



**AYLESBURY VALE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**POSITION STATEMENT**

**GYPSIES & TRAVELLERS & TRAVELLING**

**SHOWPEOPLE**

**(31<sup>st</sup> August 2011)**

**AYLESBURY VALE DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING POLICY POSITION STATEMENT  
PROVIDING FOR GYPSIES & TRAVELLERS & TRAVELLING  
SHOWPEOPLE**

**POSITION STATEMENT  
(31<sup>st</sup> August 2011)**

***PURPOSE OF THE POSITION STATEMENT***

1. Aylesbury Vale District Council is currently having to deal with issues relating to Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show People (G&T/SP) in something of a policy vacuum. The existing framework is confusing and uncertain given the position of the South East Plan (SEP), the `abandonment' of the SEP Partial Review for G&T/SP, and the withdrawal of our Core Strategy which included a policy for G&T/SP.
2. This position statement sets out the background to where we are and how we got here, highlights the difficulties currently being experienced, and outlines an interim approach to dealing with G&T/SP issues prior to these being dealt with through new policies in the next development plan for the district – the Vale of Aylesbury Plan (VAP).
3. This statement is consistent with the emerging Government advice in the Department for Communities and Local Government Draft Planning Policy Statement `Planning for traveller sites' published for consultation in April 2011.

***BACKGROUND***

***SEP G&T/SP Partial Review EiP***

4. The single issue partial review of SEP was required to identify a pitch allocation for G&T/SP for each district up to 2016. An Examination in Public was held in February 2010. The author of the South East Plan, the South East of England Regional Assembly (SEERA), sought AVDC's opinion on the early part of this process, as part of a wider process within our sub-region led by Buckinghamshire County Council as the principal authority with needs studies undertaken by `Tribal'. A paper presented to the 9<sup>th</sup> October 2007 AVDC Cabinet meeting sets out this in greater detail – please see <http://committees.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/committees/SitePortalPage.aspx?siteid=2&archives=1&committeeid=6&meetingid=161>
5. SEERA identified four options for consultation for each district:  
Option A – addressing need where it arises  
Option B – a local redistribution within the advice group area (i.e. in Aylesbury Vale District's case this would be Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes)  
Option C – a 25% regional redistribution between advice group areas (i.e. in Aylesbury Vale's case, Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes). Under this option 75% of local need is retained locally, and 25% reapportioned regionally.

Option D – a 50% regional redistribution between advice group areas (i.e. in Aylesbury Vale’s case, Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes). Under this option 50% of local need is retained locally, and 50% reapportioned regionally.

6. Option C and D attempt to take account of large constraints which may occur (i.e. protected landscapes, flooding issues etc.), and also to take account of the population across the region forecasted to 2016, on the rationale that users of pitches will need to access local facilities and that these are more easily attainable in areas of higher population. The only difference between these two options is the level of redistribution allocated. In our case this means that we ‘receive’ additional pitches from other parts of the region, inflating our overall potential pitch requirement.
7. Through the consultation process SEERA promoted Option D.

### *AVDC Objections*

8. For AVDC, the number of G&T pitches between the options varied from 33 to 52. We argued in favour of Options A & B, which had the least numbers, and against C & D on the basis:
  - a. It is wrong to assume that pitch provision can be made up where apparent low levels of protected landscapes exist. This would seem rather strange, as whilst this level of designation will undoubtedly have a bearing on the level of available land, the number of pitches and hence sites are relatively small when compared with available land. As such it provides an unrealistic picture in this context.
  - b. It is wrong to assume that any specialist services that occupants of pitches would require would ‘naturally’ be available and increase with greater population numbers. The effect of this would mean that special services provided for the prospective clients will be able to be provided equally across the region irrespective of the number of pitches in that locality. This again goes against the concept of enabling and supporting those areas with the greatest need to be able to provide the level of expertise that is required, rather than spreading this across the region, and diluting any expertise along with it.
  - c. It should not be assumed that historic encampment patterns can be disregarded, in a vain hope that the users of such sites will follow the pitch provision rather than staying where they have historically lived. The users of the pitches are a unique ethnic group who reside together as a community because of their work commitments, the need to provide protection because of the value of their equipment and the need for family support whilst other members are travelling the region for employment reasons. To provide a distribution option which requires the allocation of individual pitches for this group across multiple districts is inappropriate, ineffective and would not address the wishes or needs of this community.
  - d. Even if this was possible, this would be at the potential cost of segregating large family units and or ethnic groupings – which in the case of the lifestyle of the pitch users is unlikely to come about, and indeed why should this be the outcome for this social group and no other?
  - e. What is clearly evident when addressing this issue at any level, is that the ‘normal’ spatial planning approaches are unlikely to be applicable, and certainly applying factors that may well impact on the delivery of housing (as options C

