

Report on the outcomes of Public Consultation Options 2013

1. Introduction

1.1. This report has been prepared to provide a summary of the representations made in relation to the 2013 Gypsy and Traveller Sites Options consultation.

1.2. The outcomes from this consultation have been used to help shape the Council's 2013 Gypsy and Traveller Preferred Site Options document.

1.3. The tables in this report summarise the representations received on the range of options sites and other comments/questions. These other comments are rebutted by the Council or questions answered.

1.4. Full details of the representations received in relation to this consultation are available on the Warwick District Council website at [Gypsy and Traveller Site Options Consultation](#)

2. Consultation Representations Statistics

2.1. The table below provides a summary of the 3594 representations received. It should be noted however that although the planning system does not place weight on the specific number of responses received, it recognises the strengths and quality of the arguments put forward and the general body of opinion.

2.2. In addition to the individual representations received, the Council has received 6 petitions. They were signed by 840, 831,476, 84, 30, 20 respectively. The petitions were:

- opposing sites GT03, GT04, GT05, GT06, GT09, GT10, GT15
- against Gypsy and Traveller sites taking precedence over house building and against compulsory purchase of land
- opposing sites GT03, GT04, GT05
- opposing site GT19
- opposing site GT04
- opposing sites GT02, GT03, GT04

The following table relates to the sites and areas of search which were published in the Sites for Gypsies and Travellers consultation paper in June 2013.

Objections to Specific Sites

Site Ref:	Site	Comments
GT01	Land adj. Cobalt Centre, Siskin Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the best sites as furthest from established homes • Low deliverability • Inappropriate development in the Green Belt • Entirely within land needed to provide ecological compensation for Gateway development proposal. Significant adverse cumulative effect on biodiversity • Siskin Drive has good access and should be developed further. If this is considered insufficient, include at A45 end of Gateway development • Residents of the site will have a reduced quality of life due to aircraft noise until late at night; the noise and light from the airport and associated business park plus the smells from the sewage treatment works • There are three traveller sites (at Siskin Drive, Brandon Lane and Oxford Road) which already meet any under-provision • Proposed sites do not satisfy the local plan strategy of "distributing development across the district" • Existing residents of Baginton face overcrowded local doctors, schools and hospitals. Additional traveller site here will not help meet government aims of improving travellers' access to education, health, welfare, and employment infrastructure • Proposed site is used by local business. Unacceptable to damage a profitable business and force it to give up its land • Gateway Development will deliver many thousands of jobs and is of greater benefit to the entire community than a gypsy and traveller site • No proper drainage and concern about water quality of river downstream • The site is in close proximity to a petrol station (therefore Health and Safety reasons should discount it). The owner of the site has previously had an application to site caravans here refused because of this • It is feared that the Travellers will not maintain their site in an appropriate manner
GT02	Land abutting Fosse Way at its Junction with A425	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remote from GP surgery which is full. • Schools are either fully subscribed or with few places. • Public transport satisfactory but irrelevant as residents will use own vehicles. Bus stop but no pedestrian links. • Prone to flooding • Additional traffic on existing busy, noisy road with dangerous junctions. Fosse Way is high risk route • No mains sewerage, drainage or gas. Electricity supply needs upgrading • Fosse Way is Roman road where there is likely to be archaeological remains which would be destroyed. Also site of tollhouse • Site cannot be integrated into landscape being at the bottom of the valley and not easily screened • Small local community would be absorbed by new residents resulting in lack of integration • Impact on WEC and local businesses with loss of jobs • Urbanisation • Loss of quality farmland • Major invasion into openness of countryside • Travellers are favoured over local community who pay for the site • Won't feel safe in Radford Semele when lights go out at night • Why should locals have to relocate to make room for Travellers

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerous thefts in Harbury, Ufton, Southam and Radford Semele when Travellers pass through • Will degrade the security and safety of all local residents • Property will be unsellable • Will add to blight of HS2 • Loss of countryside to greed • Will become merged blur with Leamington and Bishop's Tachbrook • Loss of community • Potential for this to become sprawling settlement • Impact largely on neighbouring District or Stratford • Area already suffered from Ufton tip and impending HS2 • Question traditional lifestyles contributing to sustainability • Potential damage to outlying agricultural fields • SA report incomplete • Potential contamination to food crops • Ecological concerns re effects of uncontrolled and unvaccinated dogs on wildlife and livestock • Sporting shoots take place nearby creating potential danger • HS2 will close Stoneleigh Exhibition Centre so WEC will be needed • Local growers will be affected
GT03	Land at Barnwell Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remote from GP surgery • Schools are either fully subscribed or with few places • Public transport satisfactory but irrelevant as residents will use own vehicles. Bus stop but no pedestrian links • Prone to flooding • Additional traffic on existing busy, noisy road with dangerous junctions. Fosse Way is high risk route • No mains sewerage, drainage or gas. Electricity supply needs upgrading • Poor phone and broadband provision. • Fosse Way is Roman road where there is likely to be archaeological remains which would be destroyed. Also site of tollhouse • Impact on views from Chesterton Windmill • Site cannot be integrated into landscape being at the bottom of the valley and not easily screened. • Small local community would be absorbed by new residents resulting in lack of integration. • Impact on local businesses • Urbanisation • Loss of quality farmland • Major invasion into openness of countryside • Large intensive broiler site sited so as to avoid smell and noise nuisance has number of traffic movements at night and 24hr heating and ventilation systems • Will result in ribbon development • Risk of flooding on roads • Increasing carbon footprint • Coalescence • Will degrade the security and safety of all local residents • Will make property unsellable • Will add to blight of HS2 • A site for this type of community should be created in an area that could provide the amenities and services they require • Accessing this site means using a poorly maintained track with a steep incline from the Fieldgate Lane/Golf Lane bend. It is also a designated public footpath • Golf Lane is a bus route and copes with traffic from the school, golf club and large nursing home • Residents of the static homes adjacent to the site operate a business which uses large plant machinery adding further

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> pressure to Golf Lane this track cannot be considered a 'safe access' to the road network Local services would be under pressure as rubbish collections are already fortnightly and the Police need to meet budgetary constraints. The type and amount of additional traffic will add to local road pressures and have to contend with double-parking, speed humps and the sharp bend at the top of Golf Lane/Whitnash Road which all adds to the danger Without specific examples of what constitutes 'traditional lifestyles' comments on sustainability would be subjective Level of isolation of the sites is also unlikely to promote inclusion Unauthorised intrusion from the site occupiers onto the agricultural land could result in contractors not wishing to risk tractors and equipment and any crop damage and rubbish deposits could result in land ceasing to be farmed and becoming unsightly
GT04	Land at Harbury Lane/Fosse Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remote from GP surgery which is full Schools are either fully subscribed or with few places Public transport satisfactory but irrelevant as residents will use own vehicles. Bus stop but no pedestrian links Prone to flooding Additional traffic on existing busy, noisy road with dangerous junctions. Fosse Way is high risk route. No mains sewerage, drainage or gas. Electricity supply needs upgrading Poor phone and broadband provision Fosse Way is Roman road where there is likely to be archaeological remains which would be destroyed. Also site of tollhouse Impact on views from Chesterton Windmill Site cannot be integrated into landscape being at the bottom of the valley and not easily screened Small local community would be absorbed by new residents resulting in lack of integration Impact on local businesses Urbanisation Loss of quality farmland Major invasion into openness of countryside Will result in ribbon development Will degrade the security and safety of all local residents Will make property unsellable Will add to blight of HS2 Furthest from existing homes to be preferred, like Harbury Lane Whitnash is boxed in Loss of Green Belt Loss of countryside to greed Will become merged blur with Leamington and Bishop's Tachbrook Loss of community Main activity of sites is recycling waste; detritus creates a considerable eyesore Recent illegal occupation deprived children of a play area Question whether sites would be used properly Without specific examples of what constitutes 'traditional lifestyles' comments on sustainability would be subjective Local services would be under pressure as rubbish collections are already fortnightly and the Police need to meet budgetary constraints. The type and amount of additional traffic will add to local road pressures and have to contend with double-parking, speed humps and the sharp bend at the top of Golf Lane/Whitnash

		<p>Road which all adds to the danger</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of isolation of the sites is also unlikely to promote inclusion • Cannot believe how close sites are to village housing and how many there are • Worried about sites expanding • Unauthorised intrusion from the site occupiers onto the agricultural land could result in contractors not wishing to risk tractors and equipment and any crop damage and rubbish deposits could result in land ceasing to be farmed and becoming unsightly • The New Windmill football ground would be lost • Bishops Tachbrook, Whitnash and Harbury would not be able to offer any traditional forms of income or support the traditional lifestyle of travellers or gypsies given that it's not a horse based community and police advice is not to buy from door to door sales people • Could be a precedent for further ribbon development • Nearby site (on Princethorpe to Coventry Road) not been fully utilised
GT05	Land at Tachbrook Hill Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degrades security and safety of all local residents • Bishop's Tachbrook only has part-time GP. Impact of new sites for community with known health issues and mortality rates • There is no dentist • Pressure on schools with Roman Catholic school already turning pupils away. Where parents illiterate this will add to pressure in classroom • Bishop's Tachbrook school small and single form entry. Will another school be built? Will catchment areas change? • Secondary schools oversubscribed • Children will struggle to integrate • Lack of literacy affects employment potential • Site is prone to flooding • sewerage, drainage, gas and water supplies are inadequate • Site on fast moving main road. Mallory Rd/Banbury Rd is a busy junction difficult to exit • No means of pedestrian access, footways or bus routes; dangers of cycling and children waiting for school transport • Turning caravans would be dangerous • Safety provisions needed for people and animals (horses and dogs)? • Borders M40 therefore noisy for occupants also noise from new residents major effect on existing • Would be first visual sight of village and devastating on approach to historic Warwick Town; could discourage tourists and visitors • Listed buildings on site need protection • Would harm character of area (agricultural farm land) and not integrate into landscape • Highly unlikely to be peaceful and integrated co-existence given level of local disagreement • Council should consider making this site and others around it, Green Belt to ensure villages are not swallowed up • Will make property unsellable • Will add to blight of HS2 • Too remote from infrastructure at Leamington • No statement of need from a Gypsy body • Disregards Rural Area Policies in Local Plan • Unavailable and not deliverable • Should review Green Belt and allow sites north of Warwick, Leamington and Kenilworth • Not sustainable for multi-modal accessibility • Not available • Not deliverable • Should be allocated as Green Belt

