



Consultation Report

4NW – Consultation Forum on draft
Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling
Showpeople policies

4NW - Consultation Forum on draft Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople policies

A consultation report by **CAG Consultants**

January 2009

CAG CONSULTANTS
Gordon House
6 Lissenden Gardens
London NW5 1LX
Tel/fax 020 7482 8882
hq@cagconsult.co.uk
www.cagconsultants.co.uk

for direct enquiries about this report please contact:

Emma Cranidge
CAG Consultants
Ewood House, Ewood Lane, Todmorden, OL14 7DF

tel 01706 817347
ec@cagconsult.co.uk

Contents

Introduction	4
The Forum Process	5
Forum Responses	6
Email Responses	24
Stakeholder Meetings	26

Introduction

This report has been produced by CAG Consultants for the North West Regional Assembly (NWRA) as part of the 2008/09 Partial Review of the North West Plan. In it we;

- Summarise the engagement process used;
- List the comments received; and

This report represents part of stage 4 of engagement process that together forms the full engagement process of the Partial Review of the North West Plan. There are a series of engagement stages within this review as shown in the table below. In the table completed stages are shown in salmon and the current stage is shown in blue.

The focus of this engagement is Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.



The Forum Process

The engagement process

In order to seek out early views on the draft site allocations and policies for Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, 4NW agreed to test a targeted, closed consultation.

The consultation group included community stakeholders and statutory sector consultees working in the policy area.

The engagement tools

To assist the smooth running and appropriate analysis of the engagement programme the following tools have been designed and developed;

- Stakeholder search;
- Web based forum site;
- Promotion and publicity;
- Stakeholders management;
- Additional meetings facilitated for community stakeholders;
- The rules of engagement

NWPPR Forum Responses Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

FORUM ACTIVITY

In this section we outline the use of the web forum in terms of what users did, in the next section we show what they told us.

User Overview

The table below shows an overview of activity on the forum web site, by type of activity.

DESCRIPTION	TOTAL
Number of Registered Users:	139
Number of Registered Users to Login:	82
Number of Registered Users NOT to Login:	57
Total Posts:	28
Total Downloads (Download Posts)	367
Gypsies and Travellers	175 (11)
Travelling Showpeople	82 (6)
AGMA G&T FINAL REPORT June 2008 Final	23
Cheshire Partnership Area GTAA, Executive Summary May 2007	2
Cheshire Partnership Area GTAA, Full Report May 2007	2
Lancashire Sub Regional GTAA, Executive Summary May 2007	4
Lancashire Sub Regional GTAA, Full Report May 2007	1
Merseyside GTAA Executive Summary - February 2008	1
Merseyside GTAA Final Report - February 2008	12
Circular 01 06 Annex A - Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites	5
Circular 01 06 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites	4
Gypsies & Travellers: Consultation on the Regional Spatial Strategy	24 (1)
Gypsies and Travellers Options Results - ORGANISATION	9
Gypsies and Travellers Options: QUESTION	5
Circular 04 07 Planning for Travelling Showpeople	1

Travelling Showpeople in the North West	5
Travelling Showpeople: Consultation on the Regional Spatial Strategy	5
Travelling Showpeople Options: ORGANISATION	5
Travelling Showpeople Options: QUESTIONS	2

Local Authority Breakdown

The tables below shows which Local Authorities logged into the site and which did not.

Local Authorities to login:	
Barrow	Mersyside
Blackburn	4NW
Blackpool	Oldham
Bolton	Pendle
Burnley	Preston
Bury	Ribble Valley
Carlisle	Salford
Charlestopham	South Lakeland
Cheshire	South Ribble
Chester	St Helens
Chorley	Stockport
Copeland	Tameside
Crewe and Nantwich	Trafford
Ellesmere Port & Neston Borough Council	Warrington
Fylde	West Lancashire
Halton	Wigan
Hydeburn	Wirrel
Lancashire	Wyre
Lancaster	
Liverpool	
Manchester	

Local Authorities who did NOT login:	
Cumbria	
Congleton	
Macclesfield	
Vale Royal	Responses sent by email

FORUM WEBSITE RESPONSES

In this section we list the forum responses verbatim. Please note at this date we are still expecting some late responses to come in.

