government departments - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) See answer to Issue H. - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) See answer to Issue H. - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(iv) (seek to retain sites by a variety of methods) is preferred. Current non-Gypsy and Traveller occupation needs to be addressed and enforced into the future. - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (seek to restore sites by a variety of methods) is preferred. There is significant pressure on land for housing; vacant Traveller sites should not be left empty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues E and G – The GTAA will be updated shortly and this may result in the numbers of unoccupied pitches across the Borough changing, which will alter existing pitch availability. Therefore existing sites may not be sufficient to meet identified need for permanent/transit sites. • Issue F – For clarity, Travelling Showpeople require permanent sites for the storage of fairground rides/equipment, particularly during the winter months when they are not travelling to shows/fairs. There is only one such site in Wokingham Borough. • Issues H-J - It is considered that the GTLP offers the Council an opportunity to build upon the existing Government guidance (which does not always cover particular matters in detail or consider local context). On this basis creating more specific criteria-based policies would be beneficial in this regard. • Issue K2 – Site restoration would generally involve returning a site to its former condition once its Gypsy and Traveller use has ceased, but there would not be any reason why a site could not be developed again in future after its restoration if it was appropriate to do so. <p>The responses on issues A, B, C, D and K1 are noted.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr Kazek Lokuciewski	0061

Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option A (make current authorised sites larger) is preferred, to allow occupants to integrate into the established community. Also option C (allocate new sites) as Travellers need proper dedicated sites with facilities and this would reduce local concerns; option D (give permission is existing suitable sites) provided that fees are paid and sites managed - Issue B: Option B (10 pitches and under) is preferred for Traveller sites; also option D (16+ pitches) to provide accommodation and enable access to education - Issue C: Option B(iii) (split distribution in proportion to parish area) is preferred - Issue D: Option B (no phasing) is preferred, - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred, so people buying houses will know of the allocation in advance - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred if this is short term - Issue G: Option A (allocate Transit sites) is preferred, but this must have a time limit and alternative sites should be provided - Issue H: (Site layout) Pitch size, access and parking, infrastructure, amenity sites need to be considered; with amenity sites the local community should be able to use these as well to encourage integration. There should be site management, particularly for those who travel to monitor how sites are used, and on-site provision for businesses and horses - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Appropriate fencing and landscaping should be provided; this needs to be respected and enforced. Sites won't blend in but can be made more attractive - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) Amenity buildings should be proportionate in size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue D –The purpose of phasing is to provide a timeframe in which sites can be released for development to ensure that identified need is met in a managed manner over the time period of the plan. • Issue F – For clarity, Travelling Showpeople require sites for the storage of fairground rides/equipment, particularly during the winter months when they are not travelling to shows/fairs. These would be permanent not short term sites. • Issue H – It is acknowledged that whilst on-site provision of amenity space is generally considered, giving Gypsy and Traveller sites access to existing or new facilities such as play areas in the wider local community could be beneficial in terms of integration. • Issue K2 – For clarity, site restoration is intended to restore sites to their original condition once their use for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation has finally ceased. <p>The responses on issues A, B, C, E, G, I, J and K1 are noted.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>to pitches and shared; use should be policed by site occupants. Who will pay for items such as solar panels?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(ii) and (iii) (seek to retain sites by legal agreements and policy in the GTLP) is preferred to ensure it is used by Travellers who need it to settle and access services. - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iii) (seek to restore sites using a policy in the GTLP) is preferred to ensure occupants do not leave sites in poor condition. 	
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Chrystine Whittle	0062
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option B (increase number of pitches on authorised sites) is preferred - Issue B: Option B (10 pitches and under) is preferred as larger sites may not be suitable for the neighbourhood - Issue C: Option B(iii) (split distribution in proportion to parish area) is preferred - Issue D: Option A (phasing) is preferred - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred - Issue G: Option A (do not allocate Transit sites) is preferred as it would be too disruptive 	The responses on issues A – K are noted.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue H: (Site layout) Fire safety, access and parking and site management need to be considered - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) How the site blends in with its surroundings must be considered - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) Design of amenity buildings – these should blend in with the neighbourhood - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(iv) (seek to retain sites by a mix of methods) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) <i>No separate comment</i> 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr Marc Brunel-Walker	0063
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option G (other) – none of the options are preferred - Issue B: Option C (5 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Option C (do not seek to control site distribution) is preferred - Issue D: No preference - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate Transit sites) is preferred - Issue H: (Site layout) Use existing Government guidance – it is not felt that having a criteria-based policy would make an impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues H-J - It is considered that the GTLP offers the Council an opportunity to build upon the existing Government guidance (which does not always cover particular matters in detail or consider local context). On this basis creating more specific criteria-based policies would be beneficial in this regard. <p>The responses on issues A, B, C, D, E, F, G and K are noted.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Use existing Government guidance - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) Use existing Government guidance - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option A (do not seek to retain sites in Gypsy and Traveller use) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B (seek to restore sites using all available methods) is preferred 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs Sylvia Philpott	0064
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option B (increase number of pitches on authorised sites) is preferred to prevent overspill into too many other areas - Issue B: Option D (16+ pitches) is preferred - Issue C: Option A (use existing site distribution as a guide) is preferred - Issue D: Option A (phasing) is preferred - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate Transit sites) is preferred - Issue H: (Site layout) Use existing Government guidance - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Use existing Government guidance - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) Use existing Government guidance - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(iv) (seek to retain sites using a variety of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues H-J - It is considered that the GTLP offers the Council an opportunity to build upon the existing Government guidance (which does not always cover particular matters in detail or consider local context). On this basis creating more specific criteria-based policies would be beneficial in this regard. <p>The responses on issues A, B, C, D, E, F, G and K are noted.</p>