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential archaeology • Co • Consider advertising it as affecting the setting of a scheduled monument and Listed Building • Cumulative impact with other proposed sites on sustainable transport; the need to travel; local services and community/other facilities • Bishops Tachbrook's strong rural character must be preserved. Rat runs through the village to the M40 undermine its character and raise road safety issues meaning any new developments should be avoided • Close to Oakley Wood and crematorium. Potential harm to balance and harmony and reduction in use • Site close to Parish in Stratford District with great impact • Not compatible with Potential site for Nature Conservation • Concerns regarding waste disposal • Question management arrangements • Cannot believe how close sites are to village housing and how many there are • Worried about sites expanding • Consequences of animals escaping the site and getting on the road would be severe • Village offer no employment opportunities • Area is predominantly livestock breeding. Travelling nature of Gypsies from other rural areas, means poultry diseases could spread potentially decimating the breeding flocks at Tollgate Poultry Farm • Support the owner of majority of site who objects on the basis of Farming Enterprise and Agriculture, Highways and Safety Issues, Services and Utilities, Rural Landscape and Ecology and Wildlife Habitat • May lead to increase in the theft of gates, metalware and other farm fixtures and fittings • Close proximity to Oakley Wood which could be jeopardised if lurcher dogs were loose and firewood was collected • May become a fire hazard
GT06	Land at Park Farm/Spinney Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bishop's Tachbrook only has part-time GP. Impact of new sites for community with known health issues and mortality rates • There is no dentist • Pressure on schools with Roman Catholic school already turning pupils away. Where parents illiterate this will add to pressure in classroom • Bishop's Tachbrook school small and single form entry. Will another school be built? Will catchment areas change? • Secondary schools oversubscribed • Children will struggle to integrate • Lack of literacy affects employment potential • Site is prone to flooding • sewerage, drainage, gas and water supplies are inadequate • Site on fast moving main road. Mallory Rd/Banbury Rd is a busy junction difficult to exit • No means of pedestrian access, footways or bus routes; dangers of cycling and children waiting for school transport • Former landfill site with gassing potential and unsuitable for habitation and occupation • Turning caravans would be dangerous • Safety provisions needed for people and animals (horses and dogs)? • Borders M40 therefore noisy for occupants also noise from new residents major effect on existing • Would be first visual sight of village and devastating on approach to historic Warwick Town; could discourage tourists and visitors • Listed buildings on site need protection

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would harm character of area (agricultural farm land) and not integrate into landscape • Highly unlikely to be peaceful and integrated co-existence given level of local disagreement • Council should consider making this site and others around it, Green Belt to ensure villages are not swallowed up • Concerns about dog-worrying as land is used for grazing sheep and cattle • If the land is allocated will immediately apply for a judicial review of the council's decision • Not sustainable for multi-modal accessibility • Disregards Rural Area Policies of Local Plan • Reported wild deer sightings on site • Adjacent to Asps - resolved to be unsuitable for development due to impact on backdrop to Warwick Castle Park • Loss of farmland and rural employment • Ecological value not assessed • Not available • Not deliverable • CPO lengthy, costly and unviable • Should be allocated as Green Belt • Should not be considered further until consultation with English Heritage on landscapes' special character is complete • Should not be considered further until a detailed ecological assessment is carried out • Cumulative impact with other proposed sites on sustainable transport; the need to travel; local services and community/other facilities • Level of isolation of the sites is also unlikely to promote inclusion • Telephone mast in north eastern corner, which is classed by WHO and International Agency for Research on Cancer as a mobile radiation source so not recommended for residential area • Proximity to busy roads and M40 plus south westerly winds makes site noisy for any residents • Borders large heronry and is site of interest for nature conservation • Sites at Pathlow and Shipston should be fully utilised first • Unavailable so not deliverable • Understand gypsy community not in favour of internal toilet facilities which will upset locals • Threat to landscape of major importance
GT07	Land at Stoneleigh Rd, Baginton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illogical as there is already a site for travellers at Siskin Drive • Would disrupt village life • Would take away a sustained thriving business (Smiths Garden Centre) • Seems huge and would be a dominant feature in Baginton • Dramatic increase in population without increasing amenities • Significant number of places will be required at Baginton catchment area schools, where children are often not able to get their first choice. Not appropriate to increase child places • Additional costs of transporting children to school • Perceived link between gypsy/traveller sites and crime will cause dramatic drop in property values • Combined with Coventry & Warwickshire Gateway, would be too much development too quickly, resulting in strained community relations and reduction in quality of life for gypsy/travellers and villagers • The provision of a gypsy and traveller site in this area may preclude residential development on the rest of the site thereby losing the opportunity • Inappropriate development in the green belt • Potential Local Wildlife Sites in or adjacent which have not yet been fully surveyed and assessed but should be treated as Local

		<p>Wildlife Sites. The presence of a LWS could influence the type or density of development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is Council trying to destroy village with new developments • Travellers prefer to be isolated from non-Travellers • Size of site would dominate village • Will open the floodgates to other Travellers • Baginton residents have to catch a bus to Coventry for a GP surgery • Gypsies dogs have attacked people locally and caused traffic accidents • Effect on wildlife • Should preserve green spaces and fields • On privately owned land home to a thriving nursery providing employment to many local young people • Why Smith's Nurseries when there are empty fields • Small village shop useful for elderly but Gypsy children can be intimidating • Baginton being bombarded with threats of development • Already three sites in close proximity • A traveller site will detract from the Coven Tree Oak and Roman Lunt Fort adversely affecting tourism in the village • Residents feel threatened by the adverse implications of a gypsy and traveller site so close to their homes • Why do travellers' need a permanent site • There are caravan sites around our country that are available at a daily fee • Not a good move for community that, at the moment attracts professionals • Non green belt land is more appropriate • Will harm the business potential of local employer • Having them near a prestigious golf club is a foolish idea • Proximity to golf club presents a serious risk of trespass and damage • Having permanent site makes no sense • Would spoil a lovely area of the West Midlands • Will have an adverse effect on the perception of village • Site's size is totally disproportionate to the size of Baginton • Traffic calming on Coventry road and Mill Hill is totally ineffective. Site will make Baginton's traffic situation unbearable • Lack of justification for site selection and process not robust • Smells from sewage works • Access to village not suitable for pushchairs, wheelchairs or use by the infirm
GT08	Depot west of Cubbington Heath Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will degrade the security and safety of all local residents • Would add further blight to those affected by HS2 • Work traffic from HS2 will add to the problems • Fall in property values • Site entrance on brow of hill and not clearly visible • Most vehicles exceed 50mph speed limit • No utilities and excavation needed to provide them could disturb dangerous asbestos which may have been placed there when site used for landfill of building materials • Local charities would suffer as rent from this land is distributed to them • Previous bad experience of Traveller sites • Will make property unsellable • No local industry • Sites historically attract social and nuisance problems • Important to retain existing hedgerows to screen the site • Numerous small sites costly to maintain
GT09	Land north east of M40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential Local Wildlife Sites in or adjacent which have not yet been fully surveyed and assessed but should be treated as Local Wildlife Sites. The presence of a LWS could influence the type or

		<p>density of development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bishop's Tachbrook only has part-time GP. Impact of new sites for community with known health issues and mortality rates • There is no dentist • Pressure on schools with Roman Catholic school already turning pupils away. Where parents illiterate this will add to pressure in classroom • Bishop's Tachbrook school small and single form entry. Will another school be built? Will catchment areas change? • Secondary schools oversubscribed • Children will struggle to integrate • Lack of literacy affects employment potential • Site is prone to flooding • sewerage, drainage, gas and water supplies are inadequate • Site on fast moving main road. Mallory Rd/Banbury Rd is a busy junction difficult to exit • No means of pedestrian access, footways or bus routes; dangers of cycling and children waiting for school transport • Limited public transport options • Turning caravans would be dangerous • Safety provisions needed for people and animals (horses and dogs)? • Borders M40 therefore noisy for occupants also noise from new residents major effect on existing • Would be first visual sight of village • Impact on tourism in the area • Would harm character of area (agricultural farm land) and not integrate into landscape • Highly unlikely to be peaceful and integrated co-existence given level of local disagreement • Council should consider making this site and others around it, Green Belt to ensure villages are not swallowed up • Should not be considered further until consultation with English Heritage is complete • Should not be considered further until a detailed ecological assessment is carried out • Cumulative impact with other proposed sites on sustainable transport; the need to travel; local services and community/other facilities • Listed Buildings in Bishop's Tachbrook may be subject to possible damage • Threat of pollution to the Tachbrook Brook • Operated by the Gypsy Community and not the Council so the actual numbers of people on site won't be regulated or controlled • Widely reported the site was an historic landfill site • Extensive area of land exceeds what is needed, therefore assume intend max 15 pitches • No ecology or biodiversity evidence • Former landfill site with potential for gas • No proper drainage and concern about water quality of river downstream • There are large areas of Leamington (predominantly in the wealthy North greenbelt) that have no proposals • May lead to increase in the theft of gates, metalware and other farm fixtures and fittings • Urbanisation • Unavailable so undeliverable • This site contains listed buildings • Wild deer sightings on this land that roam freely across the Castle grounds to the site and beyond • Problems of tipping in woodland, loss of timber and coursing • Understand gypsy community not in favour of internal toilet facilities which will upset locals
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would impact on the setting of Greys Mallory • Farm owners annoyed at CPO
GT10	Land at Tollgate House & Guide Dogs National Breeding Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bishop's Tachbrook only has part-time GP. Impact of new sites for community with known health issues and mortality rates • There is no dentist • Pressure on schools with Roman Catholic school already turning pupils away. Where parents illiterate this will add to pressure in classroom • Bishop's Tachbrook school small and single form entry. Will another school be built? Will catchment areas change? • Secondary schools oversubscribed • Children will struggle to integrate • Lack of literacy affects employment potential • Site is prone to flooding • sewerage, drainage, gas and water supplies are inadequate • Site on fast moving main road. Mallory Rd/Banbury Rd is a busy junction difficult to exit • No means of pedestrian access, footways or bus routes; dangers of cycling and children waiting for school transport • Turning caravans would be dangerous • Safety provisions needed for people and animals (horses and dogs)? • Borders M40 therefore noisy for occupants also noise from new residents major effect on existing • Would be first visual sight of village and devastating on approach to historic Warwick Town; could discourage tourists and visitors • Listed buildings on site need protection • Would harm character of area (agricultural farm land) and not integrate into landscape • Close to Guide Dog Centre and risk of disease spread • Highly unlikely to be peaceful and integrated co-existence given level of local disagreement • Council should consider making this site and others around it, Green Belt to ensure villages are not swallowed up • Future of Guide Dogs in UK depends on unique breeding scheme producing healthy puppies in sufficient numbers. Anything that puts this at risk must be avoided • Gypsies deny having children so as not to have to send them to school so depriving local children of a place • Other areas making provision have had increase in numbers of Gypsies and Travellers • What consideration has been given to the costs • Try one small site and see how it goes • Landowners consider land is unsuitable. Will strongly resist CPO • Represents greatest danger to Guide Dogs as an organisation • Should not be considered further until consultation with English Heritage is complete regarding adjacent Scheduled Monument and listed buildings • Adjacent to the M40 and potential harm from noise needs to be assessed and quantified • Cumulative impact with other proposed sites on sustainable transport; the need to travel; local services and community/other facilities • Cannot believe how close sites are to village housing and how many there are • Worried about sites expanding • Listed Buildings in Bishop's Tachbrook may be subject to possible damage • If the site is used as a place of work, there is a threat of pollution to the Tachbrook Brook • Loss of good quality arable land • Operated by the Gypsy Community and not the Council so the actual numbers of people on site won't be regulated or controlled