and D do) will not be the same that impact on the lifestyles of the users of these pitches.

- f. On the basis of the above points, it was argued that only Options A and B are truly viable for consideration. Building on the argument that Option B still ‘artificially’ attempts to increase pitch provision in other than on a local needs basis, we supported Option A (33 pitches) as the most evidence led and fairest to the potential users of the pitches, and strongly objected to the other options.

### ***CURRENT ISSUES***

9. The District has come under considerable pressure over the last few years to provide new sites in particular for G&Ts. Some of this pressure has arisen because of the SEP process within which potentially high numbers have consistently been identified for AVDC. Illegal sites have been coming forward effectively ‘jumping the gun’ in anticipation of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)/Local Development Framework (LDF) process being completed. Many of these sites have been granted temporary permissions pending completion of the RSS/LDF process (see Appendix 1).
10. Because of the uncertainty now surrounding SEP, the fact that the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (AVDLP) policies for G&T/SP were not saved because of emerging SEP policies and the Government’s Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) Circular 01/2006 on Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites, and the anticipated changes to the local development framework to provide for localism, there is a policy vacuum against which proposals can be judged.
11. The current programme for VAP means we will not have an adopted policy framework in place until February 2014. In the meantime we have a number of temporary permissions which will be seeking either renewals or the granting of permanent permissions, local parishes asking what our approach will be to any such applications, new sites being processed and there is the constant threat of new sites being occupied.

### ***INTERIM WAY FORWARD***

#### ***Criteria based approach***

12. A criteria based framework (see Appendix 2) is proposed to deal with current and short term issues. This is based on the original AVDLP policy (as updated in the old CS policy and which takes account of Circular 1/2006), our support for Option A, emerging Government advice and the ‘localism’ agenda, and the recently published CLG Draft Planning Policy Statement ‘Planning for traveller sites’.
13. The rationale would be:
  - i) AVDLP policies GP14 and GP15 were not saved because they were superseded by SEP and Circular 01/2006. With the imminent demise and reduced weight of SEP, the decision to not save these policies needs to be reviewed.
  - ii) In light of i) above, Policy CS14 in the now withdrawn Core Strategy provides the most up-to-date policy compliant with Circular 1/2006 and the criteria set out in that policy could be used as a framework for guiding development management decisions on an interim basis. This criteria is consistent with the emerging advice in the Draft Planning Policy Statement ‘Planning for traveller

sites'. The framework could also be updated to reflect feedback from implementing this policy so far.

***Needs Assessment***

14. The most up to date assessment of needs to 2016 is based on the information fed through the Examination in Public process. AVDC maintained its' position of supporting Option A (33 pitches). SEERA, having considered all the responses made during the consultation process, produced a new table H7 for the Examination which identified 39 pitches for AVDC. It is relevant that in relation to housing needs, the Government has stated that, with the imminent demise of SEP, local authorities should rely on their 'Option 1' housing needs requirements, identified through the SEP process, as interim targets which should be used to guide development management decisions. This principle could also be applied to proposals for G&T/SP i.e. a material consideration would be the requirements we supported at the Examination (33 pitches). This approach is consistent with the approach taken by other authorities in Buckinghamshire and with the CLG Draft Planning Policy Statement 'Planning for traveller sites'.
15. Table 1 below sets out the differing requirements for G&T provision within Aylesbury Vale set out through the South East Plan process.