Question 1: Are you happy with these pitch distribution figures?

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT	
NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-11-24 16:24:37
COMMENT:	<p><i>Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Distribution Report</i></p> <p>The Lancashire Strategic Housing Working Group recently discussed this and referred the overall question of provision across the County to the Lancashire Chief Executives for consideration. We were of the opinion that there needs to be a more even spread across the County and are looking for LCC to be more proactive in the discussions as they own a number of existing pitches. We would also wish to see a consistency of approach and of standards across the county under the auspices of one dedicated officer.</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT	
NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-11-24 16:43:53
COMMENT:	<p>Based on planning applications/ appeal decisions I have worked on I offer the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Carlisle -clear immediate need for more residential provision that provides security of tenure b) South Lakeland - am dealing with current application for local need concealed for 7 years and not part of assessment. Shows difficulty of assessing need. c) Macclesfield -should be greater than shown. Current UD at Pickmere for family whose need was concealed. I am aware of another family looking for a site in this area. There could be others. d) Chester-several recent appeals suggest that need is greater than that shown. Allowance in GTAA for household formation on Common Lane site seems low. e) Vale Royal-need is probably greater than shown. Unclear what allowance has been made for doubling up on Winsford site. f) Warrington- have reason to believe the need is greater than shown. GTAA omits two temporary sites with 24 caravans

	<p>g) Halton - unclear to what extent the waiting list includes families seeking to live elsewhere in districts without a socially provided sites but who have registered with Halton as it is the nearest socially provided site to where they live.</p> <p>h) Accrington - concern over condition of some private sites and over crowding/ substandard conditions. Reason to believe site waiting list for socially provided site at Whinney Hill is much greater than indicated.</p> <p>i) Blackburn-families are facing real difficulties finding suitable sites</p> <p>j) West Lancs - immediate need for two families on unauthorised developments.</p> <p>k) Greater Manchester - these figures are a revelation and a disgrace. Hardly surprising there is so much spillage into surrounding areas when you see the level of suppressed need in this conurbation. I have assisted families in NE, Essex, Wiltshire, Stoke, Cheshire and Lancs who have been unable to get on sites in Gt Manchester and have had to move elsewhere.</p>
--	---

4NWRESPONSE

NAME:	Michael Gallagher
DATE OF POST:	2008-11-25 16:10:54
COMMENT:	- having read your comments, do you have any thoughts on what the figures should be changed to in the districts you mention?

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-11-27 13:22:27
COMMENT:	<p><i>Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Distribution Report</i> Fylde BC rejects the suggested distribution in the Fylde Sub-region since the Lancs Study identified a total need for 25 permanent pitches and 0 transit pitches. First of all, this appears to have increased to 30 and 15. Secondly there is no justification as to how the draft distribution has been made.</p> <p><i>Travelling Showpeople Distribution Report</i> Fylde BC reject the draft figures on the basis that they significantly contradict the findings of the Lancs Sub-regional study which indicated no requirement for Fylde.</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-11-27 15:23:55

COMMENT:	<i>Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Distribution Report</i> Steve Jones-West Lancs-Are the proposed pitch numbers to 2016? If the process was to smooth distribution how come the numbers are higher than the GTAA proposals? Is the district based number to be provided across the sub region?
-----------------	--