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No proper drainage and concern about water quality of river downstream • Effect on parish in Stratford district • On historic landfill - may still be gas and unsuitable for occupation • Unavailable so not deliverable • Historic landfill site • Understand gypsy community not in favour of internal toilet facilities which will upset locals
GT11	Land at Budbrooke Lodge, Racecourse and Hampton Rd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entry and exit of caravans would make road even more hazardous, making it too dangerous for cycling • Will exacerbate existing traffic problems, particularly pulling out of Chase Meadow onto Hampton Road • Local parking issues • Additional development will increase flooding on Chase Meadow • Further hard standing is likely to exacerbate current issues with the flood plain • Already lots of new development in area limiting amount of open green space for public to enjoy • Will put a strain on local infrastructure • Will cause an additional burden on Newburgh School and potential reduction in educational standards • Too close to existing residential contrary to aims of reducing tension between communities • Detrimental to racecourse and historical aspects of Warwick, fundamental to tourism • Would create poor visual approach to Warwick • Is causing anxiety in the area • Impact on environment/ waste management • Devaluation of local property prices • Overall management of site • Children from travelling community will be given priority for school places • Schools will be unable to cope with new housing developments and Travellers children • Existing GP surgery fully stretched and cannot cope with additional patients • Speed limits need checking on un-adopted roads through estate • May motivate house move • Environmental impact • Previous bad experience of Gypsies and Travellers site • Residents use proposed site for leisure activities • Site gives direct access from Chase Meadow to racecourse and St Mary's lands • Loss of St Mary's lands for recreation • More suitable locations having impact on fewer people • Hope residents will be given opportunity to have their say • Would involved CPO • Site is too big risking unauthorised numbers of Gypsies and Travellers to settle there • Chase Meadow is still being developed adding to the strain • New developments proposed with new infrastructure to south of Warwick where Gypsies and Travellers could be catered for • Located next to the Flat Straight for Warwick Race Course and will be visible to those attending events • Too near centre of town • Contrary to Planning Policy for Travellers • Large area and no way to control illegal growth • The racecourse stable block is a short distance from the proposed site, creating potential risks of diseases being transferred from non-vaccinated animals to thoroughbred racehorses • Why can't these "sites" be on green belt sites away from housing

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear that tax payers will have to fund it all • The investment and taxes paid for living here do not reflect a Gypsy site in such close proximity • Why should people have to keep their houses and gardens permanently locked up • The whole of the site is presently in an Area of Restraint and development would significantly harm the open character of the area • Local infrastructure will be unable to support a larger (12 pitch) site • Estate which has voiced strong opinion • Don't turn Warwick into a horse fair town • Understand the government is foisting this upon the Council, but think hard and long before making a final choice • Gypsy traveller community do not conform to working practices that enable a sustainable support to local communities • 500sqm per pitch is ridiculous and out of proportion to the neighbouring developments • Water voles on site • Two or three isolated sites preferable to scattergun approach adopted
GT12	Land north and west of Westham Lane (area of search)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria applied should be stricter than those for conventional housing as caravans at greater risk from flooding for example • Green belt issue is putting pressure on sites in small area south of district • Grade 2 agricultural land. Government policy is to use poorer quality land for this type of use • School places will be taken by Traveller children who will be given priority. Schools could not cope with additional children given new developments at Chase Meadow • GP surgery is already stretched • Need to police speed limits on un-adopted roads as risk to residents safety • Appearance of sites • Effect on tourism • Would change character of village • Crime rates would increase and so would policing costs • Local community will be seriously impacted by excess cars, caravans • Concerned that significant flaws in the consultation process have meant that the voice of Barford residents and in particular the Barford Residents Association have not been heard in relation to this site • Consultation forms have not been supplied and residents have had to rely on anonymous comment forms that have previously been circulated and may not be taken into account • Current discord the issue has created demonstrates that peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community is not possible • Contend unacceptable harm including to protected species e.g. water voles, badgers, owls • No restriction on number of people on the site, only number of pitches. • Farmer/owner will lose employment • No local police presence • Disregards Rural Area Policies of Local Plan • Unavailable so not deliverable • Question traditional lifestyles contributing to sustainability • Two or three isolated sites preferable to scattergun approach adopted
GT13	Kites Nest Lane, Beausale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt which should be protected • Wrong to include given previous planning history • Only included because it was suggested through 'call for sites'

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that alternative sites put forward by Parish Council have not been considered • Requiring location near facilities boloney when everyone has cars and these people are supposed to be able to travel • Prone to flooding. Horses removed due to this problem • Narrow country land not suitable for potential size and number of vehicles • Vehicles will have high visibility and impact on walkers, cyclists and horse riders using paths and bridleways • Will not blend in with surroundings • Several Grade II Listed Buildings nearby • Travellers have flouted planning laws and policies here and should be removed • Gypsies and travellers have no connection with this area and should not be permitted to live on these sites • Urbanising and incongruous • Govt. policy also to reduce tensions; history has increased • Proposed sites seem to have been selected in a somewhat haphazard manner and caused unnecessary alarm among residents • This site has been subject to Inquiry (decision due October 2013). How can it be considered a viable site • Cynical and opportunistic sleight of hand means illegal site is now being proposed • Other sites are more suitable especially if the desecrated wildlife area of the site is reinstated • Two or three isolated sites preferable to scattergun approach adopted • Disappointing that being subject to a pending planning appeal means the owners can ask for the site to be included and the council must accede in order to avoid claims of discrimination
GT14	Warwick Rd, Norton Lindsey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View will be of rows of caravans instead of elevated, glorious views of countryside • Will be hub of anti-social behaviour • Will devalue house prices by half creating negative equity forever and great stress • Village will be forever blighted • Lack of publicity for this site • Can cause distress and promote oppression towards minority communities • Local primary school is full • Crime rates are higher near such sites • Effect on tourism • Visual impact of sites • The privately owned site is on open market and is narrow that would only accommodate two visitors (approximately) • Cost of land and provision of services is prohibitive • Prefer to see low cost housing as great solution to tricky piece of land • Local community will be seriously impacted by excess cars, caravans
GT15	Land east of Europa Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nobody wants a site near them and this is a terrible option • Cumulative impact with other proposed sites on sustainable transport; the need to travel; local services and community/other facilities • Lack of public transport means distance to key facilities and employment will promote vehicle dependence where high volumes of traffic already exist, thereby increasing pressure on road infrastructure • Bishop's Tachbrook primary school is oversubscribed and often children within the catchment area are turned down, unlikely that it would cope with additional demand • Need to address significant health and educational inequalities

		<p>faced by travellers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just under half of the site is within a flood risk area. A full Flood Risk Assessment is required • Should not be considered further until a detailed ecological assessment is carried out • Anticipate widespread concern from the settled and travelling communities over a range of issues which undermine the viability of the site • Site is extremely isolated • Adult illiteracy reduces work opportunities and there are no immediate local employers for Travellers to obtain work • There are no pavements between the proposed site and the nearest village nor any bus stops or safe place for one to be installed • What are the provisions safety and security of people & animals given proximity of 50 mph roads • Bishops Tachbrook, Whitnash and Harbury would not be able to offer any traditional forms of income or support the traditional lifestyle of travellers or gypsies given that it's not a horse based community and police advice is not to buy from door to door sales people • Domestic and business operations on the site could have adverse impact on the natural environment • No ecology or biodiversity evidence • Potential for conflict with necessary future highway improvements
GT16	Land west of A429 Barford (small site)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria applied should be stricter than those for conventional housing as caravans at greater risk from flooding for example • Flood compensation area • Green belt issue is putting pressure on sites in small area south of district • Grade 2 agricultural land. Government policy is to use areas of poorer land for this type of use • Not sustainable in terms of multi-modal accessibility • Presence of water voles, a protected species • Inadequate pedestrian crossing facility to village • Proposal disregards Rural Area Policies in Local Plan • Will not allow peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community • Unacceptable loss of rural employment rendering isolated site totally unviable • Inadequate access from trunk road bypass with 60mph limit and history of accidents • Not deliverable, farmer does not wish to sell • Ecological value not assessed • In or adjacent to flood plain • Access unsafe • Local community will be seriously impacted by excess cars, caravans • The various industrial type activities likely to occur on the site could lead to river contamination and effects on adjacent agricultural land • Bronze Age burial site have been discovered in the vicinity • Will create noise and disturbance for Westham House and decimate the business • Would contradict Rural Area Policies on new housing, employment, safeguarding rural roads, camping and caravan sites • Would create eyesore and difficult to mitigate • Site has no storm/foul sewer facilities • Fails to meet Rural Area Policies of Local Plan • Two or three isolated sites preferable to scattergun approach adopted

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land below level of road and would require considerable engineering to provide access for caravans and waste collection vehicles • Caravans would not blend in with houses and the architecture of the village and would harm the landscape character • Locating the site close to a sought after location near the River Avon makes a mockery of the planning system • The bypass would create noise disturbance for site residents
GT17	Service area west of A46 Old Buddbrooke Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect on tourism • Visual impact of sites • Effect on infrastructure • School places will be given to Traveller children as priority • GP surgery already stretched • Disruption caused and cleaning up of site • Effect on Chase Meadow • Existing traffic problems • Previous experiences of Traveller sites • Should be well away from existing communities • Police are powerless to move them on • Race days already cause traffic and parking problems, especially side streets and verges • Air pollution already a problem • Local community will be seriously impacted by excess cars, caravans • Even if there is no difference in crime levels between travellers and the general population, crime is lower than average in the District of Warwick and so crime levels will rise • Proposals will make a very attractive and pretty town look bad and on how the town will be viewed • If traveller sites are needed they should be remote, to avoid tensions and negatively affecting the quality of life of people • Local MP opposes this and so Council should listen to the MP • Current discord the issue has created demonstrates that peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community is not possible • Does not promote peaceful integrated co-existence or avoid undue pressure on infrastructure and services • Noise and disturbance from A46 • Local estate agents and house builders are opposed • Why do anything that could adversely affect new house sales in the local area • Being on a dual carriageway may increase journey lengths unless access is allowed to both carriageways from the site • Site may impact in service station and have a negative economic impact
GT18	Service area east of A46 Old Buddbrooke Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect on tourism • Visual impact of sites • Effect on infrastructure • School places will be given to Traveller children as priority. Schools unable to cope • GP surgery already stretched • Effect on Chase Meadow, which is still expanding • Should be well away from existing communities • Police are powerless to move them on • Local community will be seriously impacted by excess cars, caravans • Even if there is no difference in crime levels between travellers and the general population, crime is lower than average in the District of Warwick and so crime levels will rise • Proposals will make a very attractive and pretty town look bad and on how the town will be viewed • If traveller sites are needed they should be remote, to avoid