<p>methods) is preferred</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (seek to retain sites using a variety of methods) is preferred 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr John Edwards	0065
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option B (increase number of pitches on authorised sites) is preferred as the area cannot cope with all the new development/housing; there is not enough infrastructure - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Option B(iii) (split distribution in proportion to the area of the parish) is preferred, as it is assumed that larger parishes will have more resources/infrastructure to manage new development - Issue D: Option A (phasing) is preferred as this will allow residents to make decisions - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate Transit sites) is preferred - Issue H: (Site layout) Fire safety is an important consideration to help prevent accidents/deaths; infrastructure is also important - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) The type of boundary treatments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – In terms of infrastructure provision, it should be noted that in line with national and local planning policy new developments for both housing and Gypsy and Traveller sites may be required to contribute towards the provision and funding of local infrastructure. • Issue C – It is not necessarily the case that larger parishes will have more infrastructure, as such parishes can be predominantly rural with small settlement areas, lower population densities and therefore fewer facilities such as leisure or transport hubs. <p>The responses on issues B, D, E, F, G, H, I, J and K are noted.</p>

<p>must be considered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) The number of amenity buildings is important and should be complied with; size and design are also important - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(ii) (seek to retain sites using legal agreements) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(ii) (seek to retain sites using legal agreements) is preferred 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Dr Mike Lush	0066
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option A (make current authorised sites larger) is preferred, by improving access and increasing density where appropriate, and allowing expansion. This will allow better community-focused resource allocation. Option B (increase the number of pitches on sites) should only be allowed where it won't cause overcrowding. Option C (allocate new sites) is the worst option as it has the potential to increase isolation, disruption and disharmony in existing neighbourhoods. Option D (give permission to suitable unauthorised sites is not preferred as this could set a precedent for temporary or illegal sites. Option E (allow any Gypsies and Travellers to live on sites without personal occupancy conditions) is also not preferred as the Council should be able to know who is on the site and what their needs are to be able 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – The allocation of new sites (option C) would only take place in suitable areas, considering factors such as sustainability, impacts on neighbours/local communities. Option D (giving planning permission to currently unauthorised sites) would similarly only apply to sites that are acceptable in planning terms, and not to sites that are inappropriate or meant to be short term. The comments regarding option E are noted. • Issue E - Reserve sites would not require any maintenance until these are brought forward for development (and once developed they may not be run by the Council. Reserve sites would not be capable of use until they are brought forward and have planning permission granted to become Gypsy and Traveller sites; in some cases they may not be

<p>to plan for facilities etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue B: Option D (16+ pitches) is preferred, as larger sites can help maintain a community - Issue C: Option A (use the existing distribution as a guide) is preferred - Issue D: Option B (have no phasing) is preferred; only as needs arise - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred; this seems an expensive option and might encourage use of the reserve rather than free movement - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred; this would be temporary, as show-grounds already provide accommodation - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate Transit sites) is preferred; permanent sites should be used to encourage community and responsibility for maintenance. Temporary sites can be disruptive - Issue H: (Site layout) Fire safety – need to consider adequate access for the fire service; access needs to be controlled to know who is using the site; infrastructure – water supply and drainage – must be provided and paid for by site residents, with sanitary provision to meet health and environmental standards. Site management should be the responsibility of the Travelling community. Existing Government guidance should be used. - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Appropriate boundary treatments are required to prevent encroachment and provide security. Existing Government guidance should be used. - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) Planning permission should be required for buildings on the site to control numbers, size and design. Existing Government guidance should be used. - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(iv) (seek to retain sites using a mix of methods) is preferred in order to do it properly - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (seek to retain sites using a mix of methods) is preferred to encourage long term use and a sense of community from the commitment of site occupants to restore the site when they leave 	<p>required in which case the site will not be used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue F - For clarity, Travelling Showpeople require sites for the storage of fairground rides/equipment, particularly during the winter months when they are not travelling to shows/fairs. These would be permanent not short term sites. • Issue K2 – Comments regarding community feeling are noted. <p>The responses on issues B, C, D, G, H, I, J and K1 are noted.</p>
--	---