**Table 1: IDENTIFIED GYPSY & TRAVELLER REQUIREMENTS FOR AYLESBURY VALE**

Source	Pitches
SEERA Preferred Options Consultation (Sept 08, promoting Option D)	42
AVDC supported figure (response to SEERA consultation Sept 08, support for Option A)	33
SEERA revised Table H7 (submitted to Examination Jan 10)	39

16. Within the district there are currently 49 pitches (see Appendix 1) which either have temporary or full permissions. This current provision would also be a material consideration when applying the above requirements to assessing specific proposals.
17. It is therefore considered that, with need identified as 33 pitches and current provision identified as 49 pitches, there is currently an adequate and up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites.
18. The Updated Criteria, as set out in paragraph 13 ii) above, would be used on an interim basis to guide decisions on any new applications or applications on sites currently with temporary permissions. In addition, to assist in implementing the Criteria through the development management process, a checklist is appended which provides detailed guidance on how the Criteria should be applied (see Development Management Framework set out in Appendix 3).

## ***CONCLUSION***

19. That the Updated Criteria set out in Appendix 2 be used on an interim basis to guide decision making on issues relating to proposals for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. In implementing this Updated Criteria regard will be had to the most up to date assessment of need as set out in paragraph 14 above (33 pitches), existing provision as set out in para 16 above (49 pitches), the current five year supply of sites set out in paragraph 18, and to the Development Management Framework set out in Appendix 3.

## Appendix 1

### Current Status of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites within Aylesbury Vale.

Site	Type	Number of pitches (authorised) as in Tribal report	Number of pitches authorised subsequent to Tribal report	Planning application number	Planning decision	Comments	Source of information
Cublington Road, Wing	LA	7	1	CC/18/07; 07/01648/A CC	Approved 09/08/2007	Remodelling of site to form 8 residential plots. Owned/managed by Bucks CC.	CLG/ Tribal report/ Seera count
Baghill Lane, Haddenham	LA	6				Owned/managed by Bucks CC.	Tribal report
Great Horwood Road, Nash	Private	2		90/00826/A PP	Appeal allowed 11/09/1991	Personal permission	Tribal report/Seera count
Cow Lane, Edlesborough	Private	3		91/00755/A PP	Appeal allowed 18/09/1992	Personal permission	Tribal report/Seera count
New Road, Weston Turville	Private	1	1	93/02040/A PP & 10/02556/A PP	Approved 12/05/94 & 14/02/2011	Personal; 1994 permission was temporary but converted to permanent after appeal. 2011 permission for a further mobile home on the same site.	Tribal report/Seera count/ AVDC monitoring
Willows Park (Green Acres), Horton Road, Slapton	Private	5	3	06/00659/A PP and 10/00935/A PP	Approved 03/01/2007	Extension from 5 to 8 pitches. Permission granted 16/08/2010 for turning facilities, replacement stable/storage building, and facilities for visitors (no more than 2 visitors caravan spaces for no more than 28 days occupation)	Tribal report/Seera count
Little Acre, Broughton Lane, Weston Turville	Private	1			Appeal allowed 1999	Personal permission	Tribal report/Seera count
Romany Tan, Wing Road, Cublington	Private	2		99/01612/A PP	Appeal allowed 08/12/2000	Personal condition removed by 05/02297/APP	Tribal report/Seera count
Marroway, Weston Turville	Private	7		02/00843/A PP and others	Appeal allowed 16/01/2004		Tribal report/Seera count