		<p>tensions and negatively affecting the quality of life of people</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local MP opposes this and so Council should listen to the MP • Current discord the issue has created demonstrates that peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community is not possible • Noise and disturbance from A46 • Local estate agents and house builders are opposed • Why do anything that could adversely affect new house sales in the local area • Being on a dual carriageway may increase journey lengths unless access is allowed to both carriageways from the site • Site may impact in service station and have a negative economic impact • In open countryside beyond settlement boundaries
GT19	Land off Birmingham Rd, Budbrooke, Oaklands Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt land that should be preserved • Would destroy countryside • Access onto main road will increase traffic hazards. Notoriously difficult and dangerous road with speeds in excess of 40mph limit and bend in road limiting visibility • Close to heavily populated urban area and highly visible so not in keeping with locality • Distracting to passing motorists • Schools are oversubscribed • Canal bridge suffers from subsidence and unsuitable for heavy vehicles and very narrow for caravans • Site has been breaching law for years with caravans occupying the site. To legalise is sending a bad message • Potential for unauthorised expansion • Negative effect on property values • Unattractive on approach to Warwick • Effect on tourism • Grand Union Canal recently upgraded towpath and locks are popular with walkers, family groups, canal cruisers and anglers • Direct access to the Canal from at least two points at Oaklands Farm. Leakage of noise and waste onto canal bank • Impact on important features of natural and historic environment • GP surgery already stretched • Dentists at capacity • Any further development to small community on Birmingham Road will spoil quality of life • Should be well away from existing communities • Would hamper any future development of housing • Possibility of ribbon development in green belt • Close to railway lines and bridges • Close to petrol station with dangers of waiting vehicles on road, fumes, emissions and pollutants • Effect on cleanliness and tidiness of canal and towpath
GT20	Land at Junction 15 of M40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too close to Chase Meadow estate, which is still expanding • Previous bad experience of Travellers leaving sites in a mess • Effect on infrastructure • Effect on watercourses • School places will be given to Traveller children as priority. Schools unable to cope • GP surgery already stretched • Visual impact • Risk of flooding at Chase Meadow • Disproportionate number of sites in south of district • Police are powerless to move them on

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand this site was offered to Council and declined – why • Dispute need for permanent sites as "traveller" implies itinerate nature and not of a fixed abode • Eric Pickles recently restated the need for "overriding and compelling reasons to put traveller sites on the Green Belt". What compelling reasons are there to use food producing land in the Green Belt • Less than 2 1/2 miles by road, a site has been identified and planning permission granted for a Gypsy/Traveller site • Existing site adjacent to Stratford Garden Centre approved by Stratford District Council is less than 2.5 miles away so 'need' already addressed in Sherbourne area • Issue already negatively impacting property prices. Compensation to local residents may have to be considered • Increase in crime rate • Loss of farmland and rural employment • Fails to meet Rural Area Policies of Local Plan • Will have a material adverse effect on the landscape and will harm very fragile visual amenity of this site • Local community will be seriously impacted by excess cars, caravans • Adjacent to historic landfills so may still have the potential to release greenhouse gases and are unsuitable for any form of permanent habitation and occupation • Even if there is no difference in crime levels between travellers and the general population, crime is lower than average in the District of Warwick and so crime levels will rise • Proposals will make a very attractive and pretty town look bad and on how the town will be viewed • If traveller sites are needed they should be remote, to avoid tensions and negatively affecting the quality of life of people • Local MP opposes this and so Council should listen to the MP • Local estate agents and house builders are opposed • Why do anything that could adversely affect new house sales in the local area • Unavailable so not deliverable • CPO lengthy, costly , unviable • Reserve right to raise legal argument as purchase of land for gypsy and traveller site is not appropriate use of CPO powers
--	--	--

Responses Showing Support

Site/Item	Response
GT01	Gypsy and Traveller sites are visually incongruous in open countryside and conventional housing areas and so are better suited in or close to industrial areas. For this reason this site should be supported
GT03/GT04	Support Harbury Lane area due to present urbanisation
GT05	Offers reasonable access to existing facilities, particularly primary schools
GT11	Although this area sometimes floods, it has particularly good access to local shops and Warwick town centre, by public transport [bus stop adjacent to Budbrooke Lodge] and reasonable access to the main arterial roads. Servicing the site will be potentially low cost
GT11	A sustainable site with good access to services. Adequate separation from settled community, without being isolated
GT12	Offers reasonable access to existing facilities, particularly primary schools, although the difficulty of crossing the A429 Barford bypass should be considered
GT15	Relates well to the proposed areas of growth and might be a suitable site in the long term, although its size and shape makes the provision of internal open space with good casual surveillance difficult. Noise from Europa Way could also be a problem
GT17/GT18/20	Understand that up-to four sites for Gypsies and Travellers planned in my

	community. Although not sure of exact locations, really pleased about these plans. They have previously been made to move on without having anywhere else to go and it's time we accepted their way of life; they are no different to the locals that live in council houses and flats, they just prefer a caravan. Hope this opinion, which is shared by others, is taken into consideration. Hope the dim view some have of Gypsies and Travellers won't stop the plan going ahead
General	Pleased to see that the council is taking this into consideration in the local plan
General	My paramount concern is that proper provision is made for travellers and gypsies. It seems to me to be vital to a democracy that those whose living arrangements are not mainstream should be accepted as part of our diverse (and therefore rich) culture. Unfortunately it's too easy to forget the lessons of history and the terrible suffering that takes place when differences are not tolerated. It's easy to think that we're civilised, but we'll only remain so if we have respect for all citizens. Taking the trouble to communicate because of the frequently expressed hostility to these minorities which is paradoxical when one sees the number of holiday caravans on our roads, and the well-maintained sites for them to rest in
General	In full support of the proposals. Extremely important for councils to plan adequately for housing and offering more stable sites for Travellers which will benefit not only these ethnic minorities but protect residents and minimise cost to the council from unauthorised encampments in car parks, laybys and grass verges. Since ethnic cleansing is not something a reasonable person might want, I am impressed that you are courageously facing up to how you might best include those on the margins of society, enabling potential residents to access more stable healthcare and education. Brilliant.
General	Support any plan which is acceptable to the travelling people for temporary and permanent sites in the district. The criteria of proximity to public services (especially education and health) and public transport are crucial to the plan
General	Support local planning authorities working together to identify sites and protect Green Belt from inappropriate development as it makes enforcement more effective.
General	Support WDC fulfilling its obligations to ensure access to services for all communities
General	Fully support aim to give life-enhancing opportunities to traveller children
General	After reading the literature and considering the size of the district, provide only 31 pitches is extremely reasonable
General	The approach being taken, to seek to accommodate the entire projected need for permanent and transit sites, is welcomed as the most responsible way forward. It is not clear to us whether it is intended that a 6-8 pitch, or 12 pitches, be provided on transit site/s. No comments to make with respect to the specific sites that you are considering
General	Satisfied with the content of the consultation document

The Following Table Relates to General Matters/Questions

Para or subject	Comment	Council's Response
Photographs	The photographs of caravan sites in the document are not of Gypsy and Traveller sites but of holiday caravan sites and misrepresent what sites would actually look like	The Council has acknowledged that this is fair comment and apologised if anyone felt misled. The photographs were pulled from stock since we have no existing sites to photograph ourselves and did not wish to breach copyright laws by publishing those of others.
	Beautifully illustrated booklet nothing more than marketing	The Council has acknowledged that this is fair comment and

		apologised if anyone felt misled. The photographs were pulled from stock since we have no existing sites to photograph ourselves and did not wish to breach copyright laws by publishing those of others.
Site size	Many sites are huge and would accommodate far more than the total of the Council's requirement.	It is clearly stated within the document, that some are potential sites whilst others are large tracts of land known as 'areas of search'. This means that the boundary has been drawn widely and encompasses land within which a site may be found which is suitable. It has never been the intention of this Council to locate all of its requirement for pitches on one site and indeed this would go against national guidelines which, at the time of publication, suggested a maximum of 15 pitches per site. This guidance has now reduced that number to 5 pitches per site.
	Number of people on each pitch is not limited	In the same way that those choosing to buy a house are not limited to the number of people residing at that property, the number of people accommodated on one pitch cannot be limited other than by the fact that there is only to be one residential caravan/park home on the pitch
	What do Travellers get on a site	Provision will be made for each pitch to have space for a permanent residential caravan/park home, space for a travelling caravan, space for vehicles to park and a utility building for washing/showers and toilets etc. In addition the site must have space for children to play and washing to be hung out to dry. There may also be a need for some grazing land if families have their own horses and in some cases, space for storage etc. connected with a business. Services connected to the site should include a water and electricity supply and either mains sewerage or a suitable system where mains services are not available. Some sites also provide a common room where all residents can meet, but this is at the discretion of

		the site owner
	Some traveller families live in social housing, then no need for sites	Where Travellers are happily living in social or private housing, then they will not require sites. However, there are those who are made ill by being confined within houses when their traditional homes are less restrictive. In these circumstances and where they have asked for a pitch on a permanent site, the Council is expected to provide this as part of the requirement. In this district, there are a number of such Travellers and their needs have been accounted for in the GTAA
General location of sites	Of 20 sites suggested, 15 are south of the district (Warwick and Leamington specifically) and none in Kenilworth	There is undoubtedly more pressure on the south of the district due to the Green Belt elsewhere where development can only take place in exceptional circumstances. The Government has made it clear, that lack of non Green Belt land does not provide these exceptional circumstances and that Council's must consider compulsory purchase of non Green Belt sites in advance of Green Belt sites. This very much restricts the area in which this Council can locate Gypsy and Traveller sites
	Better to site away from existing residential areas where less problems will occur	Whilst there may be fewer problems if sites are away from existing residential areas, this also means that they are further from the amenities and services that the Government say must be convenient to them. For this reason, preferred sites are on the edge of towns or villages that have services
	Better to site close to or within existing residential area where facilities are close at hand	Whilst there may be residential areas that would provide facilities and services close at hand, Gypsies and Travellers prefer not to be too close to the settled community to ensure that there is no imposition on either side of one culture against another. This is also true of the settled community. For this reason, preferred sites are on the edge of towns or villages that have services
	Site within new housing developments in the Local Plan so that new residents know	The Council is working with developers who are promoting the new developments through

