

RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL

**RUNNYMEDE PITCH AND PLOT ALLOCATION SCHEME FOR
GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING)(ENGLAND)
REGULATIONS 2012**

REGULATION 12 STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

December 2024

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Town & County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 ('the Regulations') set out in Regulation 12 that before a local planning authority adopts a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), they must prepare a statement (Statement of Consultation) setting out:
- i) The persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the SPD;
 - ii) A summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
 - iii) How those issues have been addressed in preparing the draft SPD.
- 1.2 This statement sets out how the Council has engaged various stakeholders during the preparation of the draft Runnymede Borough Council Pitch and Plot Allocation Scheme for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople: Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (hereafter referred to as the Allocation Scheme SPD).
- 1.3 A list of all those persons who have been consulted on the Allocation Scheme SPD is set out in Appendix A. It should be noted however that this appendix lists the individuals, companies and other groups registered on the Council's Planning Policy database in May 2024. It is possible that there may be minor changes in the list of people registered between this time and the finalisation of this document.

Chronology of engagement

- 2.1 The draft Allocation Scheme was first considered at the Council's Infrastructure and Economic Development Working Party on 15th March 2021 and the Housing and Enablement Working Party on 21st July 2021. A summary of the comments made on the draft Allocation Scheme (which was not proposed to be an SPD at this point in time) at these meetings is set out as follows:

Infrastructure and Economic Development Working Party:

- Support for the policy and local connection criteria.
- It was suggested that officers looked at the allocation criteria for the SCC public sites as a comparable.
- The importance of enforcement in ensuring our existing and future plots are used by persons who met the criteria was emphasised.
- It was questioned whether the travelling community would be able to get a mortgage for the pitches, and if they couldn't, whether this would limit the number of households able to acquire a pitch.

Housing and Enablement Working Party

- There was slight Member concern around applicants only being able to join the register for affordable pitches should they advise on their current address. Officers advised that being on an unauthorised or crowded pitch, would not necessarily preclude residents from applying for a pitch – a flexible approach would be applied. Generally, the majority of applicants who approach RBC were prepared to provide some evidence of where they live.
- Some Members stated a preference for RBC to take on the ownership of the pitches/plots and to manage them.
- Concerns expressed around the challenges of enforcement.
- Officers were asked to consider ways to improve engagement with the traveller community.
- Officers were asked to provide an annual review of progress against delivery of the local plan. This would involve geographic breakdown by ward, versus how much social housing has been delivered by ward in the same period.
- A Member suggested setting up a Housing Association solely to manage traveller pitches, although officers advised a minimum quantum of units would be required to operate – most probably across the entire county.
- Members agreed with the eligibility criteria for applicants matching the Allocations Policy, to have lived or worked in the borough for three years of the past five years, however key to this would be the consultation process.

- 2.2 Following this early engagement, the draft Allocation Scheme was approved by both the Planning Committee (1st September 2021) and the Housing Committee (8th September 2021) for a period of public consultation. This consultation occurred between 15th October and Friday 26th November 2021.
- 2.3 The Planning Policy Team considered all the responses received during formal public consultation. 7 representations were received in total, and a number of verbal comments were made to officers which were also captured. Appendix B contains a table setting out the main issues raised in these representations. It also sets out the Council's response to each of the points raised, the changes made to the document as a result (where appropriate), or explains why no changes were considered necessary.
- 2.4 During the first period of public consultation, a further member briefing was held on the draft contents of the document on 11th November 2021. A summary of the comments made during this meeting are summarised as follows:
- Concern about 'medical and disability' being included in affordable list bandings as a lot of traveller families seem to have health issues. Concern that this could distort the picture and it could be hard to assess all cases. It was commented by officers that the Housing team is very experienced in interrogating health information in detail.

- Officers need to take account of the tribal nature of G and T communities. Some families will not want to live alongside other families. They will not want to mix with them. If we make mistakes, this could have wider implications.
- Concern about pitches being sold as freehold products. Question as to whether the Council should be seeking to acquire and then rent out.
- Query as to whether it was appropriate to follow the same approach as set out in the allocation scheme for the sites actually owned by Gypsies and Travellers. Officers commented that Policy SL22 of the local plan only related to the new sites allocated.
- It was felt that offering some pitches and plots to the retired G and T community could be a good idea. This would help families stay in close proximity to one another.
- It was questioned whether the next Local Plan can insist that allocated pitches and plots are offered back to the Council. Officers did not feel that this could be insisted upon.

- 2.5 During the period of this first round of formal public consultation, Council officers also met with the Treasurer from the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain to discuss the draft document.
- 2.6 Following the initial round of public consultation, the Infrastructure and Economic Development Working Party discussed potential revisions to the Allocation Scheme at a meeting held on 23rd February 2022. A summary of the comments made at this meeting are as follows:
- Officers were asked to check on the licensing requirements associated with the provision of new traveller sites.
 - Officers advised that they felt that the document should be prepared as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) moving forwards to give the document a greater status in the decision taking process.
 - Officers were asked to consider including text regarding the need for developers to provide the Council with information on any offers received for pitches (and why they were not accepted, if relevant), and also for affordable pitches; the number of refusals allowed.
- 2.7 Given the delays in bringing forward the pitches and plots on the sites allocated in the Local Plan, the progression of the document (which by this point was proposed to be made an SPD) was then put on hold whilst officers focussed on other priority projects. Work started again on the Allocation Scheme SPD in Autumn 2023. On 13th September 2023, an officer from the Council attended a meeting of the Surrey Gypsy Traveller Forum and gave a presentation on the proposed contents of the Allocation Scheme and changes to be made following the first round of public consultation.
- 2.8 The change in the definition of a traveller in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) was made in December 2023. This occurred following the Court of Appeal judgement *Smith v. SoS for Levelling Up, Housing and*

Communities in October 2022. Officers reviewed both the draft Allocation Scheme SPD and the accompanying Equalities Assessment as a result and made amendments to both as appropriate.