Dun Roaming Park, Whitfield Road, Biddlesden	Private	7	3	06/00699/A PP	Approved 03/08/2006	Increase from 7 to 10 pitches.	Tribal report/Seera count
Land adjacent Dun Roaming Park, Whitfield Road, Biddlesden	Private			07/01570/A PP	Refused & appeal dismissed 16/12/2008	Extension to provide 5 additional plots	AVDC Monitoring
Land adjacent Dun Roaming Park, Whitfield Road, Biddlesden	Private		8	09/00635/A PP	Application refused 29/10/2009. Also enforcement notice issued. Appeal against enforcement notice - public inquiry 5 & 6 Jan & 12 Feb 2010. Appeal allowed 11/03/2010.	Change of use of land to gypsy caravan site to provide 8 caravan pitches. Land to east side of existing site. Temporary permission until 11/03/2013.	AVDC Monitoring
Land Adjacent To Dun Roamin Park, Whitfield Road, Biddlesden	Private			10/01639/A PP	Refused 16/12/2010. Appeal lodged 15/03/2011	Stationing of one mobile home and touring caravan for traveller family	AVDC Monitoring
Burrows Field, Radclive Road, Gawcott	Private		16	04/01001/A PP & 10/00898/A PP	Appeal allowed 30/11/06. Continued use approved 14/10/2010.	Recorded in Tribal report as 16 unauthorised pitches. Temporary permission until 11/03/2013; personal.	Tribal report/Seera count/AVDC Monitoring
Rear of plot 2, Radclive Road, Gawcott (Oakhaven Park)	Private			09/01387/A PP	Application submitted 29/07/09. Application withdrawn 03/09/2010.	Variation of condition for No.2 additional plots at rear of Plot2 until 30th June 2010	AVDC Monitoring
Plot 17, Burrows Field, Radclive Road, Gawcott	Private		1	07/00983/A PP & 10/00898/A PP	Approved 08/11/2007. Continued use approved 14/10/2010.	Temporary permission until 11/03/2013; personal.	AVDC Monitoring
Plot 18, Burrows Field, Radclive Road, Gawcott	Private		1	08/00782/A PP & 10/00898/A PP	Approved 08/05/2008. Continued use approved 14/10/2010.	Temporary permission until 11/03/2013; personal.	AVDC Monitoring

Plots 19 (A and B), Burrows Field, Radclive Road, Gawcott	Private		2	08/00795/A PP & 10/00898/A PP	Approved 08/05/2008. Continued use approved 14/10/2010.	Temporary permission until 11/03/2013; personal.	AVDC Monitoring
Land adjacent New Park Farm, Boarstall, Arncott (Oaksvie Park)	Private		13	07/00070/A PP & 07/00889/A PP	Appeal allowed 08/05/2009	Recorded in Tribal report as 19 unauthorised pitches. Personal permissions relating to 13 pitches; temporary until 08/05/2012	Tribal report/Seera count/ AVDC Monitoring
Land at Swan Edge, Aylesbury Road, Wendover (plot 1)	Private			09/00214/A PP	Approved subject to S106 at DC 08/10/2009	2 caravans unlawfully on site	AVDC Monitoring
Land at Swan Edge, Aylesbury Road, Wendover (plot 2)	Private			09/00215/A PP	Approved subject to S106 at DC 08/10/2009	1 caravan unlawfully on site	
Land opposite Causter Farm, Nash Road, Great Horwood	Private			10/00680/A PP & 11/00181/A PP	Application submitted 07/04/2010; application refused 04/11/2011; appeal lodged 17/03/2011. Enforcement notice issued (10/00155/C ON2); appeal lodged. Further application submitted 07/02/2011.	Application for 11 pitches. Caravans on site.	AVDC Monitoring
<b>Total for gypsy and traveller sites</b>		<b>41</b>	<b>49</b>				
<b>Travelling showpeople sites:</b>							
Fairview, Fenny Road, Stoke Hammond	Private		3	02/02378/A PP	Approved 25/10/2002	Recorded in Tribal report as 3 households. Personal permission; temporary until 31/10/2004; subsequent application for renewal was invalid	Tribal Showpeople report/Seera count

## Appendix 2

### UPDATED CRITERIA : Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

- I. The following criteria will be used to assess planning applications and any future allocations for proposals for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in advance of adoption of the Vale of Aylesbury Plan. Proposals should:
- a) *Be justified in terms of meeting identified needs established in an up-to-date assessment;*
  - b) *Be to meet the needs of those people with an existing significant and long-standing family, educational or employment connection to that area;*
  - c) *Be in or near existing settlements with access to local services, including shops, schools and healthcare;*
  - d) *Be well located on the highway network, with safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access including public transport;*
  - e) *Not be detrimental to the amenities of adjacent occupiers;*
  - f) *Not have an adverse impact on environmental assets such as landscape, historic environment, biodiversity, waterways, open space and green infrastructure;*
  - g) *Be large enough to provide for adequate on site facilities for parking, storage, play and residential amenity;*
  - h) *Be large enough for appropriate landscaping to minimise any visual impacts of the development;*
  - i) *Provide adequate levels of privacy and residential amenity for occupiers; and*
  - j) *Not result in a concentration of such uses in a local area.*

## Appendix 3

### Development Management Framework for considering proposals for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

The following table brings together the various statements of policy at both local and national level and sets out a checklist of factors which development management case officers should take into consideration when assessing individual proposals against policy.