	what to expect and infrastructure can be provided for Gypsies and Travellers in new schemes	the Local Plan in an attempt to provide as many pitches as possible in this way, as part of the affordable housing requirement
	Council has made no distinction between Green Belt and non Green Belt sites	At this early stage of the preparation of the Plan, it was considered that including all sites whatever their location, would give the opportunity for the public to voice their opinions. Since there are some sites within the Green Belt that have already had some development, this may make them more acceptable than open Green Belt land. Other Green Belt sites have been promoted by landowners and were therefore included in the consultation regardless of their designation
	Inaccurate to use only flood maps to identify where flooding takes place	Whilst flood maps are used to identify where flooding can be expected now and in the future due to climate change, the Environment Agency has also been consulted as part of the consultation and their views fed into the next stage of identification of sites. Furthermore, this Council also holds its own records of flood events and can utilise these to inform the next stage of the Plan
	Integration of sites into landscape can only take place through site management and this won't happen	This will be a matter which will be dealt with in detail through planning applications, however, the landscape is one of the elements which will feature in the sites assessment report which will be completed before the next Preferred Options consultation is undertaken in due course
	Why are taxpayers being compelled to fund sites and services	Taxpayers are not being expected to fund sites and services. The Council is merely finding suitable sites which the Gypsy & Traveller community can purchase to set up and run themselves, or landowners can set up sites and rent pitches out to Gypsies and Travellers. The Council will not have any involvement in the purchase of sites or running sites at this point in time, other than if compulsory purchase is necessary in order to bring sites forward, in which case, the sites will be sold on

	Council should be doing all it can to fight provision of any such sites	The policy to provide sites for Gypsies and Travellers is a national policy and the Council is responsible for the provision of homes for all its residents, including the homeless. Gypsies and Travellers in caravans without a permanent pitch are defined as homeless and under the Housing Act 2004, it is for the Council to accommodate them
	Isolation is not sustainable and does not lead to integration	There are few areas in Warwick district that can be described as truly isolated in geographic terms. Whilst there are those who wish to be integrated into their local community, there are those who do not and this applies to Gypsies and Travellers and to the settled community. It is not suggested that Gypsy and Traveller sites should be set at great distances from the settled community, but at a respectful distance for both communities
	Scattered communities more difficult and expensive to manage	The Council does not intend to manage the sites and therefore being scattered will not have an impact on cost or management aspects
	Will have huge effect on tourism especially in Warwick where pubs and restaurants close early on race days where there are a lot of Gypsies and Travellers attending	There is no reason why this should happen any more than it already does. Whilst some businesses may close early on race days, there is no indication that this is because there are Gypsies and Travellers in attendance.
	Should release sites from Green Belt in north to take pressure off south	This Government is taking its commitment to retaining the Green Belt very seriously to the extent that recent appeals for Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Green Belt have been decided by the Secretary of State. To include Green Belt sites without the very special circumstances required would mean that the Plan would be found unsound and the decision as to where the sites will be located would be taken out of the Council's control
	Need to identify deliverability of sites	This is part of the next stage of the plan and will be addressed through site assessments
	How will current Gypsies at Kites Nest Lane be dealt with when evicted from site	Initially, they will be offered council housing as homeless people. This may be a stop-gap measure until sites are allocated through this plan

		when the majority will wish to take on permanent pitches on offer
	Some sites are neither deliverable or developable	This is part of the next stage of the plan and will be addressed through site assessments
	Effect of location of sites on agriculture should not be underestimated	This is part of the next stage of the plan and will be addressed through site assessments
	If there is no alternative to using some Green Belt sites, then these should be previously developed sites	Agreed and any sites that remain in the plan and are in the Green Belt should only be those which are previously developed or for which there are very special circumstances
	No shortage of caravan sites, but Gypsies and Travellers seem to prefer unauthorised sites, so suggesting that there are no sites is not true. There are also sites for permanent caravan use and these are advertised on websites, so again it is misleading to say that there are none	There are no legal permanent or transit sites for the use of Gypsies and Travellers within Warwick district. Whilst there may be holiday caravan sites or mobile home parks, these are not what are required as part of this exercise. Gypsies and Travellers may utilise pitches on a short term basis, but it does not provide a long term solution. Equally, other caravan users could utilise spaces on Gypsy and Traveller sites, but neither community choose to do so generally speaking
	Costs of compulsory purchase will be high and a risk	There will be an initial cost to the Council if sites have to be bought under compulsory purchase orders, however this cost will be offset when the sites are sold on to the Gypsy and Traveller community
	Quarter of an acre per family is more than most families grow up with	The pitch size of 500 sq m is suggested in the guidance to provision of pitches for Gypsies and Travellers; some may be smaller than this, but given the amount of hardstanding required for two caravans, parking and a utility building, most pitches need to be around this size
	Some sites very close together	It was never intended that all the sites would be utilised even if all were suitable. It is a question of finding the most suitable and deliverable site. Some sites will meet fewer of the criteria for assessing sites than others and for this reason, many sites have been included in the Options consultation
	I don't believe access to the motorway network is a key requirement of the Gypsy and	One of the criteria for the choice of sites is access to the major highway network.

	Traveller Community, yet a significant number of sites have been located close to the motorway	Motorways form part of this network and therefore sites have been located close to the motorway and other major roads
	Question assistance provided to G & T families to find land as self provision could be appropriate	The only reasons that the Council is involved in finding such land is so that the Gypsy and Traveller community can be assured that the land they buy is allocated within a plan and therefore, subject to planning permission being obtained, suitable for their occupation with a good chance of successfully gaining the relevant permissions. The other reason is that the Council is responsible for finding accommodation for all of its residents and sites for the use of Gypsies and Travellers forms part of that responsibility
	Against compulsory purchase of private land for this use	The Council has always maintained that this would be a last resort since it can be very time consuming and costly, however, if the circumstances are that insufficient sites are brought forward and Green Belt sites are to be avoided, then compulsory purchase is the only remaining option unpopular as this option is to all concerned. The Council would always prefer to find a willing land owner than to use compulsory purchase powers
	The sites chosen have been made without looking carefully as to whether they are truly suitable and include landfill sites, sites next to busy main roads, sites well away from the amenities required to make the sites acceptable	This is part of the next stage of the plan and will be addressed through site assessments
	If there is a requirement for 25 pitches expanding to 31 why the need for so many proposed sites? Why are 15 proposed in the south of Warwick & Leamington? Bishops Tachbrook has 6 proposals. If all were approved there would be a huge Gypsy encampment in a small area and the village would be irrevocably changed	This is the number of pitches required in total, not the number of sites. Sites of 5 pitches for example equates to 5 sites in the first five years and perhaps another site of six in the next ten years. The Council has no intention of having large sites and would certainly not expect to house all on one site, apart from the sheer size, it would not be manageable for the site owner, would be likely to cause friction and would not be popular with

		the Gypsy and Traveller community who prefer smaller sites for extended family. As previously stated, whilst there is a limited area outside the Green Belt for the Council to look for sites, it is not intended to put sites close together
	What evidence is there that the Gypsy & Traveller community wish to use these sites as a permanently settled site with a fixed maximum number of 15 Pitches	There are a number of Gypsy and Traveller families working with us to advise on the sites which will be utilised if they come forward and what their requirements are. These families will be purchasing sites when they become available
	Due diligence has not taken place as document has failed to put forward any meaningful data. The council are remiss in leaving it out	All the relevant data is set out in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. This document is referred to in our consultation document and has been online as part of our evidence base where anyone can consult it. It has also been taken to exhibitions and public meetings for interested parties to consult. For anyone unable to access the internet, hard copies can be made available on request
	If the sites are operated by Gypsy and Travellers how can noise pollution, land pollution and overcrowding be controlled? What controls are there to prevent unauthorised expansion	In the same way that these issues are dealt with in any other situation. There are restrictions on noise levels into and out of Gypsy and Traveller sites in the same way as for the settled community and environmental protection can be called in to look at any cases of pollution reported. There will be a restriction on the number of caravans per site set out in planning conditions attached to a planning permission and enforcement action can be taken if these are exceeded. Exactly the same regulations apply to all members of the community, but there are more stringent tests for caravans which are more vulnerable than bricks and mortar dwellings
	The information is also not clear about which sites will be used to meet the need for 31 pitches. It appears to only show 19 sites and therefore does not make it clear where other sites will be	There is a need for 31 pitches on sites within the district. These will be tested by site assessment. Each site could take up to 15 pitches, but since the consultation has taken place, this number has now been reduced to a

		recommended 5 on each site. Sites of 5 pitches for example equates to 5 sites in the first five years and perhaps another site of six in the next ten years.
	It is not clear whether it is intended that 6-8 pitch, or 12 pitches, be provided on transit site/s	This consultation has not dealt with transit sites, because although there is a proven need through the GTAA it is the intention of Warwickshire County Council to provide the relevant sites over the whole of the county, with one in the north and another in the south. This Council is therefore not looking for a transit site currently
	The use of compulsory purchase powers would not be an appropriate use of public money without first fully exploring all WDC or WCC land first with the relevant assessment / findings published	In advance of this consultation, the Council carried out a thorough investigation of all land within its ownership and that of the County Council. The district council owns very little land now and this is primarily urban parks which are protected open space. The County Council, whilst owning more land, mostly owns highways, highway land and farmsteads which it leases out to tenant farmers. None of the Council owned land has been found to be suitable with the exception of a plot of highway land off Europa Way. This has been included in this consultation and is site GT15
	Not clear if 'Call for Sites' was a formal process or what (if any) sieving process went on to discount sites that were unsuitable against the site selection criteria in terms of sustainability, impact on environment, other designations. Undertaking this process would narrow down the number of sites and ensure the list included only sites which sustainable and in close proximity to facilities	The call for sites was a formal process but the only sites which were promoted to us as part of that process were the land occupied by Gypsies and Travellers illegally at Kites Nest Lane, Beausale and the land at Warwick Road, Norton Lindsey, a former poultry business. Both are in the Green Belt but have been included in the consultation as GT13 and GT14
	We would also welcome further information as to why the proposed traveller sites have so much land attributed to each plot, when we, as private purchases, have half that available space on what is deemed a large property	The pitch size of 500 sq m is suggested in the guidance to provision of pitches for Gypsies and Travellers; some may be smaller than this, but given the amount of hard-standing required for two caravans, parking and a utility building, most pitches need to be around this size
	Has anyone consulted with the	Yes. There are a number of