<p>Respondent:</p>	<p>Representation no:</p>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Mrs J Gardner	0067
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option A (make current authorised sites larger) is preferred, but need to ensure they are still manageable and safe. Option C (allocate more sites) – these should not be in south Wokingham and some existing sites are also too big. - Issue B: Option B (10 pitches and under) is preferred, though this would depend on the area; some areas may have transport, facilities etc. for larger sites - Issue C: Option B (look at more equal distribution across the Borough) is preferred - Issue D: Option B (have no phasing) is preferred – sites should be allocated when the need arises - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred, as other uses for the site could be found in future - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred if the need is there; for permanent sites the size will need to be adequate for storage and will need to be in an area where work is available - Issue G: Undecided - Issue H: (Site layout) All of the issues need to be considered; infrastructure should be available to prevent dumping; gardens could be provided within reason; commercial activity should abide by normal rules; livestock should only be kept if there is adequate space and facilities. Government guidance should be used if it is effective; if not, it should be amended - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Boundary treatments and landscaping should be sympathetic to the surroundings with planting to help 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues A and B – The concern about the number of sites in certain areas is noted. The Council has to consider many factors in site assessment including where there is available land that is suitable for sites and where the Gypsy and Traveller community wish to live, as well as how sustainable proposed/existing sites are (in terms of access to services as well as their relationship to adjoining settlements). There are constraints in terms of what sites are suggested to the Council and also the nature of other parishes (some of which are urban or Green Belt) which would affect any attempt to control distribution. The Council also cannot control where private individuals may make planning applications in future and must assess these on their own individual merits. <p>The responses on issues C – K are noted.</p>

<p>sites blend in. Government guidance should be used if it is effective; if not, it should be amended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) The number of amenity buildings should relate to the number of people on site and should not be larger than appropriate; use of sustainable technologies should be encouraged and design of a high standard. Government guidance should be used if it is effective; if not, it should be amended - Issue K1: (Site retention) If a site is being used appropriately then it should be retained; if there is demand then it should be guaranteed for the authorised users - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (seek to retain sites using a mix of methods) is preferred. Sites should be maintained properly whilst in use as well e.g. waste removal 	
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr K Webb	0068
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Options A (make current authorised sites larger) and B (increase number of pitches on authorised sites) are preferred, whilst not compromising local residents' quality of life. Allocating new sites (option C) should be on brownfield land only. Permission should not be granted for unauthorised sites as this bypasses the planning system. 	<p>The preferred options and comments are noted. Regarding deposits and fees, the Council can control such matters on its own sites – however privately run sites may have different arrangements over which the Council has no control.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Option B(ii) (split in proportion to population of parish) is preferred - Issue D: Option A (phasing) is preferred - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred as they are part of our history and culture - Issue G: Option A (allocate transit sites) is preferred. A deposit should be charged to use the site that is refunded if the site is left tidy - Issue H: (Site layout) All of the issues need to be considered; facilities like water supply, site management, commercial storage and livestock facilities should be funded by residents; children should have play space - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Security fencing should be used - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) There should be a single communal area for laundry and a deposit should be charged for its use. The number of buildings should be linked to the number of pitches. Design should be functional but blend with the local area. - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(i) (use planning conditions to ensure sites are retained in Gypsy and Traveller use). Also require deposits and daily fee to use pitches - Issue K2: (Site restoration) <i>No separate comments</i> 	
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs S Cox	0069
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	

Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option A (make current authorised sites larger) is preferred as existing sites are proving suitable and this would be an easy option provided an increase is not over 50% (which could create a divide with the local community). Option B (increase number of pitches on authorised sites) depends on availability of space but could work (as with terraced housing). Option F (a mix of options) – there are difficulties with any sites integrating with existing communities; site should be on the outskirts of towns/villages where they would have less impact on existing residents and more space - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches and under) should be considered in areas agreed by the local community that do not have space to accommodate larger groups. Option B (10 pitches and under) would enable a fair-sized Gypsy and Traveller community to thrive and not cause issues for local residents. Option C (15 pitches and under) should only be used for existing sites that can be enlarged - Issue C: Option A (use existing site distribution as a guide) is preferred as this will indicate what facilities there are and opportunities to expand; however sites should not become large enough to impose on existing communities. Other areas may also be available for new sites. Option B(iii) and (iv)(split in proportion to area / split in proportion to number of settlements in parish) - Issue D: Option B (no phasing) is preferred – the Council needs to understand needs and plan accordingly - Issue E: This question requires clarification - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred as Showpeople need to live where they work - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred. This would be a waste – Travellers will decide where they want to stay - Issue H: (Site layout) Pitch/site size should be controlled by the Council; there must be access to appropriate infrastructure (water and sewers); sites should be residential use only. The Council should adhere to the CLG Good Practice Guidance - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Pitches should be adequately marked. 6ft fencing is common around the Borough and would increase privacy/reduce noise. See answer to issue H relating to guidance - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) The number of amenity buildings should be less 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – The comments regarding making the best use of available space are noted. However, Gypsies and Travellers have specific requirements (such as space for trailers and amenity buildings) which mean that pitches have to be a certain size. • Issue F – Travelling Showpeople require a settled base to store their equipment, particularly during the winter months. This does not have to be near to their work as Showpeople move around to attend fairs. • Issue G – The provision of transit sites would provide the Travelling community with an authorised place to stop, as opposed to having to choose to stop on authorised sites (such as by the roadside). • Issue I – Comments are noted, however whilst 6ft fencing may be appropriate around residential gardens, particularly those in urban contexts, it may not always be appropriate for Traveller sites in more rural locations and therefore a prescriptive approach to boundary treatments may not be suitable. <p>The responses on issues B, C, D, E, H, J and K are noted.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>than that of pitches to prevent sites spreading out and encourage emphasis on mobile lifestyle; amenity buildings should be shared between pitches and in proportion to them. Design should be single storey and in keeping with the site. See answer to issue H relating to guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(iv) (use a mix of methods) is preferred to ensure sites are retained in Gypsy and Traveller use, unless there is a decline in demand for them. The Council should run the sites and ensure compliance. - Issue K2: (Site restoration) <i>No separate comments</i> 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr A Bryan	0070
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option A (make current authorised sites larger) is preferred - Issue B: Option B (10 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Option B(ii) (split in proportion to population of parish) is preferred - Issue D: <i>No comment made</i> - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred - Issue G: Option A (allocate transit sites) is preferred so that these can be policed - Issue H: (Site layout) Issues such as pitch size, fire safety, access and parking, infrastructure and site management need to be considered 	<p>WBC response:</p> <p>The responses on issues A, D, C, E, F, G, H and K2 are noted.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) <i>No comment made</i>- Issue J: (Amenity buildings) <i>No comment made</i>- Issue K1: (Site retention) <i>No comment made</i>- Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option A (sites should not be restored to their former condition) is preferred	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs J Cole	0071
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Issue A: Options A (make current authorised sites larger), B (increase the number of pitches) and E (removal personal occupancy conditions to allow any Gypsy and Traveller person to live on the site) are preferred; this will allow established sites to continue without having to create new sites that may cause issues- Issue B: Option B (10 pitches and under) is preferred as this would allow a community to develop without significantly affecting the surrounding neighbourhood- Issue C: Option A (use the existing distribution as a guide) is preferred- Issue D: Option A (have phasing) is preferred to minimise disruption to existing neighbourhoods- Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred- Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred	The responses on issues A – K are noted.

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred - Issue H: (Site layout) All of the identified issues need to be considered - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Type of boundary treatment and how sites blend with their surroundings need to be considered - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) All of the identified issues need to be considered - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(iv) (require that the site is retained for Gypsy and Traveller use through a variety of methods) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (require that the site is restored to its former condition through a variety of methods) is preferred 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr J Torrance	0072
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option B (increase the number of pitches on authorised sites) is preferred - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Option B(iii) (split distribution in proportion to parish area) is preferred - Issue D: Option A (have phasing) is preferred - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred 	The responses on issues A – K are noted.

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue H: (Site layout) Pitch size, fire safety and site management need to be considered - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Type of boundary treatment needs to be considered - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) Design of amenity buildings need to be considered - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(ii) (require that the site is retained for Gypsy and Traveller use through use of legal agreements) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option A (do not require that sites are restored to their former condition) is preferred 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs H Griffin	0073
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Options D (give planning permission to suitable unauthorised sites) and F (a mix of the options) are preferred - Issue B: Options A (5 pitches and under) and B (10 pitches and under) are preferred - Issue C: Option B(iii) (split distribution in proportion to parish area) is preferred - Issue D: Option A (have phasing) is preferred - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred; no comment at this time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue F – It should be noted that Travelling Showpeople require a permanent settled base to store their equipment, particularly during the winter months, and such sites can include residential accommodation. <p>The responses on issues A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J and K are noted.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred, as these are temporary and do not cause disruption - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred; no comment at this time - Issue H: (Site layout) All of the identified issues need to be considered and Government guidance should be used - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) All of the identified issues need to be considered and Government guidance should be used - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) All of the identified issues need to be considered and Government guidance should be used - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(i-iv) (require that the site is retained for Gypsy and Traveller use through use of all available methods) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through a variety of methods) is preferred 	
--	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs J McLeod	0074
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: <i>'Do not increase capacity in any way'</i> - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Option A (use the existing distribution as a guide) is preferred - Issue D: Option A (have phasing) is preferred 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue F – It should be noted that Travelling Showpeople require a permanent settled base to store their equipment, particularly during the winter months, and such sites can include residential accommodation.