	Issue	Policy/Criterion 'hook' + cross-reference	Indicators of an appropriate proposal/checklist of questions to pose	Commentary/rationale
	<b>Status</b>			
1.	Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (G&T/SP)	National Housing Act 2004, Circular 01/2006. Circular 04/2007. Draft PPS April 2011	<p>In order to have proposal assessed under the planning framework for Gypsies and Travellers or Travelling Showpeople, the status of the applicants should be in accordance with the definition of those groups in national legislation (see Definitions section below).</p> <p>Contacts Buckinghamshire County Council to check if applicants are known to them.</p> <p>Check family history.</p>	<p>Definition set out in national legislation so local authority must comply with that. However, the local planning authority will make checks to ensure that the applicants do comply with G&amp;T/SPS status; otherwise they cannot be subject to the special planning rules which apply through Circular 01/2006.</p>
	<b>Local Need</b>			
2.	Accommodation proposed is to meet the needs of those people with an existing significant and long standing family, educational or employment connection to those areas.	Updated Criteria Draft Planning Policy Statement April 2011	<p>Is there a proven need for G&amp;T/SP within the area (ie within or adjoining the relevant parish)?</p> <p>Is the individual or group already resident or working in the area?</p> <p>Are children currently at school in the area?</p> <p>Are there particular health needs of the travelling residents which need to be met in the locality?</p>	<p>Indicators reflect policy rationale in accompanying position statement to Updated policy.</p>

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Policy/Criterion 'hook' + cross-reference</b>	<b>Indicators of an appropriate proposal/checklist of questions to pose</b>	<b>Commentary/rationale</b>
	<b>Location</b>			
3.	Location relative to an existing settlement	Updated Criteria Draft PPS 2011	Distance between site and nearest settlement.  Is the site within 1 mile (as the crow flies) of an existing settlement?	In order to maximise the possibilities for social inclusion and sustainable patterns of living by being located close to essential facilities and service.  N.B. Need to balance this criterion with the need to avoid detrimental impacts on adjacent occupiers.
4.	Impact on local services	National Circular 01/2006 (para 54); Circular 04/2007 (para 45). Draft PPS April 2011	Are sites placing an undue pressure on local infrastructure?  Assess the capacity of local services in the area of the site. Where the development would create a need to provide additional or improved infrastructure, amenities or facilities or would exacerbate an existing deficiency in their provision, seek appropriate contributions which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport</li> <li>• School</li> <li>• Open Space</li> <li>• Community Facilities</li> <li>• Police</li> </ul>	The relevant public authorities have a duty to provide sufficient schools and health services for their area (Education Act 1996; National Health Service Act 2006).  Where service providers indicate that capacity is inadequate, or that deficiencies in capacity will be exacerbated as a result of development, developer contributions may be sought. To assess this, regard will be had to the potential number of residents on that pitch/plot.
5.	Impact on public utilities	National Circular 01/2006 (para 54)  Circular 04/2007 (para 54)  Circular 03/1999 (Planning Requirement in respect of the use of non-mains Sewerage incorporating Septic Tanks in New Development) Draft PPS 2011	Ensure that developments will be served by adequate infrastructure capacity in terms of utilities.  To include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewerage or other appropriate foul drainage/waste water facilities, including non-mains sewerage and sewage disposal where appropriate</li> <li>• Roads – safety and access</li> <li>• Drainage</li> <li>• Electricity</li> <li>• Water supply</li> </ul>	There is a statutory duty on utilities companies to provide water and electricity to service developments.  Sewerage/waste water provision to be assessed against the principles in Circular 03/1999.  See Chapter 5 of the CLG Good Practice Guide 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites' for detailed requirements.  Highway access arrangements to be assessed.
6.	Relationship to number of houses/development locally	Updated Criteria	What is the percentage of pitch/plot numbers	Judgement required in each case as to whether