	gypsies/travellers to find out what they think	Gypsy and Traveller families working with us to advise on the sites which will be utilised if they come forward and what their requirements are. These families will be purchasing sites when they become available
	Social Housing should be made available	The Council will provide a Council property for homeless people where there is a vacancy. These are offered to Gypsies and Travellers but it is not their preferred/traditional way of living in many circumstances. They may take advantage of the offer until such time as sites are provided however and some do settle in houses. Others do not and it is for these people that permanent pitches are required
Chance for a public meeting	No public meetings held in south west Warwick	Two public meetings were held in south Warwick and one of these was held at Chase Meadows
Evidence base	The methodology applied to the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) is flawed	This respondent's points were put to the team at Salford University who carried out the GTAA on behalf of the Council and their responses relayed back to the respondent
	Why spend time and money on finding and providing permanent pitches when the Gypsy Officer says only one transient site needed	This relates only to transient sites, not to permanent sites which is what the 31 pitch requirement is. The County Council will be providing sites for transient use and therefore this council is not currently looking for this type of site, just those to provide permanent pitches
	Council needs to justify location and number of sites	The numbers are justified through the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) which is referred to in our consultation document and has been online as part of our evidence base where anyone can consult it. It has also been taken to exhibitions and public meetings for interested parties to consult. For anyone unable to access the internet, hard copies can be made available on request. The number of sites will depend upon how many pitches can be accommodated on each chosen site
	Report in Ireland says that Gypsies and Travellers do not	As this report has been produced in Ireland, it relates

	want to live in rural areas yet this is where the majority of sites are located	presumably to Irish Travellers and not those in our district. Ireland is a much more rural area than Warwick district and we have no sites located here as yet therefore they will not be remotely located as they may be in Ireland. Without sight of this report it is difficult to respond
	Environmental issues do not appear to have been assessed	This is part of the next stage of the plan and will be addressed through site assessments
	In GTAA the number of households 'based in the District' was said to be 30, but of these, only 7 were actually living in caravans. The reliability of all these estimates and level of need must therefore be questionable	The 7 living in caravans in the district at the time, were those families located on the illegal Kites Nest Lane development. They have an immediate need, as do the other families who are being moved around but wish to settle here. Some of those in need are living here in bricks and mortar accommodation but wish to live in their traditional way on a permanent site.
	Residents not been advised of the methods used by Salford University to obtain the data relied upon and over what dates. Please provide a full copy	The numbers are justified through the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) which is referred to in our consultation document and has been online as part of our evidence base where anyone can consult it. It has also been taken to exhibitions and public meetings for interested parties to consult. For anyone unable to access the internet, hard copies can be made available on request.
	How is it known whether travellers are within WDC area	Apart from those interviewed by the Council for its own records, there are some Gypsies and Travellers living in houses who have been identified through tenant surveys and through the GTAA whose team have interviewed not only Gypsies and Travellers in the district, but also those passing through or illegally encamped. Some members of the Gypsy and Traveller community have identified themselves during public meetings and at exhibitions, sometimes to the surprise of their neighbours
Number of pitches and definition	Wrong to say that the Council is required by law to provide 31 pitches	The Council is required by law to provide accommodation for its residents. It is, as part of that requirement, responsible

		for accommodating homeless people and a Gypsy or Traveller with nowhere to stop is classed as homeless. Our GTAA shows a need for 31 pitches in our area and we therefore need to provide this number of pitches over a 15 year period
	Why do 25 pitches have to be supplied within the first 5 years	Warwick District currently has no provision for Gypsies and Travellers and has not done so for some considerable time. There is therefore a requirement to provide for the underprovision to date as well as current need. This results in a larger number of pitches required now and the remainder spread over a wider period of time to meet future need as it arises. This will be monitored to ensure that all our future needs are met and if we do not need those pitches, we will not provide them. However, if it proves that we need more then we must provide a higher number
	Given Council's own survey in "Evidence of Local Need and Historic Demand or Gypsy & Traveller sites in Warwick District" (April 2011) the need for the number of sites currently proposed and the resources being expended must be questioned	This document was prepared in the light of the Planning Inspector at a planning appeal calling into question the results of a previous South Housing Market Area GTAA (2008) that was prepared on behalf of a number of local authorities. It was felt that the work had not been comprehensively carried out and that the figures were in doubt, therefore the Council prepared its own document, but again this was called into question by the Inspector as it was not independent and may not have gathered all the details of Gypsies and Travellers passing through the area. For this reason and in order to provide a sound evidence base for this Plan, a new GTAA just for Warwick District was commissioned and the University of Salford, a leading consultant in this field, carried out and published the report in November 2012. This GTAA now supersedes all previous reports
	Need further clarification on the definition of a "pitch" and how this is to be utilised. i.e. single or multiple occupancy	A pitch is an area (usually hardstanding) where there is space to park a permanent residential caravan/park home,

	<p>per pitch? Not clear what is meant by a pitch.</p> <p>Clear guidelines on the number of pitches per site and a preference for permanent as opposed to itinerant occupancy</p>	<p>space for a travelling caravan, space for vehicles to park and a utility building for washing/showers and toilets etc.</p> <p>In addition a site must have space for children to play and washing to be hung out to dry. There may also be a need for some grazing land if families have their own horses and in some cases, space for storage etc. connected with a business. Services connected to the site should include a water and electricity supply and either mains sewerage or a suitable system where mains services are not available.</p> <p>Whist a figure of between 5 and 15 pitches per site was suggested in the consultation paper, guidance now clearly indicates that sites should comprise no more than 5 pitches per site.</p> <p>The GTAA shows a need for both permanent pitches and transit sites, but the County Council wish to take on responsibility for the provision of transitory need for the whole of Warwickshire and they will find sites to do so. It is therefore for the district council to find sites for its permanent need, i.e. 31 pitches</p>
Use of existing sites	<p>There are plenty of touring caravan spaces for one night plus use, where people cannot be turned away on the basis of ethnicity, why not use these.</p>	<p>In theory this would be possible however, Gypsies and Travellers would no more choose to stay on one of these sites than a holidaying family would choose to stay in their caravan overnight on a Gypsy and Traveller site.</p>
	<p>Existing sites in County sufficient to serve current and future needs. No need for further sites as all current legal requirements being met</p>	<p>There are sites across the County catering for Gypsies and Travellers and these are serving the needs of the districts within which they are located, however, Warwick District does not have such facilities and are therefore failing to provide the 31 pitches needed as demonstrated by the GTAA</p>
Equitability	<p>Sites should be spread across the whole district equally and green belt should not be used as a reason not to do so</p>	<p>Whilst the Council wishes to spread the sites across the district Green Belt is still an impediment to doing so. Approximately 80% of the district is in the Green Belt and</p>

		that is predominantly in the north, therefore the pressure is on the non Green Belt land to the south. This Government is taking its commitment to retaining the Green Belt very seriously to the extent that recent appeals for Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Green Belt have been decided by the Secretary of State. To include Green Belt sites without the very special circumstances required would mean that the Plan would be found unsound and the decision as to where the sites will be located would be taken out of the Council's control
Education	How will schools cope	This Council is taking the advice of the Education Officer on this question. In addition, the new developments in the Local Plan will need to provide new infrastructure and schools form part of this. There are plans for new schools in the south of the district and these will ease the burden of existing schools and provide places for children from new housing and Gypsy and Traveller sites
	Traveller children will get preference for school places with local children unable to access their local school	This is not the case. All students have to apply for school places and those within the catchment area are given first priority regardless of their background. The County Council may see fit to change some of the catchment areas for schools in the light of the Local Plan housing developments and the new schools that will be built as part of these schemes in the south of the district
Experience of sites	Sites are always left in a terrible mess that the taxpayer has to pay to clear up.	It is for this reason that the County Council proposes to take all responsibility for the transit population. They will provide sites for those Travellers who are passing through the district; one in the north of the county and one in the south. Travellers will have to pay for use of these sites and it will be in their interest to keep the sites clean and tidy or they will forfeit a bond paid up front before they can stay overnight or for a longer period of time. The County Council and the Police have the

		increased powers to remove Travellers from the County if they do not agree to these terms or are in breach of their agreement
	It takes too long to remove Travellers from illegal encampments	This has always been the case. It does take considerable time to go through the courts and to take enforcement action against illegal encampments. By providing permanent sites for those who need them and transit pitches for others, it is hoped to drastically reduce the number of illegal encampments in the district, thus reducing time spent in removing them, court expenses etc. In addition, the transit sites will be policed by the County Council and refusal to use these sites will result in greater powers being afforded to the County Council and the Police to remove Travellers from the County quickly
	Will there be waste bins and collections on the sites	Yes. Residents will pay Council Tax and will receive the same services as those in bricks and mortar accommodation including waste bins and a regular collection
	How much does the Council pay annually to clear up after they leave sites	This is not itemised as a separate factor in the budget sheets, but is included in an overall figure for waste disposal. Provision of permanent and transit sites should see the figure decrease dramatically
Travelling	Gypsies and Travellers travel, the clue is in the name. They do not need to settle anywhere	Although Travellers are a nomadic community, there are circumstances in which they need a permanent pitch. This can be because they want their children to attend school or because elderly relatives need to be close to a doctor or hospital or from choice because there are so few transit sites across the country. In this situation it is the responsibility of the local authority to provide appropriate sites
	If Travellers need a permanent place to live, they should live in a house	There are a surprising number of Gypsies and Travellers within the settled community and living in bricks and mortar, however, this is not acceptable for some and they choose to keep their traditional way of life by living in a portable

		building which can move if necessary. There are many instances of Gypsies and Travellers moving into houses only to find that they cannot stand to be confined by four walls and suffer severe depression as a consequence. The Council also needs to provide sites for these people so that they can return to living in caravans
	The majority have a house elsewhere	It is not for the Council to check whether this is the case or not. The GTAA interviews have asked questions about property owned elsewhere and this information has been taken into account in the final figures.
	Who is allowed to use the sites	In planning terms anyone who is defined as a Gypsy or Traveller as laid down in the 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' document which was published alongside the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012: "Persons of nomadic habit of life whatsoever their race or origin, including such persons who on the grounds of their own or their families or dependants educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of Travelling Show People or Circus People travelling together as such" Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers are defined as minority ethnic groups under the Race Relations Act (1976)
	Have specific Gypsy and Traveller Groups been identified and are on a waiting list for sites	Yes. A number of families are working with us to identify sites which would be suitable and they are also waiting for sites to become available for purchase so that they can develop them and move on
	Concerned that Gypsies may use permanent address when not actually living there to access services	It is possible that this could happen, however since they will be paying for their pitch either by purchase or renting it, and paying Council Tax and for services provided, it would not be in their interests financially to do this
Alternative sites	Surprised and disappointed that the sites suggested by FRoG were not included in the	The site that was a possibility was included in the consultation paper; the others