- 2.9 The changes made to the draft Allocation Scheme SPD following the first period of public consultation are summarised in paragraph 1.11 of the report which was taken to the Planning Committee on 29th May 2024 (when permission from the Planning Committee was sought to conduct a second round of public consultation. The officer report can be viewed [here](#) (see item 8)).
- 2.10 A further round of public consultation subsequently occurred between 5th June and 31st July 2024. The Planning Policy Team has considered all the responses received during formal public consultation. 8 representations were received in total. Appendix C contains a table setting out the main issues raised in these representations. It also sets out the Team's response to each of the issues, the changes made to the SPD as a result of the issue, or explains why no changes were considered necessary.
- 2.11 The Planning Policy Team publicised both public consultations on the Council's website, and distributed the consultation documents in the Borough's libraries and main office at the Civic Centre in Addlestone, in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The consultations were also promoted to the local community via the Council's social media channels. Beyond the requirements of the SCI, the Council also adopted the following techniques to make the public consultation as accessible as possible to the travelling community:

-A leaflet was prepared which was targeted at the travelling community to simplify what the consultation was about and provide contact details (email address and phone number) where travellers could find out more. The leaflet was distributed to each of the pitches on the public traveller sites in the Borough, and at least 1 leaflet was sent to each of the private sites in the Borough.

-Representative organisations were engaged with; with leaflets also being passed to such groups, so they could help spread the word to the traveller community about what the consultation was about, and help any interested parties engage. This includes the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain.

-Professional agents who are known to represent/have acted on behalf of traveller families in the Borough for planning purposes were also notified of the consultation.

-The Council worked with the Surrey Gypsy Traveller Communities Forum who publicised the consultation to its members and provided information on their Facebook page and via Whatsapp.

- 2.12 Following the publicity around the consultation, officers engaged with numerous Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople on the telephone, via email and face to face (with 2 face to face meetings being held with individual travellers). With their permission, contact details of all parties interested in acquiring a pitch or plot were recorded so that updates on the progress of the Allocation Scheme SPD and the delivery of the allocated pitches/plots could be relayed.

Next Steps

- 3.1 The Council has considered all the responses received during early engagement and formal consultations.
- 3.2 A final version of the SPD will be presented to the Planning Committee in December 2024 for adoption and implementation. Once implemented, the SPD will become a material consideration in decision-making on planning applications.

Appendix A - List of Persons Consulted on the draft Pitch and Plot Allocation Scheme for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople SPD (May 2024)

As well as the organisations listed below a further 479 private individuals on the Planning Policy consultation database were consulted.

398 Air Cadets	Chertsey South Residents Association	Hodders
ACS Egham	Chobham Commons Preservation Committee	Hogan Lovells
Highways England	Chobham Parish Council	Home Builders Federation
Adams Group Real Estate Ltd	Christian Science Society Egham	Homes England
Addlestone Baptist Church	City Planning	House Builders Federation
Addlestone Community Centre	Civil Aviation Authority	Hythe Community Church
Addlestone Historical Society	CMA Planning	Hythe Community Church Pentecostal
Addlestone Salvation Army	Community Life	Iceni Projects
Affinity Water	CPRE Surrey	International Community Church
All Saints New Haw	CT Planning	IQ Planning Consultants
Andrew Black Consulting	Darley Dene Primary School	Jaspar Group
AR Planning	Department of Education [DoE]	John Andrews Associates
ARUP	Devine Homes	JSA Architects
Aston Mead Land & Planning	DHA Planning	Just a helping hand
Avison Young	Dhammakaya International Society Of The United Kingdom	Kennedy Trust
Barton Willmore LLP	Disability Empowerment Network Surrey	Kevin Scott Consultancy
Basingstoke Canal Society	DP9 Ltd	Kings Church Addlestone
Beacon Church	DPDS Consulting	Kinwell Property Investments Ltd
Bellway Homes	DWD LLP	Laleham Reach Residents Association
Berkeley Group	Egham Chamber of Commerce	Leaders Romans Group
Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Egham Residents Association	Lichfields
Bishopsgate Primary School	Egham Women's Institute	London Borough of Hillingdon
Bisley Parish Council	Elmbridge Borough Council	London Borough of Hounslow

Blue Cedar Homes	Englefield Green Neighbourhood Forum	London Borough of Kingston Upon Thames
Blue Crest land	West End Parish Council	London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
Bluestone Planning	Englefield Green Village Resident's Association	London Plan Team/Greater London Authority [GLA]
Boyer Planning	Enterprise M3 LEP	Longcross North Residents Association
Bracknell Forest Council	Epsom and Ewell Borough Council	Loup Architecture
Brett	Department for Education	Lovell Partnerships Ltd,
British Horse Society	Friends families and travellers	Lyne Residents' Association
Brooklands College	Georgian Group	Lyne School
Browns Group Holdings Ltd.	Gladman Developments Ltd	Lyne Village Hall
Buckinghamshire Council	Glanville Consultants	Macegreen
Cameron JonesPlanning	Grade Planning Ltd	Maddox Planning
Carter Jonas	Hallam Land	Mayor of London
Carter Planning Ltd	Hambledon Land	MCS group Ltd
CBRE	Hamm Court Residents Association	Meadowcroft Community Infant School
CDS Planning	Hampshire County Council	Meath School
Chertsey Chamber of Commerce	Hart District Council	Mole Valley District Council
Chertsey Good Neighbours	Heathrow Airport	Montagu Evans LLP
Chertsey Museum	National Trust	National Grid
Natural England	Pegasus Group	Runnymede Christian Fellowship
Windlesham Parish Council	Penton Park residents Association	Runnymede Churches South
Network Rail	Philip Southcote School	Runnymede Council Residents' Association
New Haw Community Centre	Plainview Planning Ltd	Runnymede Deanery
New Haw Community Junior School	Plan Aware	Runnymede Foodbank
New Haw Residents Association	Runnymede Art Society	Runnymede Muslim Society
Newlands Developments	Planning Potential Limited	Rushmoor Borough Council
Newlands Uk	PMV Planning	Savills
North Surrey CAMRA	Pyrcroft Grange School	Sayes Court School
North West Surrey Valuing People Group	R Clarke Planning Ltd	SETPLAN
Nova Planning	Rainbow Day Nursery & Pre-School	Shanly Homes
Office of Road and Rail	Ramblers	Sigma Homes
Ongar Place Primary School	Redrow Homes	Slough Borough Council