UNCLASSIFIED

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred as they <i>'are not talking up permanent residence'</i> - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred - Issue H: (Site layout) All of the identified issues (apart from amenity sites) need to be considered and Government guidance should be used - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) All of the identified issues need to be considered and Government guidance should be used - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) All of the identified issues need to be considered and Government guidance should be used - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option A (do not seek to retain sites for Gypsy and Traveller use) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through a variety of methods) is preferred 	<p>The responses on issues A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J and K are noted.</p>
---	---

Respondent:	Representation no:
Ms S Warr	0075
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option G (other) is preferred – do not increase the amount of accommodation - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Option B (look at more equal distribution of sites across the Borough) 	<p>The responses on issues A - K are noted.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>is preferred</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue D: Option A (have phasing) is preferred - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred – <i>‘because there is no more available space’</i> - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred - Issue H: (Site layout) Pitch size, fire safety, site management, commercial activity and livestock need to be considered - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Landscaping and how sites blend in with their surroundings need to be considered - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) All of the identified issues need to be considered - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option A (do not seek to retain sites for Gypsy and Traveller use) is preferred – <i>‘anyone can use the site’</i> - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through a variety of methods) is preferred 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr J Ferguson	0076
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option A (make current authorised sites larger) is preferred as this will allow families to remain near each other; options C (allocate new sites) and option D (give planning permission to suitable existing sites) are also preferred 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue B – The number of sites required will depend on the outcomes of the updated GTAA. • Issue C – Comments regarding equality and the treatment of

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>to allow for future expansion, provided sites are in suitable locations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue B: Option D (16+ pitches) is preferred as this will reduce the number of sites needed - Issue C: Option C (do not seek to control distribution of sites) is preferred, as there is no attempt to do this with conventional housing - Issue D: Option A (have phasing) is preferred so that it is clear what will be available and when - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred to cover unexpected events such as unexpected expansions or flooding [of existing sites] - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred if required to avoid unauthorised stopping; <i>'Showpeople tend to have large equipment which needs a proper site in order to be safe'</i> - Issue G: Option A (allocate transit sites) is preferred; one for short term usage, up to 5 pitches (approximately) - Issue H: (Site layout) Use existing Government Guidance is preferred – <i>'Using existing guidance and good practice means that there is a framework which can be readily put in place, and avoid having to 'invent the wheel twice'.'</i> - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) See answer to Issue H – again this would be easier and cheaper to implement - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) See answers to Issues H and I - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(iv) (require that the site is retained for Gypsy and Traveller use through use of various methods) is preferred; <i>'Unless the sites are only for GRT there is a risk that they may be taken over by others ... meaning that there will not be enough room for the expected expansion.'</i> - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through a variety of methods) is preferred, but this should be flexible to take into account the circumstances of each site 	<p>conventional housing are noted. Gypsies and Travellers have different needs to those of the settled community which can require a more specific approach to site provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue E – Comments are noted. Having reserve sites could potentially allow for a site to come forward if another existing site was for some reason no longer available for use. • Issues H-J - It is considered that the GTLP offers the Council an opportunity to build upon the existing Government guidance (which does not always cover particular matters in detail or consider local context). On this basis creating more specific criteria-based policies would be beneficial in this regard. <p>The responses on issues A, D, F, G and K are noted.</p>
---	--

<p>Respondent:</p>	<p>Representation no:</p>
<p>Mr R Fenny</p>	<p>0077</p>

Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: The 2013 GTAA did not identify any additional need, therefore no further sites should be authorised - Issue B: <i>No comments made</i> - Issue C: Option B (distribute sites equally between parishes) is preferred - Issue D: Option A (have phasing) is preferred - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred as no more sites should be provided than are required by law - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred unless the Council are required by law to do so - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred unless the Council are required by law to do so - Issue H: (Site layout) All of the identified issues must be considered - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) All of the identified issues must be considered - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) All of the identified issues must be considered - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(i-iii) (require that the site is retained for Gypsy and Traveller use through use of legal agreements, conditions and policy) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(i-iii) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through use of legal agreements, conditions and policy) is preferred 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue A – The GTAA will be updated shortly and this may result in the level of need in the Borough changing. Existing sites may no longer be sufficient to meet identified need and therefore other options – including the provision of new sites – will need to be considered. • Issues E – G - Local authorities are required by Central Government to assess the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and develop a strategy that addresses any unmet need that is identified. Allocation of reserve sites, transit sites and Travelling Showpeople sites could assist the Council in meeting identified need. <p>The responses on issues B, C, D, H, I, J and K are noted.</p>
Respondent:	Representation no:
Ms F Heston	0078

Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option A (make current authorised sites larger) is preferred - Issue B: Option C (15 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Option A (use existing site distribution as a guide) is preferred - Issue D: Option A (have phasing) is preferred - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred - Issue G: Option A (allocate transit sites) is preferred - Issue H: (Site layout) Fire safety, access and parking, infrastructure and livestock must be considered - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) How the site blends into the landscape must be considered - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) The number, size and design of amenity buildings must be considered - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(iv) (require that the site is retained for Gypsy and Traveller use through use of various methods) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through use of various methods) is preferred 	The responses on issues A - K are noted.
Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr J Scales	0079

Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option G (other) is preferred. <i>'I believe that there is already sufficient provision in and around Hurst. There is an official Wokingham Borough site at Carters Hill, and 2 other private sites that have recently been approved in Nelson / Islandstone Lane), Since we already support 50% of the borough allocation I do not believe further provision should be in Hurst and we will be contributing this view to the discussions.'</i> - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Option B (look at more equal distribution of sites across the Borough) is preferred - Issue D: Option B (have no phasing) is preferred as this can hide the number and location of sites being approved - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred to prevent authorised use of private land - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) – <i>'no preference'</i> - Issue G: Option A (allocate transit sites) is preferred to prevent authorised use of private land - Issue H: (Site layout) Pitch size – this needs to be considered as road infrastructure will become overloaded if there are too many pitches on a site; access and parking – site accesses should be safe; commercial uses – these should be sited at existing business parks; livestock – this depends on site location and impact on existing properties. Existing Government guidance should also be used as this has been specifically developed for the purpose - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Type of boundary treatment – this should be considered to stop sites incrementally growing in size; how the site blends in with its surroundings should be governed as it is with normal houses. Existing Government guidance should also be used as this has been specifically 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues A and C – The concern about numbers of sites in rural parishes such as Hurst is noted. However, the Council has to consider many factors in site assessment including where there is available land that is suitable for sites, as well as how sustainable proposed/existing sites are (in terms of access to services as well as their relationship to adjoining settlements). • Issue D – Phasing would be used to control the timing of sites being brought forward for development. It would not bypass the requirement for obtaining planning permission, at which point local residents and the Parish/Town Council would be consulted on the application – and therefore residents will be made aware of the number and location of sites as these progress through the system. <p>The responses on issues B, E, F, G, H, I, J and K are noted.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>developed for the purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) Existing Government guidance should also be used as this has been specifically developed for the purpose - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option A (do not require that the site is retained for Gypsy and Traveller use) is preferred – <i>‘If they are not in use, then why waste the land’</i> - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through use of various methods) is preferred, to ensure that the cost of clearing up is not passed on to taxpayers 	
---	--

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mrs M Land	0080
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option A (make current authorised sites larger) is preferred; <i>‘For some sites this may not be an option, but there will already be no access issues and better facilities that at greenfield sites’</i>. Option B (increase the number of pitches on authorised sites) could be an option on sites with space or alternative uses - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches and under) is preferred; <i>‘This reduces the traffic to and from sites, which are often not along a main road and extra vehicle traffic is often not suitable for the existing road structure in the area. Many of the local roads are raised roads with ditches and the larger vans involved are often</i> 	The responses on issues A - K are noted.

<p><i>as wide as the road and they force other road users off into the ditches which is very dangerous'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue C: Option B (split in proportion to population of the parish) is preferred - Issue D: Option A (have phasing) is preferred as this allow for planning and infrastructure improvements - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred; <i>'They are asked to manage the sites and should in consultation with the sites users allocate them'</i> - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred to provide safe and well maintained places to stop between venues - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred as these may not stay as transit and may be occupied permanently - Issue H: (Site layout) Pitch size – if pitches are too large they will become filled with additional items; fire safety and access and parking – these are essential; access and parking – site accesses should be safe; infrastructure – water and drainage should be provided but should be paid for by site occupants; amenity sites – safe playing areas would be good; site management – if handled with care this could help to control rubbish and vehicles; commercial activity – sites should be used for living, not businesses; livestock – these should not be kept on sites. <i>'Why can't we get it right for our community?'</i> - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Type of boundary treatment – this needs to fit in with local surroundings; landscaping – this would help to soften sites and make them less obvious; how the site blends in with its surroundings – will help to become part of the landscape. - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) Number and size of buildings – should be judged on a site by site basis; sustainability measures are worth trying; design should fit in with other local buildings - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(iv) (require that the site is retained for Gypsy and Traveller use through use of various methods) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through use of various methods) is preferred 	
---	--