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-11-27 17:30:49
COMMENT:	<p>Hi can I just make a couple of points about the proposed figures in relation to the Greater Manchester area? The figures proposed include a figure for transit site provision in each authority which you have calculated from the unauthorised encampments identified in each local authority area in the GTAA. You have then redistributed them according to where people in the GTAA had indicated transit site provision should be. The problem with doing this is that the need arising from unauthorised encampments has already been fed into the overall pitch requirement in the GTAA. By creating a separate column for transit site provision aren't you just duplicating this and doubling the number of pitches needed arising from unauthorised encampments?</p> <p>Secondly the proposed re-distribution of pitch provision seems to be an attempt to address the research problem of need often being identified where provision already exists and those local authorities with sites/pithes then having to provide even more. The GM GTAA took into account geographical preferences so that need was not necessarily linked directly to the place at which the person was interviewed. In effect the GM GTAA has already included an element of geographical redistribution of pitch requirements. On what basis would a further re-distribution be needed?</p>

4NWRESPONSE

NAME:	Michael Gallagher
DATE OF POST:	2008-11-28 12:05:06
COMMENT:	<p>- having read your comments, do you have any thoughts on what the transit and permanent pitch figures should be changed to in the Greater Manchetser districts?</p> <p>At the moment having read the Greater Manchester GTAA is is not clear that the figures within it for pitch provision (table 6.1 of the GTAA) are a total for permanent and transit provision. Also the Greater Manchester GTAA as written is not clear about the impact of geographical preference, which has influenced the figures set out in</p>

	Table 6.1 of the GTAA. It would be useful to have a set of figures in the public domain for all districts in Greater Manchester, setting out the GTAA outputs before the impact of geographical preference had been applied. In doing so this would help to make the Greater Manchester GTAA figures comparable with the evidence base from the other GTAA's done in the region.
--	--

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-11-28 18:36:28
COMMENT:	Chorley Council supports the suggested distribution of 0 pitches for gypsies and traveller pitch distribution. Chorley Council does not support the draft proposed distribution of 14 pitches for travelling showpeople. No need is shown for travelling showpeople pitches in Chorley Borough in the GTAA identified need figures. There is no justification as to how the draft distribution for travelling showpeople pitches has been made. Use the results from the studies (GTAA) to distribute new provision based on the existing identified 'need where it arises' basis.

4NWRESPONSE

NAME:	Michael Gallagher
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-01 12:21:50
COMMENT:	<p>amarland - thanks for your feedback.</p> <p>Please note, the draft distribution for Gypsy & Traveller pitch does not put forward a figure of 0 for Chorley. In this context do you comments still remain valid?</p> <p>With regard to Travelling Showpeople - the distribution takes account of the feedback from the options stage consultation which backed Working with sub-regional partnerships and the Showman's Guild agree a more balanced share of meeting need across districts, reflecting a wider range of factors other than solely the 'need where it arises' basis. This would see pitch provision distributed to meet the requirements for Travelling Showpeople, so that they had the same chance to enjoy equal (or comparable) access to services and facilities, social and economic opportunities, as the settled community, and thus contribute towards community cohesion and sustainable communities.</p> <p>The results from "The North West's Travelling Showpeople's Current Base Location, Preferred Base Locations and Operating Patterns" 4NW, 2008 - produced with assistance from The Showmen's Guild, Lancashire Section.</p> <p>In this context do you comments still remain valid?</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-02 12:15:15
COMMENT:	<p>Alison Marland - Chorley Council. Further to comment on 28 Nov, having seen proposed distribution for Chorley do not support distribution of 10 permanent and 5 transit pitches for gypsies and travellers pitch distribution. Chorley Council also rejects the draft proposed distribution of 14 pitches for travelling showpeople No need is shown in the gypsy and traveller accommodation assessment identified need figures for any pitches in Chorley Borough. There is no justification as to how the draft distribution has been made. Use the results from the studies (GTAA) to distribute new provision based on the existing identified 'need where it arises' basis.</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-01 12:06:30
COMMENT:	<p>This is the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) response to the informal consultation on the site distribution figures for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>Following an initial assessment by Stockport MBC, AGMA has serious concerns about the validity of the figures which 4NW are proposing. This is based upon concerns with the methodology used by 4NW, the differences between the 4NW work and the 4NW figures, and that 4NW have misunderstood the Greater Manchester work on Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>Until we can satisfactorily resolve the issues referred to above, AGMA has no further comments to make on any of the questions at this stage.</p>