Ottershaw & West Addlestone Residents Association	Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust
Ottershaw BRAG	Reside Developments	Sovereign Housing Association
Ottershaw C of E Junior School	Revera Limited	Surrey County Council
Ottershaw Society	Richborough Estates	Spelthorne Borough Council
Ottershaw Village Hall	Rickett Architects	Sports England
Ottershaw Women's Institute	Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Squires Planning
Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum	RSPB	St Anne's Catholic Primary School
Paul Dickinson and Associates	Runnymede Access Liaison Group, Elmbridge & Runnymede Talking Newspaper Association, Runnymede Disabled Swimmers Board, Surrey Coalition of Disabled People, North Surrey Disability Empowerment Group, Surrey Vision Action Group	St Ann's Heath Junior School
St Cuthbert's Catholic Primary School	Surrey Positive Behaviour Support Network (Surrey County Council)	The Victorian Society
St Johns Beaumont	Surrey Scouts	Thorpe C of E Primary School
St John's Church Egham	Surrey Wildlife Trust	Thorpe Lea Primary School
St Judes C of E Junior School	Environment Agency	Thorpe Neighbourhood Forum
St Paul's C of E Primary School	Tandridge District Council	Thorpe Park (Merlin Entertainments Plc)
St Paul's Church Egham Hythe	Tarmac	Thorpe Ward Residents Association
Staines and District Synagogue	TASIS The American School in England	Transport for London
Stepgates Community School	Taylor Wimpey	Turley
Stride Treglown	Terence O'Rourke Ltd	Turn2us
Stroude Residents Association	Tetlow King	UK Power Networks
Strutt and Parker	Thames Water Utilities Ltd	Union4 Planning
Surrey and Borders Partnership, NHS Trust	The Berkeley Group plc	United Church of Egham
Surrey Chamber of Commerce	The Egham Museum	Urban Green Developments
Surrey Coalition of Disabled People	The Emerson Group	Vail Williams LLP
Surrey Community Action	The Gardens Trust	Vanbrugh Land

Woburn Hill Action Group	The Holy Family Catholic Primary School	Virginia Water Neighbourhood Forum
Surrey Heath Borough Council	The Marine Management Organisation	Voluntary Support North Surrey
Surrey Minority Ethnic Forum	The Twentieth Century Society	Waverley Borough Council
Surrey Muslim Centre	The Theatres Trust	Wentworth Residents Association
Surrey Police	The Planning Bureau Ltd	West Addlestone Residents Association
Woking Borough Council	Woodland Trust	WSPA
Wokingham Borough Council	Woolf Bond Planning	WYG
Woodham Park Way Association	Wraysbury Parish Council	YoungsRPS
Stonehill Crescent Residents Association Limited Company		

Appendix B- Summary of the main issues raised by stakeholders during the preparation of the draft Allocation Scheme and how they have been addressed (from public consultation carried out in Autumn 2021)

Representor	Summary of comments received	Officer response
Natural England	Natural England does not consider that this Pitch and Plot Allocation scheme poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.	Noted
Ottershaw and West Addlestone Residents Association (OWARA)	<p>1-We believe the essential missing ingredient in the draft is 'Control'. From experience and for whatever reason, RBC's public image has shown remarkable lack of effective, prompt enforcement in many aspects of the planning process in the private domain. With such a ground-breaking notion as incorporation of these pitches within conventional planning applications it seems <i>vital</i> that the detail provides RBC with <u>best control</u> of them. To that end, retention of ownership of the pitches by a public authority is essential. Whether that be RBC or SCC is open to debate but since the Local Plan 2030 is owned by RBC, that is where we suggest the ownership sits best.</p> <p>From that point and with the assessment of allocation by RBC as described in your draft, rental of the pitches is probably best suited to a population of 'Travellers' and 'Travelling Showpeople'. Effective control (enforcement), should the need arise, on a tenant rather than a landowner will be less troublesome.</p> <p>Financially, the cost of this scheme could be neutral or positive for RBC. A developer is likely to donate these plots to the Local Authority on behalf of the community</p>	<p>1-The Council will be discussing matters associated with site management and ownership with individual site promoters/land owners as appropriate as part of the planning application process. Any agreements related to site management/ownership will reflected in the S106 legal agreements for the allocated sites.</p> <p>2-The Council is of the opinion that the use of planning conditions and S106 clauses are appropriate mechanisms to ensure that the pitches and plots are only occupied by eligible households, and are enforceable if any breaches occur.</p> <p>3- This point has been carefully considered by officers across a range of departments, however the considered view of officers is that it would not be appropriate to include additional criteria into the allocation scheme to address this point. This is because such criteria could have the unintended consequence of leading to discrimination against people/groups within the wider Travelling community who have protected</p>

	<p>and rental revenue will flow. RBC already manages a large housing stock which places it in a skilled position to manage this new type of housing which will be an integral part of a larger housing scheme in a residential area.</p> <p>2-If RBC decides to continue down the dubious path of private sale of these plots (as drafted in Para 2.3 and 2.4) we ask for stronger control of the ownership of the plots than through Section 106 agreements and subsequent future owners being 'written a letter' informing them of the status of their and future occupation of the plots.</p> <p>3- Finally, we understand that some gypsy and traveller communities do not mix well and to avoid lack of harmony, a recognition of this in the allocation process is desirable. This would be particularly important on adjacent plots.</p>	<p>characteristics. This could leave the Council open to legal challenge. It is recognised that some allocation schemes prioritise applicants who already have family on a site. The Council has considered this specific potential mitigation but this is not considered to present a solution for brand new sites. However, additional text has been added into the market pitches/plots section of the Allocation Scheme to allow applicants to apply in groups to acquire a number of pitches/plots on a site. Allowing family/other groups to apply in this way is considered to partially address the point made by the representor.</p>
Waverley Borough Council	Thank you for consulting Waverley Borough Council on the above consultation. Having reviewed the consultation documentation we have no comments to make.	Noted
Surrey County Council	Thank you for notifying us of this consultation. Our Land & Property team do not have any comments to make on this consultation.	Noted
Private individual	The consultation is hard to understand. Most Gypsies, especially the older generation do not read. We have had numerous allocation schemes for Gypsies. I am still yet to be given a plot and have been waiting for the past 19 years on one of the Borough's public sites.	<p>Officers responded to this email with the intention of offering assistance but received a bounce back.</p> <p>Efforts were made by the Council to make the public consultation as accessible as possible to the travelling community. A leaflet was</p>