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Policy/Criterion 'hook' + cross-reference</b>	<b>Indicators of an appropriate proposal/checklist of questions to pose</b>	<b>Commentary/rationale</b>
			<p>compared with conventional dwellings? Can it be judged to be disproportionate and/or over-dominant? An assessment of this should include the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of site (in area) relative to size of settlement.</li> <li>• Speed of change – number of pitches/plots which have been developed over the past 5 years (see Consolidated Site List)</li> <li>• Number of G&amp;T/SP pitches/plots granted via retrospective planning permissions over the past ten years (see Site List).</li> <li>• Number of pitches/plots permitted in locations where conventional development would be contrary to normal planning policies.</li> <li>• Also see issues 7- 9 below</li> </ul>	the combination of answers to these questions leads to the conclusion that the site is disproportionate or over-dominant compared to the scale of the existing settlement.
	<b>Pattern of development</b>			
7.	Visual impact including landscape	National Circular 01/2006 (para 52).  Updated Criteria Draft PPS 2011	Density  No breaks  Ability to screen  Refer to AVDC's Landscape Character Assessment and Areas of Sensitive Landscape studies	
	<b>Sustainability</b>			
8.	Transport/environmental issues	National Circular 01/2006 (Para 64 (d and e) Circular 04/2007 (para 54 (e and f).  Updated Criteria	Will the site provide a settled base that reduces the need for long-distance travelling and possible environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment?	

	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Policy/Criterion 'hook' + cross-reference</b>	<b>Indicators of an appropriate proposal/checklist of questions to pose</b>	<b>Commentary/rationale</b>
		Draft PPS 2011	Is the site located in an area at high risk of flooding, including the functional flood plain?	
9.	Social cohesion	National Circular 01/2006 (para 64 (a));  Circular 04/2007 (para 54(b)). Draft PPS 21011	Ability of the site to promote the peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.  Access to schools, churches and other community facilities.	Availability of opportunities to become involved in community activities.
	<b>Proximity</b>			
10.	Direct impact on neighbours	National: Circular 01/2006 (para 66);  Circular 04/2007 (para 56  Updated Criteria Draft PPS 2011	Any evidence/likelihood of the following issues arising as a result of the G&T/TS site:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overshadowing</li> <li>• Overbearing impact</li> <li>• Overlooking</li> <li>• Light and noise pollution</li> <li>• Noise and disturbance</li> </ul>	
	<b>Good Site Layout and Design</b>			
11.	Site Design and Management	National:PPS1 CLG Good Practice Guide 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites CLG Good Practice and Travellers Site Management'. Draft PPS 2011	Is site designed for safer communities and to reduce the fear of crime?  Are the proposals of high quality design?  Is an appropriate level of open space provided on-site?  If site is privately run, no direct means of the LA to control site management through the planning system – however, applicants should be pointed to the CLG Good Practice Guide on Gypsy and Travellers Site Management.	Good layout can improve amenity levels for occupiers, e.g. privacy levels, access to play space.  Definition of private and shared space can reduce potential conflict.  Good layout of access, circulation and parking space to provide good access, minimise manoeuvring etc.

**Definitions** (CLG Circular 01/2006, Draft PPS April 2011)

***Gypsy and Traveller status:***

Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.

***Travelling Showpeople status:***

Members of an organised group for the purposes of holding fairs, circuses or shows (whether or not travelling together as such). This includes such persons who on the grounds of their own or their family's or dependants' more localised pattern of trading, educational or health needs or old age, have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently but excludes Gypsies and Travellers.

***Definition of Gypsies and Travellers in legislation:***

Persons with a cultural tradition of nomadism or of living in a caravan; and all other persons of a nomadic habit of life, whatever their race or origin, including: such persons who, on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependant's educational or health needs or old age, have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently; or members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people (whether or not travelling together as such).