

## **SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE VILLAGES**

### **Summary of land for gypsies and travellers comments:**

- You will never successfully integrate new traveller sites in the close knit rural communities.
- This is a very badly worded point with two parts. Whilst the evidence may or may not identify a need, I do not see any evidence in this area for it.
- Limited sites are worth considering.
- If there is evidence and there is a genuine need then yes, I do agree.
- Identify brownfield sites for this use. Why should those who choose this lifestyle be granted preferential sites in 'green' areas?
- I feel these sites should be in an area that will cause little disruption to residents I.e. good infrastructure (main road access) and also have a good access to services (electricity and sewerage) to cause minimal disruption.
- Gypsies do not contribute to society - Abberley/Great Witley should not be sites for travellers.
- Crime is our concern.
- As long as the people living on them are subject to rent, Council tax etc.
- Answered yes to this question, because we need to know where the sites for gypsies are proposed. We do not want them just illegally settling in any vacant field.
- No such community is likely to welcome such a site.
- Villages are well aware of the established sites for travellers and the problems relating to such sites.
- The cost of these sites and any income should be known to council tax payers.
- If a plot of land is suitable for a gypsy / traveller site then it should be limited to say 4 or no more than 6 caravans / dwellings to ensure all services including schools are not over stretched.
- We all work hard to provide homes for our families. Why should Gypsies and Travellers be provided with land by local authorities.
- They do not wish to be part of a community and therefore sites need not be located near/in villages.
- We don't want gypsies in this area.
- Small sites scattered for Travellers. The sites must be kept attractive, not dumping yards for old cars etc.
- This area already has sufficient sites.
- Travellers themselves need to be consulted rather than just placed in areas. As far I am aware there is no need locally for a travellers site.
- Travellers are an important part of Worcestershire's economy and culture.
- A small number of semi-permanent sites should be made available-some farmers have provided spaces around Holt.
- Allocated sites.
- The agreement to their location is vital.
- Worcestershire has provided more than many counties.

- The evidence also shows that the people of south Worcestershire do not want the problems associated with these sites.
- Unnecessary consideration. What do they do for the community?
- Gypsy sites near housing will lead to problems for residents such as theft, vandalism, litter, noise and violence. Any site must be sanctioned via a voting system by local residents and the council must detail its evidence of need prior to this. Hopefully the council will pay residents increased insurance premiums when problems begin?
- Kempsey Common
- This has been an ongoing problem for over 25 years in Kempsey. The facilities do not warrant it and it is universally condemned.
- No one wants to devalue properties with the inclusion of travellers sites.
- Usually Gypsies have a better reputation than Travellers.
- Travellers do need somewhere to live, but should be made to pay like the rest of us
- Several felt that there are already adequate facilities for Gypsies and Travellers in the region which would benefit from further development.
- Gypsies are a bane to society, we don't need them, and why should the rate payers have to pay for them? Definitely No!
- Small selective sites only.
- Big problem, but more sites will only aggravate the issue
- Can't think of a suitable site within Martley
- I quite agree that there should be more sites for Gypsies and Travellers in our communities and would welcome one in Martley where ever ground is available.
- Needs full countywide consultation to identify not just sites but processes.
- Would prefer such sites to be small and subject to clear local public control.
- Small sites which are 'not a blot on the landscape'.
- If people want to follow the gypsy lifestyle i.e travelling they do not need permanent sites near villages.
- Small sites are more appropriate eg may be a small site on land between Powick and Callow End (Upton Road) or between Powick and Bastonford off the A449.
- We don't feel that the encouraging of travellers is in the interests of the majority of householders.
- Travellers should buy their own sites.
- The land is often left in a very poor state leaving behind rubbish and sanitation problems.
- Travel is a luxury and a commodity and should therefore not be supported by the local authority.
- The Parish Council can see no suitable sites within the Parish and therefore has no suggestions.
- Ticked the yes box but do gypsies and travellers want to settle and take responsibility for their surroundings or do they need to roam from site to site. if so who facilitates the site?