4NWRESPONSE

NAME:	Michael Gallagher
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-01 12:28:03
COMMENT:	<p>- Having read your comments, I am keen to satisfactorily resolve the issues referred to by AGMA.</p> <p>In this context it would be useful if you could provide more detail on your concerns about the methodology etc.</p> <p>At the moment having read the Greater Manchester GTAA is not clear that the figures within it for pitch provision (table 6.1 of the GTAA) are a total for permanent and transit provision. Also the Greater Manchester GTAA as</p>

	<p>written is not clear about the impact of geographical preference, which has influenced the figures set out in Table 6.1 of the GTAA. It would be useful to have a set of figures in the public domain for all districts in Greater Manchester, setting out the GTAA outputs before the impact of geographical preference had been applied. In doing so this would help to make the Greater Manchester GTAA figures comparable with the evidence base from the other GTAA's done in the region.</p> <p>At the moment from the feedback given I am uncertain what figures AGMA would be happy with on pitch provision. Do you have any thoughts on what the transit and permanent pitch figures should be changed to in the Greater Manchester districts?</p>
--	--

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-01 14:21:13
COMMENT:	<p><i>Gypsies and Travellers Distribution Report</i> Wyre BC objects to the suggested numbers and distribution across the Fylde Coast which appear to have no regard to the findings of the sub-regional study. It is not clear what is the rational/ justification of the proposals.</p> <p><i>Travelling Showpeople Distribution Report</i> Wyre BC objects to the suggested number and distribution of pitches for Travelling Showpeople which do not have regard to the sub regional study. Provision for travelling showpeople and Gypsies and Travellers should be on identified need where it arises basis.</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-01 16:39:41
COMMENT:	<p><i>Gypsies & Travellers: Consultation on the Regional Spatial Strategy Report</i> Blackpool Council is currently investigating ways of meeting the needs identified within the earlier Lancashire Sub-Regional assessment of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, completed in May 2007. In line with the preferred option of the majority of respondents at the earlier NWRSS Partial Review consultation stage, Blackpool Council supports the view that this is a matter which is best considered in future on a wider basis through a sub-regional approach. Meeting the identified need arising in Blackpool within the Blackpool boundary is not possible given the acute constraints on</p>

available land and the requirements for rapid housing growth. In these terms Blackpool Council therefore fully supports the approach of an indicative more even split of future provision across Blackpool, Fylde and Wyre within the wider Fylde Sub-Region. Blackpool Council would support in principle the "suggested split" of the figures, with the emphasis then being on the different local authorities within each sub-region to work together to determine the best way forward. Blackpool Council accepts and understands that the individual district figures are, however, a good baseline to give impetus to this process and that it is the responsibility of all local authorities across the North West to help meet identified needs. Blackpool Council does not, however, support the vastly increased November 2008 figures, compared to the figures set out in the Lancashire Sub-Regional Assessment. It is not understood how, after a very exhaustive and comprehensive assessment for Lancashire concluded there was a combined need for 25 permanent gypsy vans to meet the combined requirement of Blackpool/ Fylde and Wyre districts, this has now been increased to 30 permanent, plus 15 transit vans. Of much more concern, against a current authorised provision of just 2 Travelling Showpeople vans across the Fylde Sub-Region, the need is now identified for at least 39 vans based on a Showmans Guild Preference Survey. It is essential to ensure that requirements are determined based on real need and against the clear background of the realities on the ground and competing choices that need to be made. There is no awareness of this scale of need in Blackpool and the Fylde Sub-Region from any past considerations.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-01 17:26:32
COMMENT:	Dear Moderator, In relation to your question about whether we are content with the pitch distribution figures relating to Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, we note that the figures you record are in accordance with and acknowledge our Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment and are therefore happy that you are using them as opposed to any other figures in this work. The GTAA has been adopted by the Authority and we intend to use its figures in any future work in relation to this issue. Best regards, Phil Dagnall, Ribble Valley Borough Council Forward Plans Section