	Options paper for consultation	were not as there were reasons for them not being suitable, however, these have been included in the site assessment work and will appear in the Preferred Options document for comparison and comment
	List of sites proposed by Beausale, Haseley, Honiley and Wroxall Parish Council were rejected on flimsy grounds and should be reconsidered.	The site that was a possibility was included in the consultation paper; the others were not as there were reasons for them not being suitable, however, these have been included in the site assessment work and will appear in the Preferred Options document for comparison and comment
	Understand that land where the site offices were situated for the recent A46 development was offered free to the Council. It has services is more suitable and would have minimum public expense. Why was this offer declined?	At the time this site was offered as a possible site for Gypsies and Travellers, the road works were in progress, therefore officers were unable to take essential noise readings as they would not show typical road use values. When we approached the landowner once the road was completed and in use, the offer had been withdrawn. Nevertheless, this site was included in the consultation document and formed part of site GT20. As such it has now been subject of a full site assessment, the results of which will be published on our website and as part of the evidence base for the Preferred Options consultation paper
	Question Gypsy & Traveller use of other types of dwelling to caravans	Gypsies and Travellers have lived in caravans or wagons for about 150 years, but more recently many have settled on permanent sites using the caravan for travelling but living in a park home or permanent caravan. There are also Gypsies and Travellers living in bricks and mortar. Our own evidence points to there being somewhere between 12 and 20 such families in Warwick District alone. The numbers are somewhat unclear since it was only the latest census that included Gypsies and Travellers as an ethnic group. More data on the number living this way is expected in future therefore.
	There are sites along the M40	Whilst the impact on the

	where the impact would be less or negligible. No site should be within a mile of a residential property	settled community may be less, the impact of living next to a motorway for the Gypsies and Travellers would be intolerable. It is difficult enough to provide sufficient noise insulation for a house in these circumstances, but such insulation is not available for a caravan which is far more vulnerable in these terms. Locating sites totally away from residential property isolates them from services and facilities and also prevents integration – one of the criteria for the choice of suitable sites
	Not clear if LPA has considered regulating existing unauthorised sites	The only unauthorised site in the district is that at Kites Nest Lane, Beausale. This site was included in the consultation paper as GT13 as the landowners wished it to be considered for permanent use as a Gypsy and Traveller site. The site has however been the subject of two planning applications which were refused and two appeals which were dismissed. The site is now subject of an enforcement notice to vacate the site
	Council owned land must be made available	In advance of this consultation, the Council carried out a thorough investigation of all land within its ownership and that of the County Council. The district council owns very little land now and this is primarily urban parks which are protected open space. The County Council, whilst owning more land, mostly owns highways, highway land and farmsteads which it leases out to tenant farmers. None of the Council owned land has been found to be suitable with the exception of a plot of highway land off Europa Way. This has been included in this consultation and is site GT15
Payment of fees etc	Would the occupants pay Council Tax	Yes. The pitches will be assessed once provided and the relevant band applied.
	What rent would occupants pay	This will depend upon what the landowner asks on individual sites. Warwick District Council will not own sites, rent out pitches or manage sites. There are some housing associations who provide sites on which

		they rent out pitches
	Should not be given sites for free	None of the sites will be given away. All sites will be made available for sale and either Gypsies and Travellers themselves, private landlords or housing associations will be able to purchase sites and rent out pitches
	Will occupants pay for services	Yes, in the same way that the settled community pays for services, so will the Gypsies and Travellers on permanent sites
	Are there penalties for non-payment	Yes, in exactly the same way as for the settled community
	What are the likely costs of the provision of necessary infrastructure for these sites and how will this be funded	It is difficult to generalise as each site will have different requirements. Some will already have services to the site whereas others may have to pay for new connections to existing services off site. None of the costs will be borne by the Council. It will be for the landowner to provide and fund
	Object to self-management model. Management by WDC or registered social landlord/housing association preferable to ensure fair rents and high levels of occupation	Government advice and evidence points to the self-management model as being far and away the most successful way of running such sites. There are housing associations that may wish to take on this role as some do own such sites, but it is not the intention of this Council to own, manage or rent out sites
Alleged attitudes	They do not want to integrate into community	There are always people in every community who do not wish to integrate. Many Gypsies and Travellers wanting permanent pitches do so in the expectation that they will integrate into the community and become a contributing element. Equally, the settled community need to allow this to happen and not shun newcomers
	Policy says that sites should be located where the occupants can be integrated peacefully into the community but responses prove that this will not be the case	Advice from Warwickshire Police through this consultation is that it doesn't matter where the sites are located as there is good and bad in every community and there is no evidence to suggest that locating sites in any particular situation has any influence on peaceful integration. Locally, their experience is with the illegal encampment at Beausale where they have reported that they have

		encountered no problems
	There will be increased noise and disturbance	Where new residential developments are introduced, there is always an increase in noise and disturbance. There is no reason why this should be any more prevalent where Gypsies and Travellers locate any more than any other community
	New Travellers and Gypsies do not necessarily mix well meaning some form of separation on sites will be needed	There are certain groups that do not necessarily choose to live together in any community. As sites will be small, it is expected that only one or two families are likely to be accommodated on them and since the Gypsy and Traveller community will probably own the sites, they will be able to decide who they will and will not allow onto the site
Other services	Will there be police teams to deal with any difficulties	The Police are aware that a large number of new homes including sites for Gypsies and Travellers, are proposed for Warwick District. They do not envisage that this will cause any particular policing issues
Affordable Housing	Affordable housing is needed in villages, not Gypsy and Traveller sites	There are proposals for villages to have new housing as part of the Local Plan. The consultation on this element is due to commence in December 2013. However, Gypsy and Traveller sites are also classed as affordable housing and cannot be excluded on the basis that affordable housing is only required for the settled community
Consultation	People are being ignored when their way of life could be changed forever	The consultation is a means of allowing people to have a say. The Council do not ignore the views of people, but this is one element in the choice of sites and the sites assessments reflect other elements which have to be taken into account. Once the Preferred Options have been published, there is another chance for people to have their say on a reduced list of potential sites and these comments will be taken into account when the Draft Plan is written
	(Lack of) prominence on Council's website means that people are unaware of the consultation	The Gypsy and Traveller Site Options consultation was one of four taking place at the same time. The others were for the Revised Development

		Strategy of the Local Plan, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). All four documents directly relate to the Local Plan and were located together on the Council's website with links to each of the individual documents. Many more responses have been received to the Gypsy and Traveller consultation than any of the other elements; the level of negative response indicates otherwise
	Consultation process is brief (compared to Local Plan) and little work done to help residents understand the impacts.	This is the first of the consultations to take place on the provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers. It was therefore kept very wide to enable people to have a say on any aspect of the subject. The consultation period is laid down by Government as a minimum of six weeks. This Council usually allows longer than this and has, in the past, extended even this period when public opinion has been such that more time was considered desirable. Originally the consultation period ran from 14 June to 29 th July but this was extended and responses were still accepted even after the official closing date where individuals or groups had contacted us
	Useful for community representatives to meet representatives from Gypsy and Traveller Groups	This is something that the Council is currently working to achieve. It is possibly fear of the unknown that provokes some initial responses and meetings such as this may go some way to reducing this fear
	Lack of engagement is a major negative. Council should do more to help residents understand the reality of living near such sites as it might relieve some concerns.	The Council has held public meetings, exhibitions and meetings with the community forums as well as answering questions online or by telephone. The documents give a lot of information too but there are no provisions for Gypsies and Travellers in Warwick District as yet, so experience is limited. The Council is working on arrangements for meetings between representatives of the settled community and of the Gypsy & Traveller community in an attempt to

		answer some of these concerns
	Document is not easy to read and understand. Sites are not in order and maps are at different scales and angles	The document is a planning document and as such has to contain certain elements explaining the need for Gypsy and Traveller sites and the relevant legislation, however, the remainder of the document gives more general information and plans for potential sites. The sites have not been put into any particular order as we do not wish people to think that we have ordered them in any particular way. We have not made any decisions on the sites prior to the consultation so would not order sites accordingly. The maps are at the best scale to show the full extent of each site or area of search. All plans have the scale shown on them and all are aligned so that north is the top of the page which is standard practice. If anyone has specific problems with reading the maps or with understanding the content of the document, we are able to talk it through over the phone or in person and have done this for those who asked
	People left public meeting in Whitnash half way through as they felt that they were not being listened to	Public meetings can be very difficult as so many people wish to speak. We have tried to be fair and allow anyone with a question to ask it, but in a relatively short period of time, this was not always possible. The consultation is the vehicle for making points of view known however, and the place to make these comments was either online through our dedicated consultation software, by completing the questionnaire provided, by emailing us or writing a letter. These are the comments that are recorded and analysed before the next stage of the Plan is prepared
	Running consultation at same time as that for Local Plan means proper attention was not paid to either; was this deliberate	The Revised Development Strategy and the Gypsy and Traveller site Options Plan were consulted upon at the same time. There is no reason why this should be a problem as we have received many responses to both. The Gypsy and Traveller Sites will form part of the Local Plan

		documentation in due course, so there was no reason to separate them and this means that consultation fatigue is reduced by having both together rather than over two different sessions. There were two other supporting papers also consulted upon at this time; the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA).
	Confusion with sites GT12 and GT16 is inexcusable and unacceptable	There was some confusion but the titles did explain which site was which. The site GT12 shows a large 'area of search' and is labelled as such. There is a small 'hole' in the middle of it as this is a site in different ownership and with different characteristics which became site GT16 and was labelled 'small site' to distinguish it from the larger 'area of search'. The sites were given different addresses to differentiate one from the other. It would have probably been clearer if the larger 'area of search' had been omitted on the site plan for GT16 in retrospect
	No reason why sites for Gypsies and Travellers should be treated any differently to any other type of housing	This is true. Sites that are suitable for conventional housing can also be considered suitable for Gypsies and Travellers
	Sustainability report has shortcomings	The Sustainability Report is a high level document and at this stage of the process, is not a detailed document. The issues raised in the criteria for site choices will be addressed through site assessments which are in preparation
	Online response system very poor and not at all user friendly	Comments have been passed to our provider in the hope that any problems can be ironed out in advance of the next consultation
	Are these proposals or a done deal	The potential sites and areas of search were put out to public consultation to gauge public response as part of the ongoing work to identify suitable sites. As a result of the consultation, more sites have been suggested to us and now all of these sites will be assessed on a site by site basis against all the criteria to see which are the best ones to take forward into the next