		<p>prepared which was targeted at the travelling community to simplify what the consultation was about and provide contact details (email address and phone number) where travellers could find out more. Representative organisations were also engaged with; with leaflets also being passed to such groups, so they could help spread the word to the traveller community about what the consultation was about, and help any interested parties engage. Professional agents who are known to represent/have acted on behalf of traveller families in the Borough for planning purposes were also notified of the consultation.</p> <p>In particular, during the course of consultation, officers worked closely with the Showmen's Guild who distributed leaflets on the consultation to its Members and explained what it was about. The leaflet was also distributed to each of the pitches on the public traveller sites in the Borough, and at least 1 leaflet was sent to each of the private sites in the Borough.</p> <p>The Council also worked with the Surrey Gypsy Traveller Communities Forum who publicised the consultation to its members and provided information on their Facebook page and via Whatsapp.</p> <p>Following the publicity around the consultation, officers engaged with numerous Gypsies,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Travellers and Travelling Showpeople on the telephone, via email and face to face (with 2 face to face meetings being held with individual travellers). With their permission, contact details of all parties interested in acquiring a pitch or plot were recorded so that updates on the allocation scheme and construction of pitches/plots can be relayed.</p>
<p>Surrey Gypsy Traveller Communities Forum</p>	<p>We are writing back to you in support of the plans to provide more pitches for Gypsy, Roma, Travellers and Show People. There is a serious need for more accommodation and we are pleased to see you achieving this.</p> <p>Since the inception of the Surrey Gypsy Traveller Communities Forum (SGTCF) in 1996, the number one topic of concern has been the lack of site provision for growing families living in the county.</p> <p>Successive governments and local authorities have indicated that this continuing situation is intolerable given the documented need for accommodation, but despite some lengthy, expensive 'need' assessments, there has been little tangible evidence of new provision.</p> <p>We strongly support the creation of new sites, including ones placed on larger new housing sites. We suggest that the design of such sites is important both to provide quality housing for the occupants and to ensure a good visual impact. There are examples of new sites at Rose Meadow View, Bristol and Fenn Land, Cambridgeshire.</p>	<p>Support for the Council's proposals is welcomed. The Council will continue to ensure that new pitches/plots on larger housing sites are clearly shown on the approved plans as suggested. The Council is committed to working closely with the developers of these sites and organisations representing the G and T communities such as the Surrey Gypsy Traveller Communities Forum as site designs are finalised and as occupants take up their pitches/plots to ensure a smooth transition.</p>

	<p>It is important that such sites should be clearly shown as part of the original plan, not added afterwards so that other residents are unaware of them. It is important to require the developer to follow through on providing the accommodation.</p> <p>We also support new sites being given planning permission on land belonging to Gypsies and Travellers. We further support the extension of sites to include new pitches with appropriate consultation with present site occupants to ensure a satisfactory outcome.</p> <p>In the past, councils and councillors have been reluctant to agree to such sites, fearing reluctance from voters. Letters of objection usually contain the idea “We think there should be provision for Gypsies, but not here”, or something similar.</p> <p>New sites have been successfully and amicably established recently despite initial opposition. We feel that now is a time for councils to shoulder their responsibility to provide accommodation for all sections of the population without prejudice or discrimination.</p>	
Transport for London	Thank you for consulting Transport for London (TfL). I can confirm that we have no comments to make on the draft allocation scheme	Noted
Verbal comments from private individuals	1-For the market plots, the Council should introduce some form of prioritisation to recognise that some travellers are in more need for the new pitches/plots than others. Request that the Council gives priority to the following families in particular:	1-The Equalities Assessment carried out to support the Allocation Scheme clearly shows that there are links between Gypsies and Travellers who have insecure accommodation and health and wellbeing outcomes in particular. As such, for the affordable pitches,

	<p>-those who are overcrowded but own no other land on which they can expand into;</p> <p>-those families who have an exceptional or unique healthcare reason to live in Runnymede;</p> <p>-Showmen who are currently unable to store and maintain their equipment on land that they own alongside their living accommodation.</p> <p>2-The Council should seek to verify applicants applying for pitches/plots do not actually own other land where they would have the ability to meet their own needs.</p> <p>3-The level of assets held by a Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople is likely to far exceed the value set out in chapter 5 (assets of £16,000 beyond their mobile home/touring caravan) especially in the case of Travelling Showmen who own their own fairground rides.</p>	<p>there is a banding system included which will consider whether applicants are impacted by a number of factors which would give them a higher priority for any new affordable pitches or plots which come forward. However, it is considered to not be appropriate for the Council to intervene in the market and introduce criteria which seek to prioritise market plots, beyond ensuring that the terms of Policy SL22 are met. Instead, once the market pitches are set out and available for purchase, they will be advertised by the developers, who will consider the offers made by interested eligible parties, and as a private entity, they will decide which offer(s) they wish to accept.</p> <p>2- In terms of whether the Council can check whether applicants for the pitches and plots own land elsewhere which they could use to meet their accommodation needs, for affordable pitches and plots the application process will contain a “Disqualified Persons” criterion which will cover property ownership: <i>Applicants who own property either in the UK or abroad which they could reasonably be expected to reside in, or liquidate in order to resolve their own housing difficulties.</i></p> <p>However, in relation to market pitches and plots being sold privately, the Allocation Scheme SPD allows both speculators and those who wish to reside on the pitches and plots to</p>
--	---	--