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-01 17:50:09
COMMENT:	<p><i>Gypsy and Traveller Distribution Report</i></p> <p>Wirral Borough Council cannot accept these figures. It is not appropriate to consider these matters as part of an informal process, as decisions on matters like this require high level political endorsement, which is not possible within the timescales provided. With regard to gypsies and travellers, at Issues and Options the Council supported Option 3 - working with sub-regional partnerships to allow cross boundary working.</p> <p>The Merseyside GTAA recommended a strategic approach. The Merseyside GTAA stated that the split between local authorities was indicative only and that the numerical results of the apportionment should not necessarily be assumed to imply that those needs should actually be met in that specific locality. Wirral has had repeated nil caravan counts and has had no recent encampments. The draft requirement for transit pitches at 5 per district or 20 in total far exceeds the need for only 10 transit pitches identified in the Merseyside GTAA across the sub-regional partnership area as a whole. A need for 5 transit pitches in Wirral is not proven. With regard to travelling showpeople, at Issues and Options the Council supported Option 1 - distribution on the basis of existing need where it arises. The Merseyside GTAA showed no need or demand for pitches for travelling showpeople within the sub-regional partnership area.</p> <p><i>Travelling Showpeople Distribution Report</i></p> <p>With regard to travelling showpeople, at Issues and Options the Council supported Option 1 - distribution on the basis of existing need where it arises. The Merseyside GTAA showed no need or demand for pitches for travelling showpeople within the sub-regional partnership area.</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-01 18:07:36
COMMENT:	The proposal for 5 Gypsy Transit Pitches in Copeland is not supported by the Cumbria GTAA. Copeland is not regarded as a staging post.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-01 18:55:14
COMMENT:	We consider the proposed pitch distribution figures for South Lakeland should be in line with the level of need identified in the Cumbria GTAA study. At present the proposed figures appear to be significantly higher than those in the study.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-01 19:17:33
COMMENT:	<p>Whilst the revised allocations represent a step forward insofar that the distribution is now more equitable, they do not appear to have made provision for a reduction in the numbers of pitches to be provided by Hyndburn, Blackburn with Darwen or Lancaster City who are still providing the majority of pitches across Lancashire. Hyndburn therefore objects to the proposed figures on the basis that despite being the smallest Borough in Lancashire it is being asked to provide a disproportionate number of new pitches. It already provides significantly more pitches than all other authorities in the North West (except Lancaster). Hyndburn has not accepted the figures in GTAA. Now the principle of achieving a more equitable distribution has been accepted, it is necessary to ensure that it is taken one or two steps further, with significant decreases in the allocations for Hyndburn and Blackburn with Darwen and further increases in the remaining Lancashire authority areas. Only at that stage will Hyndburn consider changing its position.</p> <p>Hyndburn Borough Council</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-02 10:35:53
COMMENT:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have the results of the representations submitted to the June 2008 consultations (regarding 3 Options) been published? If they have where can they be found? 2. Merseyside local authority Chief Executives submitted a representation supporting Option 2, however, the questions posed now appear to relate to Option 1 - is this a correct interpretation? 3. The Merseyside G&TAA did not assign to an individual local authority, the new provision required for transit needs. Should a question be posed to address this aspect?