		consultation on Preferred Options
	Lack of information on pitch sizes, levels of occupancy or amount of land allocated makes it difficult to raise accurate objections and limits responses to general statements.	<p>At this first stage of the work to identify sites, the consultation is looking to reduce the number of potential sites and bring forward any new suggestions. There is a lot more basic information within the 'Frequently Asked Questions' document accompanying the 'Sites for Gypsies and Travellers' paper. This was available online, at exhibitions and public meetings as well as at deposit points throughout the district. Questions on pitch size etc were raised during public meetings and at exhibitions and were answered at the time.</p> <p>Each pitch should have space for a permanent residential caravan/park home, space for a travelling caravan, space for vehicles to park and a utility building for washing/showers and toilets etc. The Government guidance on the size required therefore is 500 sq m. At the time that the consultation was running, the advice was that a maximum of 15 pitches should be accommodated on a site. Since this, it has been reduced to a maximum of 5 pitches.</p>
	Lack of landowner engagement means consultation is a flawed and largely worthless	<p>The landowners were identified as far as possible through searches at Land Registry. All landowners were then contacted by letter and a follow up letter if they did not respond to the initial contact. The Council then ran a Landowners Forum which was a session where landowners could hear about the need for sites and the coming consultation and then ask any questions. Documents were available for them to take away and read at leisure. Following this, all landowners received a further letter advising them that their land would be included in the forthcoming consultation.</p>
	Stratford District Council residents should be engaged and consulted to same degree as Warwick District Council	There was no restriction on who could respond to the consultation. Indeed there has been a relatively high

		percentage of responses from residents in Stratford district
	Council does not appear to have consulted Stratford District Council	Stratford District Council was consulted on the consultation and a response has been received. Additionally, officers continue to discuss the requirement for Gypsy and Traveller sites in their districts and the possibility of shared site provision
	Local farmers must be fully consulted	Whilst we cannot single out individuals for consultation purposes other than those who have chosen to register with us for information on certain topics, no-one is excluded from taking part. Many of the landowners whose land was included in the consultation are farmers and they have been consulted throughout
	The instructions for the consultation process are very unclear so have grave concerns that it has not achieved its legal goal of "improving the efficiency, transparency and public involvement in large-scale projects or laws and policies" as people do not know how to respond in the correct manner	It is difficult to respond directly to this comment as it is unclear what the respondent had an issue with. All documentation and the website made it clear that representations could be made online through our dedicated consultation software, by completing the paper questionnaire provided, by emailing us or writing a letter. If the criticism relates to the online representation system, we are aware that some people had problems with this and have reported these back to our provider in the hope that these can be ironed out before the next consultation
	Were not informed properly about this process/consultation and only found out by doing research and talking to others in the local community	The Council went to great lengths to try to reach all its residents to make them aware of the consultations taking place. A bin hanger was attached to every property's wheelie bin signposting the events and leaflets put through the doors of those who use communal bins. There was publicity through our website and social websites. Articles appeared in the local press. Information was posted at libraries, public buildings and council offices. Public meetings were held and exhibitions mounted at supermarkets and other heavily trafficked areas. Parish councils were made aware and many individuals

		took it upon themselves to raise awareness throughout their local community. Word of mouth is a very powerful device and the fact that this respondent found out about the consultation is testament to the amount of publicity that was afforded to the consultations
	Not enough time for people to view all the sites	The consultation period is laid down by Government as a minimum of six weeks. This Council usually allows longer than this and has, in the past, extended even this period when public opinion has been such that more time was considered desirable. Originally the consultation period ran from 14 June to 29 th July but this was extended and responses were still accepted even after the official closing date where individuals or groups had contacted us
	Site selection/suitability criteria acceptable but should include well-being of travellers in relation to noise and air quality and good access to welfare and employment	This is part of the next stage of the plan and will be addressed through site assessments
	No public meeting held at Hatton Park	Meetings and staffed exhibitions were held throughout the district. Unfortunately it was not possible to visit every village. There were several held in the Warwick area, also at the Rural West Community Forum, in Hampton Magna and at major supermarkets
Duty to co-operate	Disturbing that Warwick District Council is no longer working on cross border provision	The Council is continuing to have a dialogue with adjoining districts, but they too have their own requirements which they are finding difficult to meet. We have not ruled out cross border provision, but is looking less attainable
	Should be working with Stratford District Council	The Council is continuing to have a dialogue with adjoining districts including Stratford District, but they too have their own requirements which they are finding difficult to meet. We have not ruled out cross border provision, but is looking less attainable
	Should be taking site just granted planning permission outside Sherbourne into account and working on this	The site is within Stratford District and counts toward its own need. We cannot therefore include it in our own provision.

	with Stratford District Council	The Council is continuing to have a dialogue with adjoining districts, but they too have their own requirements which they are finding difficult to meet. We have not ruled out cross border provision, but is looking less attainable
	A joint GTAA would be better use of resources	A joint GTAA was carried out in 2008 but found to be unreliable. Other districts chose to have their individual GTAA's carried out and Warwick therefore had little choice but to do the same
Effects on existing residents	House prices will fall and houses will become difficult to sell	There is no evidence to support this view. During the consultation, one of the local residents association carried out their own survey on this topic and whilst it was found that at first there is a slight fall in existing property values, these quickly recover and have no lasting effects on overall values.
	Effect on home insurance premiums	Questions asked of home insurance providers resulted in no response. Unable therefore to comment on this aspect
	Gypsy and Traveller sites are dominated by vehicles which will impact on countryside and existing residents giving the appearance of an urban car park so are better located next to industrial sites	Any new residential development has its share of vehicles. The Gypsy and Traveller community are no different in this regard. However, the choice of a suitable site cannot be dictated by the number of vehicles that may or may not be owned by prospective residents whether that be the settled community or Gypsies and Travellers. A planning permission would almost certainly have conditions attached regarding parking, screening etc. and this would be decided on a site by site basis
	Following the creation of approved sites, how will the settlement of travellers or gypsies of the type that are "unpredictable economic migrants" be handled in the event of their occupation of sites over and above the official sites provided	The sites proposed are for permanent pitches. Any planning permission would have conditions attached as to the number of pitches on each site. Any pitches introduced over and above the permitted limit will be subject to enforcement action if necessary. In the case of transit sites, the County Council intend to provide these for the whole of Warwickshire and they will monitor the numbers on sites.

		They and the police will have greater powers to move people to sites with available pitches if such an event occurs
	We have a policy within our village for affordable housing, only people who have some links to the village are entitled to access the affordable housing stock. We do not understand how this can be completely ignored when allowing sites to be chosen	This is something that Warwick District has in its policies. We offer affordable homes to locals first, but then others are entitled to apply once locals needs are met. In the case of Gypsies and Travellers, there are no homes available to them, so they are treated as an exception to the rule and as homes are needed, we have a duty to provide them
Criteria	Policy criteria is sensible but omits crucial national guidance on protecting Green Belt from inappropriate development and identifying sites in appropriate locations. Why	Green Belt is not being ignored. Approximately 80% of the district is in the Green Belt and that is predominantly in the north, therefore the pressure is on the non Green Belt land to the south. This Government is taking its commitment to retaining the Green Belt very seriously to the extent that recent appeals for Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Green Belt have been decided by the Secretary of State. To include Green Belt sites without the very special circumstances required would mean that the Plan would be found unsound and the decision as to where the sites will be located would be taken out of the Council's control. The assessment of sites will deal with this issue when deciding which sites will go forward into the Preferred Options paper
	Land ownership (and willingness to sell) should not be a concern due to availability of CPO powers.	The Council does not wish to consider using compulsory purchase powers to bring sites forward except as a last resort. However, it will have to consider this option if landowners are not willing to bring sites forward
	No evidence has been provided that the sites meet the criteria to be used to bring forward sites for Gypsies and Travellers as set out in the 'Sites for Gypsies and Travellers' document (June 2013). Therefore, this is not a fair, transparent or accessible consultation	This is part of the next stage of the plan and will be addressed through site assessments
	Sites don't all meet WDC's criteria for selection. Suggests	This is part of the next stage of the plan and will be addressed

	first sieve not yet carried out and thus the consultation is premature	through site assessments. The first stage of consultation was to put forward some suggestions for potential sites to gain public opinion.
	Can use vehicles to access school and medical facilities	Whilst one of the policy criteria is to be close to public transport to be sustainable, it is acknowledged that, as with the settled community, use of the private vehicle to access facilities is highly likely

Summary of Recurring Themes:

What is a pitch and what is a site
 Size of potential sites
 Location of sites - being close together
 Funding
 Management by the Council
 Difference between permanent and transit sites
 Individual district requirements
 Difference between district and county councils
 Differences between Romany Gypsies, Irish Travellers, New Travellers and their
 Different lifestyles

Sites Suggested As Alternatives, Through Consultation

Ref No	Address
GTalt01	Brookside Willows, Banbury Road
GTalt02	Land off Rugby Road, Cubbington
GTalt03	Henley Road/Hampton Road, Hampton-on-the-Hill
GTalt04	Station Road, Hatton
GTalt05	West of Europa Way
GTalt06	Land at Warwick Gates/Trident Park (junction of Heathcote Lane with Macbeth Approach)
GTalt07	Field west of Leicester Lane, Cubbington
GTalt08	Employment land, Lower Cape, Warwick
GTalt09	Former Ridgeway School, Montague Road, Warwick
GTalt10	Land off Welsh Road, Cubbington
GTalt11	Stoneleigh Showground
GTalt12	Land west of Barford By-pass
GTalt13	Land off Old Warwick Road, Warwick
GTalt14	Land north of Fortress House, Stratford Road
GTalt15	r.o. department store, Leamington Retail Park
GTalt16	Gateway proposed employment site
GTalt17	Sydenham Industrial Estate (vacant units)
GTalt18	Land off Stoneleigh Road, Baginton
GTalt19	Castle Park, Warwick
GTalt20	Land off Ranelagh Street, Leamington

APPENDIX 1

GTalt21	SE of Leamington Golf and Country Club
GTalt22	Extend caravan site at racecourse
GTalt23	Althorpe Street (vacant) units