		<p>acquire them. This is in recognition of the fact that not all of the Borough's Gypsies, Travellers and Showmen are likely to be able to afford to purchase the allocated pitches and plots. Allowing speculators to also acquire the pitches and plots is likely to result in a mix of owned and rented accommodated in the local market to meet the needs of different households.</p> <p>Furthermore, this is also in line with Policy SL22 of the Local Plan, which stipulates that the relevant factors for the Council in each case (in terms of the occupation of the pitches/plots) will be whether the households can demonstrate that they are members of the Gypsy/Traveller/Showmen communities and whether they are able to demonstrate a local connection to the Borough. This means that individuals are able to purchase the allocated pitches and plots and rent them out, and still comply with the tests in Policy SL22.</p> <p>3-Agreed, for affordable plots, the Allocation Scheme has been amended to confirm that the value of any fairground rides owned by the applicant will not be included in the calculation of residual assets.</p>
Showmen's Guild	<p>1-concerns about speculators acquiring the plots. 2-anyone who acquires a plot should not be allowed to sell them on or sublet them for a specified period of time. Concerned about people trying to profit from the activity</p>	<p>1/2- In relation to market pitches and plots being sold privately, the Allocation Scheme SPD allows both speculators and those who wish to reside on the pitches and plots to acquire them. This is in recognition of the fact</p>

	<p>3-often children in their late teens, early twenties are covered under their parents memberships. As such, suggested that on the application forms a person would be asked to put down their Guild membership number or the membership number of their parents.</p> <p>4- requested that the draft application form was shared with the Guild prior to it being finalised so they could check that it would be in a suitable format for the Showmen.</p>	<p>that not all of the Borough's Gypsies, Travellers and Showmen are likely to be able to afford to purchase the allocated pitches and plots. Allowing speculators to also acquire the pitches and plots is likely to result in a mix of owned and rented accommodated in the local market to meet the needs of different households.</p> <p>Furthermore, this is also in line with Policy SL22 of the Local Plan, which stipulates that the relevant factors for the Council in each case (in terms of the occupation of the pitches/plots) will be whether the households can demonstrate that they are members of the Gypsy/Traveller/Showmen communities and whether they are able to demonstrate a local connection to the Borough. This means that individuals are able to purchase the allocated pitches and plots and rent them out, and still comply with the tests in Policy SL22.</p> <p>3-Noted. This will be addressed in the eligibility form.</p> <p>4-Request noted. The draft eligibility form will be shared with both the Surrey Gypsy Traveller Communities Forum and The Showmen's Guild for their comments before the form is finalised to ensure that it will be as accessible as possible to the traveller community.</p>
--	---	---

Appendix C-Summary of representations received during public consultation carried out between 5 June and Wednesday 31 July 2024

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum	<p>1. General. The policy seems to be on a plot by plot and case by case basis. Is this the best way or should there be an eligibility assessment and application which places them on a prioritised “waiting” list. The individual including site preferences could be checked when a plot comes available.</p> <p>2. Section 1. Section needs rewriting. Paras 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 are all related to the current review process and should be removed.</p> <p>3. Section 2. Para 2.1. Amend to “across 9 other housing....”</p> <p>4. Section 2. Para 2.2. Last Bullet. The policy does not explain what is meant by “off-site” in this context.</p> <p>5. Section 2. Para 2.4. “Allocation Scheme”. It is not clear what this is. The policy talks of “Allocation policy”. Explain what the scheme is if different.</p> <p>6. Section 2. Para 2.5. Talks of Chapters and the contents refers to this. This doc states</p>	<p>1. For any affordable pitches which come forward, there would be a prioritised waiting list based on the banding criteria presented in chapter 6 of the SPD. The Council previously considered holding a prioritised waiting list for the market pitches, however, decided that it was not appropriate to intervene in the open market, when the Council does not do this for any other open market products.</p> <p>2. This chapter was only ever considered a temporary chapter whilst the document was in draft form and subject to consultation. It has been replaced in its entirety in the final version of the document.</p> <p>3. Amendment accepted.</p> <p>4. ‘Off site’ in the context of policy SL22 is addressed elsewhere in the policy (see page 109, second half of page). It is considered that further elaboration is not required in the SPD.</p> <p>5. Additional text added at paragraph 2.3 to provide clarification.</p> <p>6. The document refers to chapters throughout. SPDs can vary in terms of</p>	<p>Yes in response to point 2. See amendments to chapter 1.</p> <p>In response to point 3, please see amendment to para 2.1.</p> <p>In response to point 5, please see amendment to para 2.3.</p> <p>In response to point 7, please see amendment to the chapter title.</p> <p>In response to point 8, please see amendment to para 3.1.</p>

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
	<p>sections. Are SPDs in Sections or chapters (for consistency).</p> <p>7. Section 3. Precis the Title.</p> <p>8. Para 3.1 Given that the allocated pitches/plots are restricted exclusively for the use of the Gypsy/Traveller Showmen communities, a planning condition will be attached to the relevant planning consents for the allocated sites at para 2.4 to ensure that they cannot be occupied by any other parties.</p> <p>9. Question. Is there an “unless” issue here whereby a pitch may not be sold to one of the GT & S community? If so this needs to be caught somewhere.</p> <p>10. Para 3.2. Query whether you can legitimately state “or any other replacement guidance.”</p> <p>11. Para 3.8 “....agreement for sites containing allocated pitches....”.</p> <p>“....the delivery of the X(non-transit type) pitches on the Gypsy and Traveller Pitches allocated Land;”</p>	<p>their headings, as long as they are consistent throughout.</p> <p>7. Title of chapter shortened.</p> <p>8. Suggested amendments partially accepted. Model condition to restrict the use of the pitches to Gypsies and Travellers/Travelling Showmen also now included in the SPD for completeness.</p> <p>9. The matter of alternative uses is dealt with at para 3.13. This sets out the process that would be followed if it can be evidenced that after comprehensive marketing, the pitches cannot be disposed of to the travelling community. If the representor is asking instead what would happen if an allocated pitch was found to have been sold to/or rented out by a non traveller, in this case, the Council would be able to consider the appropriateness of using its enforcement powers if a breach of planning condition or obligation was found to have occurred. It is considered that further text in the SPD is not required to address either point.</p> <p>10. This phraseology is consistent with the wording contained in Policy SL22 which was agreed with the Planning Inspector who examined the Runnymede</p>	<p>In response to point 13, please see amendment to paragraph 3.9.</p> <p>In response to point 17, see definition of family which has been added at the bottom of page 11.</p> <p>In response to point 18. See para 4.1 b and footnote 2 on page 11</p> <p>In response to point 19. See para 4.3.</p>