	<p>4. What is the timetable to complete the revised North West Plan Partial Review?</p> <p>Regards Ray Bowers Principal Planning Officer - Liverpool.</p>
--	---

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-02 10:37:01
COMMENT:	<p>With regard to the figures for Crewe & Nantwich, within the Cheshire Partnership area, I feel that they are in line with the GTAA of 2007 and make a good start, but it should be looked in the wider area that provision usually only come where gypsies and travellers wish to be.</p> <p>The transit provision is a bit more difficult as the GTAA only had a whole figure for the whole of the Cheshire Partnership and therefore we would need to see the rational of how the breakdown was arrived at.</p> <p>There is a mistake on the Cheshire Partnership figures for the travelling showpeople requirement. It states 47 but when you add the figures up, it only comes to 36. The error seems that in Cheshire East and Cheshire West the figures have been included twice. This figure is not detailed as additional provision or the total provision required. More discussion needs to take place over this part of the requirements.</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-02 10:49:55
COMMENT:	<p><i>Gypsies and Travellers Distribution Report</i></p> <p>With regard to the figures for Crewe & Nantwich, within the Cheshire Partnership area, I feel that they are in line with the GTAA of 2007 and make a good start, but it should be looked in the wider area that provision usually only come where gypsies and travellers wish to be. The transit provision is a bit more difficult as the GTAA only had a whole figure for the whole of the Cheshire Partnership and therefore we would need to see the rational of how the breakdown was arrived at.</p> <p><i>Travelling Showpeople Distribution Report</i></p> <p>There is a mistake on the Cheshire Partnership figures for the travelling showpeople requirement. It states 47 but when you add the figures up, it only comes to 36. The error seems that in Cheshire East and Cheshire West the figures</p>

	have been included twice. This figure is not detailed as additional provision or the total provision required. More discussion needs to take place over this part of the requirements.
--	--

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-02 14:01:26
COMMENT:	<p><i>Gypsies and Travellers Distribution Report</i></p> <p>Lancaster CC has implemented positive criteria based planning policies for a significant period of time, and this is reflected in the large stock of current authorised provision. It would be helpful to know what the general approach is to the suggested split - the intention would seem to be to increase provision where it already exists - on a scale that reflects the existing provision, and to introduce provision on a small scale in the areas where the GTAA survey revealed no demand. Perhaps it would be helpful to consult on a general approach to distribution - that is the objectives to the distribution - before suggesting a split across the sub-region which does not appear to be justified (but which might well be).</p> <p><i>Travelling Showpeople Distribution Report</i></p> <p>Lancaster CC: The difference between the GTAA Identified Need Figure for Lancashire and the Suggested split, informed by the Showmans Guild Preference Survey is stark: if the latter is to be used to inform the distribution then this variation requires explanation. Do we know if splitting the pitches as suggested, into often very small group numbers, spread throughout Lancashire, is likely to create genuinely useful camps?</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-02 15:52:53
COMMENT:	<p><i>Gypsies and Travellers Distribution Report</i></p> <p>The figures seem fair enough and build on the GTAA for Cheshire undertaken in 2007. In Ellesmere Port and Neston the impact of accepted encampments in the area and changes in the number of Travellers in bricks and mortar will have altered the situation since the GTAA. There is also an interrelationship with the accepted encampment in the Runcorn area of Halton. There are a couple of other issues which will be increasingly relevant. Firstly there is the impact of the transit site in Halton when it opens which could have a significant impact on patterns of movement.</p>

	<p>There is also the issue of LGR in Cheshire. The GTAA has assessed need for the current districts of Cheshire. LGR will lead to aggregation of these needs for the two new councils. It is important that the information about more localised demand is not lost when considering new site provision and that consultation processes are robust enough to pick up these issues.</p>
--	--