<p>Respondent:</p>	<p>Representation no:</p>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Mrs H Pickup	0081
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option G (other) is preferred; the respondent does not consider that there is a need as Travellers are transitory - Issue B: <i>No comments made</i> - Issue C: <i>No comments made</i> - Issue D: <i>No comments made</i> - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred; it is considered that unauthorised stopping will still occur - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred; it is considered that unauthorised stopping will still occur - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred; it is considered that unauthorised stopping will still occur <p>No further comments are provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues E – G – The purpose of allocating these sites is to discourage unauthorised stopping by providing alternatives for the Travelling community. <p>The responses on issues A, B, C, D, H, I, J and K are noted.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr D Pickup	0082

Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option B (increase the number of pitches on authorised sites) is preferred to avoid additional expense for taxpayers - Issue B: <i>No comments made</i> - Issue C: <i>No comments made</i> - Issue D: <i>No comments made</i> - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred; no more sites should be created - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred; the existing sites should be used - Issue G: Option B (do not allocate transit sites) is preferred; they are unsightly and reduce house values in the surrounding area - Issue H: (Site layout) Fire safety should be considered to avoid any risk to the surrounding area; access and parking should be considered to avoid any impact on local residents - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) <i>No comments made</i> - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) <i>No comments made</i> - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option A (do not seek to require that sites are retained for Gypsy and Traveller use) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(i, ii) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through use of conditions and legal agreements) is preferred 	<p>The preferred options and comments are noted. It is noted that residents have concerns relating to costs of sites and the impact on local communities. However local authorities are required by Central Government to assess the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and develop a strategy that addresses any unmet need that is identified. Failure to do so can result in more unauthorised sites/encampments and planning applications being granted at appeal.</p>
Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr C Carpenter	0083

Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option A (make current authorised sites larger) is preferred as this will have less impact on the local community than new sites. Option D (give planning permission to suitable unauthorised sites) should also be considered of these are long term as the impact already exists - Issue B: Option D (16+ pitches) is preferred to allow for good facilities - Issue C: Option B(i, ii) (split evenly between parish and split according to parish population) is preferred - Issue D: Option B (have no phasing) is preferred; just respond to need - Issue E: Option A (allocate reserve sites) is preferred - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred as this could result in partly used sites that allow others to move in - Issue G: Option A (allocate transit sites) is preferred; if there is genuine need and good controls are in place - Issue H: (Site layout) All of the identified issues need to be considered, as well as Government guidance. Gypsies and Travellers should comply with Council regulations along with other residents of the Borough - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) See comments on Issue H - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) See comments on Issue H - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(i-iii) (seek to require that sites are retained for Gypsy and Traveller use through conditions, legal agreements and policy) is preferred, as if there was no control that could increase demand - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through various methods) is preferred to prevent the countryside being damaged 	<p>The responses on issues A - K are noted.</p>

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr K Newland Chairman - Wokingham Without Parish Council	0084
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option G (other) – the case for needing additional pitches does not seem well made; there is ongoing concern about existing non-Gypsy and Traveller occupation and how this may affect any new pitches that are provided - Issue B: Option A (5 pitches and under) is preferred as large sites can inhibit integration with the local community and make it harder to deal with problems - Issue C: Option B(iv) (split by the number of settlements within/adjoining parish) is preferred. However, this option does not address the reasons behind the issue of site distribution i.e. unpopularity with local residents - Issue D: Option B (have no phasing) is preferred; if non-Gypsy and Traveller occupation is addressed then additional pitches will be available and there will be no need for a phased plan - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred; until a better case for need is made, reserve sites are unnecessary - Issue F: Option A (allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred as genuine Travellers should have access to such facilities; ideally these should be temporary sites on showgrounds instead of permanent sites that may be underused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues A, D, E – The Draft Options Paper is based on the existing GTAA which was published in 2013. The GTAA will be updated shortly and this may result in the level of need in the Borough changing, which may impact on the requirement for additional pitches. The concern about non-Gypsy and Traveller occupation is noted and the Council will continue to seek to address this issue, both with existing sites and with any new sites in the future (see Option K1). • Issue C –Concerns of residents are noted. . All of the responses made on the various options will feed into the evolution of the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan which seeks to address both Gypsy and Traveller need and also local concerns in future policies and site allocations. • Issue F – Travelling Showpeople have particular requirements for permanent sites during the winter months and space for storage and maintenance of equipment. It is expected that the owners of such sites would seek to ensure they were fully utilised and secure. • Issue G - The Council is aware that a dedicated policy and clear, enforceable regulation/management would be required for any potential transit sites. The purpose of such sites would be to help address the issue of unauthorised encampments.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue G: Option A (allocate transit sites) is preferred as unauthorised encampments are a huge problem and the Council has a duty to provide somewhere for Travellers to stop. The main concern is the need for effective enforcement for these to stay as transit sites, as well as Council powers to stop unauthorised encampments - Issue H: (Site layout) Access and parking and infrastructure must be provided; commercial activities should not take place on residential sites (as is the case with normal housing) but should be on suitable business premises; keeping of livestock should also be subject to the same regulations as other residents - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) <i>No comments made</i> - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) Design of amenity buildings – planning and building regulations should apply - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(i-ii) (seek to require that sites are retained for Gypsy and Traveller use through conditions and legal agreements) is preferred where sites are made specifically for Travellers to occupy. Otherwise it is considered that settled members of the Travelling community should integrate with the settled community in conventional housing or mobile home parks - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(i, ii) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through use of conditions and legal agreements) is preferred; these sites should not be considered ‘brownfield’ but restored to greenfield status and subject to the appropriate policies accordingly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue K1 – The Council is required by Government to assess the need for pitches for of the Gypsy and Traveller community and to develop a strategy to meet the identified need. <p>The responses on issues B, H, I, J and K2 are noted.</p>
---	---