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
	<p>“the marketing of the Gypsy and Traveller Pitches Allocated Land”</p> <p>“the disposal of the Gypsy and Traveller Pitches Allocated Land.”</p> <p>12. Note: An explanation is required for the scope of “Disposal”.</p> <p>13. Para 3.9 “Friends, Families and Travellers....”</p> <p>14. Para 3.11. First para. The model wording suggests that the G, T & S pitches always follow from the residential development. Will this always be the case. It seems possible these could be marketed earlier and sold/rented.</p> <p>15. Para 3.14. The para does not stipulate what the vehicle is to ensure a purchase to sub-let is to an appropriate person or group. This seems to be a two tier approach as once owned the plot could be re-let. How does RBC track change of occupancy?</p> <p>16. Para 4.1. Statement is not completely true as previous section allow the plot to be sold for other use. Needs clarification.</p>	<p>2030 Local Plan and is therefore considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>11. It is considered that the word ‘allocated’ does not require inserting in the model wording as the S106 agreement comes with the land which is outlined in red on a plan appended to the agreement, making it clear which land the legal agreement relates to.</p> <p>12. Agreed, moving forward the legal agreements for these sites will be amended to provide clarification on this point.</p> <p>13. comma added</p> <p>14. Yes this is possible. Policy SL22 sets out that, ‘Phasing of site delivery and trigger points to secure early delivery, proportionate to the site delivery’ will be set out in the s106 agreements. To date, on all allocated sites, the developers have sought to develop out an early phase/phases of residential development before delivering the pitches, and the Council has been content that this is in line with Policy SL22. If a developer sought to deliver the pitches first, the model wording would be amended as appropriate.</p> <p>15. The Council expects the owners of the pitches and plots to comply with the</p>	

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
	<p>17. 4.1a. Does this need to be adult.</p> <p>18. 4.1b. “employed” requires defining.</p> <p>19. 4.1c. The welfare aspect of this is undefined.</p> <p>20. Para 7.7. Does not cover vehicles. Are these included or excluded. Most vehicles exceed £16000 value. How is this demonstrated?</p> <p>21. Para 7.8. Do all have bank accounts? What is scenario if not.</p>	<p>terms of the planning consent including the S106. However, as with all other breaches of planning control, any breaches brought to the Council’s attention will be investigated and assessed on a case by case basis in accordance with the Council’s enforcement charter.</p> <p>16. If an alternative use was agreed for the land set aside for pitches, the guidance in this chapter would no longer be relevant and would therefore cease to apply.</p> <p>17. The local connection criteria have been amended to define who would be applicable (see bottom of page 11 in draft document).</p> <p>18. This is defined in footnote 2. The position of footnote 2 has been moved to the end of the ‘Employment’ sub heading at 4.1b to ensure that it is more prominent to the reader. In discussion with the Council’s Housing Team, further changes have also been made to the definition of employment at footnote 2 to tie in with proposed changes to the Council’s Housing Allocation Scheme for social housing (currently subject to public consultation).</p>	

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
		<p>19. The wording in paragraph 4.3 has been amended to address this point. Subsequent changes to this paragraph have also been made following discussions with the Housing Team. In particular the word 'unique' has been removed to tie in with proposed changes to the Council's Housing Allocation Scheme for social housing (currently the subject of public consultation).</p> <p>20. Assets would include cars. In line with paragraph 7.8, applicants would be required to provide bank statements for all working members of the household to check savings levels. A fraud check would also be required for all affordable pitches which would pick up on undeclared bank accounts.</p> <p>21. Advice has been sought from the Council's Housing Department who has confirmed that it would be reasonable to consider that most applicants would at least have bank accounts.</p>	
Private individual	1. Unclear why the Planning Committee considered a planning application for the Chertsey Bittams C allocation before consultation on the SPD has ended.	1. The Chertsey Bittams C site is allocated in the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan, under Policy SL16 for 9 net additional C3 dwellings, 11 net additional serviced Gypsy/Traveller pitches and permanent retention of the existing	None

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
	<p>2. Question as to why the planning department is intent on turning the Chertsey Bittams area into a traveller ghetto? Questions whether there are other parts of Runnymede in which travellers can live.</p> <p>3. Question as to why travellers are treated as a special case. Most of them have become settled in static homes and no longer travel. There are plenty of young couples desperate for a home, who are being pushed aside for so called ethnic minorities who are now so embedded in this country that they should no longer be special cases.</p> <p>4. Runnymede should get a grip and treat everyone equally, that is true equality. This proposal is prioritising some people, whose ancestors used to move around in caravans, over others of similar ethnicity, whose ancestors settled in one place.</p>	<p>temporary pitch. There is nothing to preclude planning applications coming forward on sites allocated in the Local Plan prior to this SPD being adopted. The SPD will not introduce new policy against which such applications will be assessed, but will provide further guidance to assist with the interpretation of certain parts of Policy SL22 of the Local Plan which is concerned with Meeting the Needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>2. The distribution of proposed gypsy and traveller pitches was considered both during the preparation of the Local Plan, and at the Examination stage by an independent inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. The Council's approach was found to be sound in this regard.</p> <p>3/4. Travellers are not treated as a special case or prioritised over other groups. Para 63 of the NPPF sets out that the Council is required ensure that the, <i>'size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. These groups should</i></p>	