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT

NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-02 17:01:42
COMMENT:	<p><i>Gypsies and Travellers Distribution Report</i></p> <p>There appear to be areas in Lancashire (Chorley, Wyre South Ribble and Rossendale) where no GTTA has been carried out and other areas (Pendle, Fylde) where only minimal site provision is anticipated. In two of these cases (Pendle and Rossendale) the main moorland transit route between Yorkshire and Lancashire runs through the area. These routes were well-used by travellers on the way to Appleby in particular prior to the 1994 Act. It seems unlikely therefore that there can be no need for travellers sites in these areas. Jean Johnson</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT	
NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-03 00:58:48
COMMENT:	<p>Sefton notes that the Merseyside Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment said that:</p> <p>"The split between local authorities [of estimated requirements] is indicative only and based on evidence of 'need where it arises' and this reflects the current uneven distribution of the Gypsy and Traveller population across the Merseyside sub-regional area. The numerical results of this apportionment should not necessarily be assumed to imply that those needs should actually be met in that specific locality.</p> <p>"It is recommended that decisions about where need should be met be strategic, taken in partnership with local authorities, sub-regional bodies and the North West Regional Assembly - involving consultation with Gypsies and Travellers and other interested parties - which will take into account wider social and economic planning considerations such as equity, choice and sustainability."</p> <p>This indicates that the findings of the assessment are a starting point and not an absolute answer. Sefton notes that the Merseyside response to the NWP PR consultation in June 2008 regarding Gypsy & Traveller provision stated that a balance needs to be struck between option 2 (providing a minimum provision in each authority) and option 3 (addressing inequalities of provision across the region), and Sefton continues to support this approach. Sefton considers that several issues still need to be discussed between the Merseyside authorities and this may require clarification and advice from the assessment's authors preferably before the consultation events in January/February 2009. For example, regarding transit pitch provision, the assessment suggests 10 pitches for the entire study area but does not suggest where they should be, whether this should be on one site or more sites, attached to existing sites or not, etc, whilst the NWP PR suggest 5 pitches in each authority area (20 in total). Sefton also notes that there has not yet been consultation with Gypsies and Travellers in the Merseyside area about the findings of the Assessment.</p> <p>Please note that these comments are officer-level and have not been sanctioned by Sefton Council, however they reflect the comments made in June which were reported to and approved by Sefton's cabinet.</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT	
NAME:	
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-03 14:53:40
COMMENT:	<p>It is disappointing that 4NW has not been more proactive in recommending to Local Authorities the pattern of future provision of pitches for gypsies and travellers. The current recommendations draws on the research carried out earlier which is based on interviews with a sample of gypsy and traveller households over the region.</p> <p>Naturally respondents will state a preference for the locality in which they are currently based i.e. in those Local Authority areas which historically have carried out their obligation to make some provision. Whereas Authorities which have not carried out this obligation will continue to be able to do so under these recommendations.</p> <p>The opportunity has not been taken to consider other relevant factors which include supply of suitable sites, pressures on local services and community cohesion , all of which may argue for a more even future provision of pitches across the region.</p> <p>Blackburn with Darwen Council is committed to making reasonable provision to meet the future housing needs of local gypsies and travellers. This commitment is on the basis that other Local Authorities also make local provision for the future needs of gypsies and travellers.</p>

STAKEHOLDER COMMENT	
NAME:	Gill Pinder
DATE OF POST:	2008-12-03 17:42:00
COMMENT:	<p>The timescale of the draft distribution of pitches for Gypsy & Traveller and Travelling Showpeople allocation is uncertain. The RSS has a timescale to 2025, are the suggested allocations to this date? The Cheshire GTAA figures identified need up until 2016 - do these recommendations go beyond this date? If the figures cover the period to 2016, no indication is given on the assumptions beyond this date.</p> <p><i>Gypsies and Travellers</i></p> <p>The figures recommended for Gypsies and Travellers provision is broadly in line with the findings of the Cheshire GTAA, with the addition of 5 transit pitches. The GTAA identified that upto 2011 the residential accommodation need arising within St Helens is around 17 additional pitches and a further 14 by 2016. Funding has been</p>

secured from Department of Communities and Local Government to develop additional transit facilities within St Helens.

Travelling Showpeople

In the Cheshire GTAA, no need for a travelling show peoples site was identified within St Helens. The evidence gathered in Showmen's Guild Travelling Preference Survey, Autumn 2007, appeared to indicate that need for Showpeople's accommodation in St Helens is seasonal, which would indicate that temporary provision over summer would be most appropriate.