Respondent:	Representation no:
Mr A King	0085
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	

Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option G (other) – <i>‘Hurst should not have an increase in the number of Gypsies and Travellers as we already have sufficient provision in the area.’</i> - Issue B: Option B (10 pitches and under) is preferred - Issue C: Option B(i) (split evenly between parishes) is preferred; <i>‘Hurst is already providing 50% of the Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Borough and should not have to provide more.’</i> - Issue D: Option A (have phasing) is preferred - Hurst should not have any more sites and this can be reconsidered in 5 years - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred as this may lead to too great an increase in numbers - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred as they should use existing sites - Issue G: Option A (allocate transit sites) is preferred as they could become permanent - Issue H: (Site layout) All of the identified issues should be considered and Government guidance should be used. - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) All of the identified issues should be considered and Government guidance should be used. - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) Design of amenity buildings should be considered and Government guidance should be used. - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(i-iii) (seek to require that sites are retained for Gypsy and Traveller use through conditions, legal agreements and policy) is preferred - Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(i, ii) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through use of conditions and legal agreements) is preferred 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues A, C, D – The concern about numbers of sites in rural parishes such as Hurst is noted. The Council has to consider many factors in site assessment including where there is available land that is suitable for sites and where the Gypsy and Traveller community wish to live, as well as how sustainable proposed/existing sites are (in terms of access to services as well as their relationship to adjoining settlements). • Issue F – Travelling Showpeople have different requirements to other members of the Travelling community due to their need to store fairground equipment, therefore it is unlikely they will be able to use existing sites (and there is only one existing Travelling Showperson site in the Borough). <p>The responses on issues B, E, G, H, I, J and K are noted.</p>
Respondent:	Representation no:

Mr R Edwards	0086
Call for Sites	
Site name / number: N/A	
Summary of Representation:	WBC response:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue A: Option C (allocate new sites) – <i>‘Wokingham Borough site at Carters Hill, and 2 other private sites that have recently been approved in Nelson / Islandstone Lane), Since, in Hurst we already support 50% of the borough allocation we do not believe further provision should be in Hurst.’</i> - Issue B: <i>No comments made</i> - Issue C: Option B(iv) (split by the number of settlements within/adjoining parish) is preferred - Issue D: Option A (have phasing) is preferred - Issue E: Option B (do not allocate reserve sites) is preferred as it will lead to these sites becoming ‘de facto sites’ - Issue F: Option B (do not allocate Travelling Showpeople sites) is preferred - Issue G: Option A (allocate transit sites) is preferred as they could become permanent - Issue H: (Site layout) Pitch size should be considered to stop too many people occupying the site; fire safety, infrastructure and site management are important on health and safety grounds; access and parking to stop parking of vehicles that will exceed the capacity of the site; amenity site and commercial activity should be considered; livestock should be controlled to stop them running loose - Issue I: (Site boundaries and landscaping) Boundary treatments, landscaping and how the site blends with the landscape should be considered so as not create an eyesore - Issue J: (Amenity buildings) <i>No comments made</i> - Issue K1: (Site retention) Option B(i-iv) (seek to require that sites are retained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Issue A – The concern about numbers of sites in rural parishes such as Hurst is noted. The Council has to consider many factors in site assessment including where there is available land that is suitable for sites and where the Gypsy and Traveller community wish to live, as well as how sustainable proposed/existing sites are (in terms of access to services as well as their relationship to adjoining settlements). <p>The responses on issues B – K are noted.</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

<p>for Gypsy and Traveller use through all available methods) is preferred</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Issue K2: (Site restoration) Option B(iv) (require that sites are restored to their former condition through various methods) is preferred	
---	--