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
		<p><i>include (but are not limited to) those who require affordable housing; families with children; older people (including those who require retirement housing, housing-with-care and care homes); students; people with disabilities; service families; travellers; people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes'. The Council assessed the accommodation needs of all these groups during the preparation of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan.</i></p> <p><i>Paras 3 and 4 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) state, '3. The Government's overarching aim is to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community'.</i></p> <p><i>4. To help achieve this, Government's aims in respect of traveller sites are [amongst other things]:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. that local planning authorities should make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning</i> <i>b. to ensure that local planning authorities, working collaboratively,</i> 	

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
		<p><i>develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites</i></p> <p>The Council has sought to comply with these national policy requirements through the production of its adopted Local Plan by making provision for the specialist groups listed in para 63 of the NPPF where a need has been identified.</p>	
Private individual	Pitches for gypsies should be allocated in different towns, not Addlestone, Ottershaw or Chobham.	The distribution of pitches for gypsies and travellers was agreed through the examination and subsequent adoption of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan. The location of pitches is not being revisited as part of the preparation of this SPD.	None
National Highways	Have reviewed the documentation but have no comments to make	Noted	None
Rushmoor Borough Council	No comments to make	Noted	None
Environment Agency	<p>We note the allocated sites below are in flood zones.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SL6 – Pycroft Road, Chertsey – in accordance with your redline boundary the site lies in Flood zones 2, 3a and 3b • SL7 – Thorpe Lea Road, North - in accordance with your redline boundary the site lies in Flood zones 2, 3a and 3b 	Comments noted. The distribution of pitches for gypsies and travellers was agreed through the examination and subsequent adoption of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan. The location of pitches is not being revisited as part of the preparation of this SPD. No objection was raised by the Environment Agency on the inclusion of pitches on these allocations at the time of preparing the Local Plan.	None

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SL14 – Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams, Chertsey - in accordance with your redline boundary the site lies in Flood zones 2 and 3a <p>We have identified the sites boundaries by using Maps on your website and on that basis have provided you with this advice below.</p> <p>Gypsy and Traveller/Travelling Showmen Schemes (Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use) are classified as ‘Highly Vulnerable’ development according to Annex 3 in NPPF. It should be noted that ‘Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use (Highly Vulnerable’ development) is not appropriate in Flood Zone 3a and 3b in accordance with the flood risk section of the PPG (Table 2 Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone ‘incompatibility) and therefore should not be permitted. This would apply to - <i>SL6 – Pyrcroft Road, Chertsey and SL7 – Thorpe Lea Road, North and SL14 – Parcel A, Chertsey Bittams, Chertsey.</i></p> <p>RBC must consider;</p>	<p>Planning consents have been granted for residential developments (including the allocated traveller pitches) at Chertsey Bittams A and Pyrcroft Road following consultation with the Environment Agency. All of the pitches on these sites would be located in flood zone 1. There is a live application under consideration at Thorpe Lea Road (North) where 2 pitches are proposed in line with the allocation policy. The Council has consulted with the Environment Agency as part of this application.</p>	

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
	<p>- <u>all</u> sources of flooding when assessing flood risk for all the sites (apart from the 3 sites above) listed on page 4 of the SPD. (Please note, a Flood Risk Assessment which demonstrates the requirements of NPPF and PPG may be required for sites greater than 1 hectare).</p> <p>- a route of safe access and egress <i>to an area of safe refuge in the event of a flood</i> must be provided for all the sites (apart from the 3 sites above) listed on page 4 of the SPD.</p>		
Leo Property Group	<p>1. The SPD runs to 25 pages, which is excessive when you consider that it only relates to 45 pitches of which 19 are situated at Chertsey, Bittams</p> <p>2. Local Plan Policy SL22 is not clear as to whether or not pitches can be utilised as an affordable element of a development scheme</p> <p>3. Local Plan Policy SL22 states site delivery should be secured early. This puts an additional pressure on landowners/developers in relation to infrastructure. Early site delivery should not be required.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. If any of the allocated pitches were delivered as an affordable product, this would count towards the total affordable housing requirement for the allocated site in question. This is already confirmed in the final bullet point of Policy SL22 of the Local Plan but has been clarified in the SPD.</p> <p>3. Policy SL22 has been adopted and is not being revisited as part of the preparation of this SPD. Whilst an SPD can provide further clarification on how a policy should be interpreted, it cannot change the wording of Policy SL22 or introduce a new and contrary policy approach.</p>	<p>Yes in response to 2. Please see paragraph 6.3.</p> <p>Yes in response to 5. Please see amendments to the local connection criteria in chapter 4.</p>

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
	<p>4. Paragraph 3.3 of the SPD defines Gypsies and Travellers as “<i>Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin</i>”. However, there are other races and origins who might have a nomadic habit of life and does this mean that they qualify for a plot under the SPD.</p> <p>5. In paragraph 4.1a) the Councils policy for allocation state that you have to be a “permanent member of your household, live in the borough of Runnymede and have done so for at least 3 of the past 5 consecutive years or 6 out of the last 12 months if an individual is homeless”. This seems to be a conflict of the definition of a nomadic lifestyle.</p> <p>6. In relation to the marketing of the pitches and plots, it is not clear whether the Council expect separate marketing for the pitches. There is a risk of creating separation and exclusion for the occupiers of the plots which is surely not intended.</p> <p>7. There is no guidance as to how much a plot should be rented or sold for. Is it intended that developers will set their own prices and if so will that impact on the success of any marketing campaign.</p>	<p>4. The definition at para 3.3 is copied directly from the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). The PPTS confirms that this national definition is the appropriate definition for the purposes of planning policy.</p> <p>5. Local connection criteria are required by Policy SL22. The criteria in the SPD are based on those adopted by the Council in its Housing Allocation Scheme but have been amended in some areas to ensure that they do not prejudice the nomadic nature of the travelling community. Further changes have been made to the criteria to further ensure that they do not conflict with the nomadic lifestyle of some traveller households. For example, the terms ‘consecutive’ and ‘permanent’ have been removed. For the residence and employment tests, the word ‘household’ has also been substituted for ‘family’ in acknowledgement of the fact that the distinctive way of life and traditions of gypsies and travellers is frequently based around living in extended family groups. As amended, the local connection criteria are considered to be sufficiently flexible to ensure that those wishing to acquire the allocated pitches have a genuine</p>	