However, representation submitted on behalf of travelling showpeople from Mr Silcock, indicates that winter provision is needed within the Borough. This is difficult to reconcile with the findings of the study. No details are available on how this relates to similar requests across the subregion, whether this is a sub regional need and additional/alternative sites are being sought elsewhere. Has account been taken of over winter storage/accommodation needs?

The Travelling Showpeople Draft Proposed Distribution of Pitches suggests provision of at least 47 additional pitches across the sub-region based on Showman's Guild Preference Survey - single preferences, including 8 within St Helens. However, the Survey recognised that only 2.1% identified a preference for locating within St Helens, and multiple preferences resulted in only 1.7% expressing a preference for locating within St Helens. This would suggest that of the 47 pitches required across the sub-region, the suggested provision of 8 within St Helens (0.35 ha) exceeds the required/identified need and could result in unnecessary provision and vacancies.

Please note that these comments are officer-level and have not been sanctioned by St Helens Council.

Email Responses

To date we have had two email responses after the dead line for the forum. These are as follows:

St Helen's 3rd December 2008

The timescale of the draft distribution of pitches for Gypsy & Traveller and Travelling Showpeople allocation is uncertain. The RSS has a timescale to 2025, are the suggested allocations to this date? The Cheshire GTAA figures identified need up until 2016 - do these recommendations go beyond this date? If the figures cover the period to 2016, no indication is given on the assumptions beyond this date.

Gypsies and Travellers

The figures recommended for Gypsies and Travellers provision is broadly in line with the findings of the Cheshire GTAA, with the addition of 5 transit pitches. The GTAA identified that upto 2011 the residential accommodation need arising within St Helens is around 17 additional pitches and a further 14 by 2016. Funding has been secured from Department of Communities and Local Government to develop additional transit facilities within St Helens.

Travelling Showpeople

In the Cheshire GTAA, no need for a travelling show peoples site was identified within St Helens. The evidence gathered in Showmen's Guild Travelling Preference Survey, Autumn 2007, appeared to indicate that need for Showpeople's accommodation in St Helens is seasonal, which would indicate that temporary provision over summer would be most appropriate. However, representation submitted on behalf of travelling showpeople from Mr Silcock, indicates that winter provision is needed within the Borough. This is difficult to reconcile with the findings of the study. No details are available on how this relates to similar requests across the sub region, whether this is a sub regional need and additional/alternative sites are being sought elsewhere. Has account been taken of over winter storage/accommodation needs?

The Travelling Showpeople Draft Proposed Distribution of Pitches suggests provision of at least 47 additional pitches across the sub-region based on Showman's Guild Preference Survey - single preferences, including 8 within St Helens. However, the Survey recognised that only 2.1% identified a preference for locating within St Helens, and multiple preferences resulted in only 1.7% expressing a preference for locating within St Helens. This would suggest that of the 47 pitches required across the sub-region, the suggested provision of 8 within St Helens (0.35 ha) exceeds the required/identified need and could result in unnecessary provision and vacancies.

Please note that these comments are officer-level and have not been sanctioned by St Helens Council.

Vale Royal, 4th December 2008

Vale Royal has no issues with the figures you are proposing for Cheshire West and Chester (this title should be used in preference to West Cheshire) in particular and the suggested split across the sub region more generally.

In the interests of openness and transparency we would welcome the earliest possible publication of the final agreed figures so that our wider communities can be informed and involved in the ongoing discussions.

Stakeholder Meeting Records

Notes from **meeting** held on Tuesday, **9th December 2008** at the Showmen's Guild.

The contents of these meetings have been removed on 17th February 2009 by:

Emma Cranidge (CAG Consultants)

North West Plan Partial Review Consultation Team Manager.

Notes from meeting held on **Friday, 19th December 2008** at the Winsford Centre, Cheviot Square, Winsford.

The contents of these meetings have been removed on 17th February 2009 by:

Emma Cranidge (CAG Consultants)

North West Plan Partial Review Consultation Team Manager.