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
	<p>8. The model wording for Section 106 agreements in paragraph 3.11 is unduly onerous. The number of pitches required is only a small proportion of each proposed development and the idea that the first residential unit cannot be occupied until the scheme is approved is excessive. Furthermore, there needs to clarity on the required period of marketing.</p> <p>9. There is real concern that occupiers of these pitches will at some time in the future seek to build permanent residential dwellings. We will include a restrictive covenant against this in the title to our site. This needs to emphasised in the SPD.</p> <p>10. There is concern that there is nothing in the SPD ensuring that pitches do not become small farm holdings, including the likes of horses, chickens and other gypsy and traveller related animals, because this will have a detrimental impact on value.</p> <p>11. It is proposed that each pitch is 500 SQM – Whilst this might be acceptable on much larger sites (more than 50 dwellings) for smaller sites this is wholly disproportionate and more likely to lead to occupiers seeking to develop their plots in the long term.</p>	<p>connection to the borough, whilst also supporting traditional ways of life and allowing for nomadic lifestyles.</p> <p>6. It will be up to the developers to decide how they market the pitches. The SPD seeks to avoid being prescriptive in this regard. Instead of envisaging separate marketing, it is more the case that some additional marketing measures may be required to raise awareness of the pitches to the Gypsy and Traveller community.</p> <p>7. Developers are expected to determine a suitable sales/rental value for the allocated pitches. The Council does not seek to guide developers/land owners on how to value houses or other development types, and can see no reason to deviate from this approach for the allocated pitches. Guidance in para 3.9 of the SPD confirms that as part of the marketing strategy for the pitches, the developer is encouraged to include <i>details of the process to be followed, and factors that the land owner/developer will take into account in implementing price reductions as necessary to maximise the chances of disposing of the pitches and plots.</i> By following this advice, it is envisaged that a marketing campaign would not be compromised.</p>	

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
	<p>12. We represent gypsies and travellers in Liverpool where we are based and having spoken to them they have said that their absolute preference is for sites of not less than 10 pitches because otherwise this leads to fragmentation of their communities. Putting 2 pitches here or there across the borough actually does more harm than good for the gypsy and traveller community and really the objectives of the SPD would be far better served by allocating a larger site for more pitches.</p>	<p>8. The Council is of the view that given the small number of pitches on each allocated site that the requirement is not overly onerous. The caveats are considered necessary to ensure the prompt delivery of the pitches given the acute needs for this type of specialist accommodation in Runnymede.</p> <p>9. Para 3.1 SPD confirms that, <i>'Given that the allocated pitches/plots are restricted for the use of the Gypsy/Traveller Showmen communities, a planning condition will be attached to the relevant planning consents for the allocated sites to ensure that they cannot be occupied by non travellers'</i>. Policy SL22 of the Local Plan further confirms that, <i>'The loss of authorised pitches and plots for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople to other uses will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that there is a surplus supply of traveller pitches and plots for gypsies and travellers in the Borough'</i>. These safeguards are considered sufficient to resist the loss of the allocated pitches in the future.</p> <p>10. The need for and suitability of planning conditions to control development is considered on a case by case basis. Generally speaking however,</p>	

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
		<p>at 500sqm, the pitches are considered too small to accommodate large animals such as horses. In relation to smaller animals (cats, dogs, chickens for example) it is likely to be discriminatory to impose a planning condition to restrict the keeping of such animals when this is generally not a condition attached to planning consents for new bricks and mortar homes.</p> <p>11. 450-500sqm is recommended in the Runnymede Design SPD as the minimum size for gypsy pitches. However, this is guidance only. An alternative size of pitch may be acceptable provided it can be demonstrated that the pitch is large enough to contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Adequate space for parking, -pitch boundary treatment which respects and enhances existing character; -space for a mobile home and touring caravan; -an area of private amenity space capable of accommodating activities such as outdoor play, drying clothes and storage; -an attractive hard standing area suitable for use by trailers, touring caravans or other vehicles and which takes account of sustainable drainage; and -an amenity building to provide as a minimum water and electricity supply, 	

Representor	Summary of comments made	Council response	Change made to SPD?
		<p>toilet, personal washing and laundry facilities. See comments made in response to 9. above about the controls which are in place to help resist the redevelopment of the pitches.</p> <p>12. The number of pitches per site has been established in the Local Plan and is not a matter for consideration as part of the SPD.</p>	
Waverley Borough Council	Having reviewed the document have no comments to make.	Noted	None

Appendix C-Statement of Representations Procedure for 2nd round of consultation (as a Supplementary Planning Document

The Council is holding public consultation of the draft Runnymede Pitch and Plot Allocation Scheme for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople: Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for a period of six weeks between Wednesday 5 June and midnight on Wednesday 17 July 2024.

Representations must be made in writing to:

Planning Policy Team

Runnymede Borough Council

Runnymede Civic Centre

Station Road

Addlestone

KT15 2AH

or by way of e-mail to planningpolicy@runnymede.gov.uk.

Anyone can make a request to be notified of when the SPD is adopted in their representation.

The draft SPD and supporting material is also available for inspection at the Civic Centre in Addlestone from 8.30am-5pm Monday to Thursdays, and 8.30am-4.30pm on Fridays, and at the following locations: -

- Addlestone Library (if required outside of Civic Office hours), Runnymede Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone, KT15 2AF
- Chertsey Library, Guildford Street, Chertsey, Surrey, KT16 3BE
- Egham Library, High Street, Egham, Surrey, TW20 9EA
- New Haw Community Library, The Broadway, New Haw, Surrey KT15 3HA
- Virginia Water Community Library, 6 Station Parade, Virginia Water GU25 4AB

Details of library opening times can be found on the Surrey County Council website at <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/libraries>.